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CLEARING, WHAT IT IS

A lecture given on 3 September 1964

Thank you.

What's the date?

*Audience: Third of September.*

Third of September, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

I had a bunch of things to talk to you about but my mail line has been hitting me so hard in the last few minutes that I'm a bit discombobulated and so forth.

There is a storm going on in London at the present moment. And it was a protest by the Director of Prom Reg of the use of the word Clear in *Certainty* magazine and she carefully went around to the staff and collected all the entheta that everybody was saying on staff on this particular word.

Well, frankly, if you went back and used the technology of 1958 you could make a Clear. You wouldn't make a 100 percent job of the line, don't you see, but something on the order of 50 percent or something like that. And they'd stay that way nicely. And some of them would stay that way for years.

Now, the point I'm making on the situation is a standard term which originally came out of the field of adding machines. (I'm actually talking to you now about PE and that sort of thing, and I'll gradually remember what I was going to talk to you about.)

In the field of adding machines there is a button that says, "clear" and that's what Clear means. And that's a fairly antique definition because it probably – it goes back in Dianetics – it goes back to *Dianetics, Evolution of a Science*, which predates Book One, of course, and the example is given in that.

And it goes back to the invention of adding machines which is quite previous to Dianetics and Scientology so this is an old term. That's actually what Clear means. It's the c-l-e-a-r which is written on the button on an adding machine. Now, let's just become factual about the definitions here and let's say exactly what they are.

Now, why is that there? Well, in the world of electronic computers they sometimes have solder trouble. This gives you another – another viewpoint of the same problem; they have solder trouble. There's these tremendous numbers of circuits that they build up inside of one of their computers and these circuits are extremely complex and when somebody gets in there with a soldering iron occasionally to fix in a new transistor or something of the sort, why they'll drop a drop of solder or something, you see? Well, the second he does that he will
add some figure into all the computations. All the computations will now have this additive figure because it's short-circuited with a drop of solder, you see, and so that when you say "How far is it to the moon?" this will give you the answer but then multiplies or subtracts this soldered figure. So it never comes up with the right answer.

Now, in plain, mechanical adding machines you can do this very, very easily. This is not a computer – let's get back more – more elementary. On a plain, ordinary, garden-variety adding machine used in every accounts office anyplace in the world – except the abacus, but I imagine you can make the same mistake on the abacus – yes, you can. You've just got through adding up yesterday's receipts and then you start to add up today's receipts and you never push the clear button. You never push that clear button and pull the handle down twice. If you don't believe it, try it sometime on an adding machine. You get the most remarkable answers. See, you've added this all up and now you've still got a total unseen in the machine.

So when you reach over here and pull the lever, put another figure on it and add it, it just keeps adding this total. Only you don't notice that it's adding the total into the whole line because – until you are clear down to the end of it. So, you have added yesterday's receipts, you see, and that figure is still lurking in the machine, uncleared.

And now you start to add up today's receipts and you get yesterday's receipts and today's receipts in the total. So, the answer, you see, if there wasn't a clearing in it, was a cumulative answer which depended on some old data modifying the present time answer.

Now, the mind, when it has an old experience will add that data into its current experience. And it keeps coming up with wrong answers. A professor looks at some college student with a slight twitch of the eye and this girl says, "He has winked at me," (and dust got in his eye at that minute, you see?) "He has now winked at me so there is nothing I can do now but quit school."

And you say, "Well, that's crazy." No, no, it's a perfectly correct answer according to that computer because she was assaulted when she was ten by a fellow who winked at her first and it messed her up considerably, you see?

So to prevent this experience from occurring she adds the old experience into this new experience and gets, really, a wrong answer. Well, she actually is incapable of observing the new experience because she's still got the old experience, you see, so she can't come up with the right answer to this situation which is some dust got in his eye. This would never occur to her. It must be very meaningful that he winked at her. And this means, of course, she is going to be assaulted; and this means of course she is going to get messed up like mad and therefore she is going to have to leave school. That's the only answer to the situation.

And you say, "Well, that's silly; that's outrageous." Well, that's because she is not cleared on the subject of winks. Do you see?

Male voice: Yah.

So where she still has a lurking datum which is an aberrated datum – and what people have never gotten, I suppose, is this word, "aberrated." It means NUTS! [laughter] Have you got it?
I love the – some people's evaluation of this particular thing because it's a, "Well, he worries a little bit when he gets broke, so therefore he's aberrated." Oh, no, people worry when they get broke, see, he is not aberrated on it. No, it means nuts! See?

This guy's shoes in the morning are found to be where the left one – the right one is where the left one is, and the left one is where the right one is; they are crossed so their toes go out slightly. So he looks at this situation alongside of his bed and has a nervous breakdown. That's aberrated! [laughter] See, people are not operating in the degree of the uncleared datum. See? They're going out here and saying, "Well, sunlight when it shines in my eyes hurts my eyes, so therefore I must be aberrated on the subject of sunlight." Now, that's not aberrated. That's not aberrated. That's – might be peculiar in degree or something, but that – that's no aberration.

No, it's much worse than this. The guy is walking along in the dark and his eyes hurt because of the bright lights he sees in them. That's nuts! He doesn't know where they're coming from. There's no source for these lights. He goes around worrying about it. He finally decides (wrong answer because he is not cleared on the subject) that Martians keep landing in front of him all the time! He's nuts! Now, that is a datum that needs to be cleared.

The girl with the aberration on the subject of every time she sees a man's eye twitch she has to leave college or something – that's interfering with her life like mad! And that is the datum that needs to be cleared. And a Clear wouldn't have those. It doesn't add in yesterday's totals into a completely wrong answer for today. Do you follow? That's all a Clear is.

Now, it also happens that when a person is very, very aberrated, and I hate to have to say, very, very – let's just call it aberrated because that is the missing word here as well as Clear – when a person is aberrated he can't remember a thing! Nothing, along some given line of action.

Now, this girl whose – the professor winked at her and she has to leave school, can't remember where it happened, what class she is in, when she enrolled in that class. She'd have to think for a long time before she'd finally even come up with a subject, don't you see? It's where did she put her textbooks, you know? Anything connected with that, her memory stinks! Do you follow it?

She's – usually goes down the hall to this particular classroom and goes into the wrong classroom. Do you get the idea? In other words she cannot remember on this particular subject. And as far as being able to remember the subject itself, she's going to flunk her finals, man, she is going to flunk them. Memory bad on that particular subject. Have you got it? Lousy! Oh, she can remember everything else, she can remember letters from her girlfriends and she can remember this and she can remember childhood, she can remember all sorts of things, but anything connected with this classroom, she can't remember. This thing is buried. She doesn't even remember the assault on her when she was ten! This is – little gimmick is what made Freud famous. Just this one, little, tiny gimmick – that if you could get somebody to remember what had happened to them, they were better.

Now, she doesn't even remember that – the assault on her when she was ten, much less what the subject or class or anything else is about that it's associated with.
In other words, it's a motion-picture screen with no projector, no film and no audience. That is memory on this given subject.

Memory is not a broad condition. Everybody is going around saying, "My memory is bad. My memory is good. He has a good memory. He has a bad memory." Bull! [laughter] Nobody's memory works that even. Nobody's memory works that evenly, it doesn't work that badly, and it doesn't work that goodly. Memory is not a uniform condition. It's as spotty as a leopard!

This fellow, he can remember, oh man, you ask him — you ask him, "Now, what were the dimensions of the last building you built?"

"Oh!" he says, "That was 97.5 feet wide and the bricks were 3 1/4 inches above the cantles and blah-blah-blah-woof-wulf, and the roof poles were so forth, and we put 3/16 inch, you know, reinforcement in the ruddy rods, you know." He goes on and on and on. He's a walking ware — warehouse — not — not — not he's a walking memory, he's a warehouse of memories, you see, on the subject.

And you say, "What did you have for dinner?"

And he says, "Well, I don't know. I don't know what I had for dinner."

"What did you have for breakfast?"

"Oh God! Don't ask me that. That's too long ago. That's hours ago, see."

On the subject of food he's a dead blank. On the subject of figures and construction and that sort of thing, man, he's a running racehorse. And that's people. That's the way they are.

And the worse off they are, the less they can remember.

And now, if you got a total blank you would simply get the condition known as unconsciousness or amnesia. And that is simply the culmination of all the held-down fives eventually adding up to a total wipeout. But that is the extreme condition and you can't even talk to that bloke. He can't even open his eyes much less see anybody wink. So, it actually, from the world's standpoint doesn't matter much whether this fellow can remember or not remember, observe or not observe because he's not even there! So it isn't a question of memory, it's a question of not-ness. He is not, memory is not, past is not, present is not. Don't you see? Everything is not. Not there. There isn't any.

Well, you could get a culmination of adding up all his bad memories into a totality of bad memory, but would you have at that moment a normal human being? No, you would not have a normal human being. You wouldn't have a human being, you'd just have a lump of meat, see? So to say somebody has a — has a bad memory. On what? It's an incomplete statement.

If you said, "Somebody has amnesia," yes, you could say, "Well, all right, that is a total bad memory," but of course you can't even classify it as memory because he's not even there to remember. It's a gone dog that we're talking about now.
So memory is not an even condition. People remember some things well and remember some things badly.

Now, if you wanted to improve somebody's memory you'd also have to say, "on what?" See? The guy says – sets a goal for the session – "I want to improve my memory." Well, all right, he set it for the session and you are an auditor and this is his session and you're not going to argue with him. Let him make a mistake, it's his mistake.

But if you were handling this sensibly, you would have to ask the remaining – I mean, don't say that you should do this in a session, you know, but I mean, in investigating the situation you would have to say, "Improve your memory on what?" Now you would have something to work on, wouldn't you? But up to the moment when he doesn't add the "on what" you don't have anything to work on. And you're left with this complete lie that memory is an evenness, don't you see? Memory is an even goodness or badness or memory as a whole subject can be improved. Oh no, memory as a whole subject could only be improved – yes, whole – as a whole subject it could be improved but only by stressing the particularities on which his memory is bad. And then if you kept picking up each thing on which his memory was bad, having asked this burning question, "Improve your memory on what?" you would now get an answer like, "Well, improve my memory for – for – for names."

"Well, any particular names?"

"Yes. Girls' names. I just don't seem to be able to remember – I meet Agnes and I think she is Bessie. Aluuur-luuur! You know, bhuuuul! Horrible!"

Well, man, you're right on the track of that button called clear because it goes hand-in-glove. Just as the held-down five in the electronics machine that is held down there with a piece of solder, just as yesterday's total receipts are being added in unobserved, why, so he doesn't observe that zone or area where (quote) "his memory is bad" and that is where he is aberrated!

You couldn't ask for a nicer little set of scales by which to measure somebody's nuttiness.

He says, "I want to improve my memory."

You say, "What do you want to improve in memory?"

"I want to improve my memory on names."

"Any particular name?"

"Yeah, I want to improve my memory on girls' names!"

Now you as the auditor have something to run down. And you'd run it down and you'd find some – now let's go into Dianetics – you'd find some traumatic experience. "Traumatic" was a word invented to bedevil medical students. Some painful experience of some kind or another that is buried, not in the subconscious – there is no subconscious for anything to get buried in – it's just buried in the guy himself. It is an occlusion (to use a big word on you). Occlusion. To occlude, to slam the door in the face of, to close the window quickly in the front of. You know, to drop the blind; occlude. It is not there, that window he can't look out of, that backtrack he can't look into, that's gone. And sitting on it will be a nuttiness, and it
will be a good, big nuttiness. It's not a little, bitty nuttiness and sometimes – he doesn't even know he's got this nuttiness or he wouldn't have it, see? It's – it will be something on the order of, "If doors are half open, it's bad luck, and all day long people will be mad at him." That's sane, isn't it? He's got it added up into "won't be an even flow of time" or something, see.

He can explain it to you, but once he starts explaining it, it's a gone dog, his memory starts opening up on it at once. All you have to do is turn a spotlight on this thing. All you have to do is start looking at the machine and find out where the figure is held down, where the five is held down. All you've got to do is just monkey with it a little bit and it starts to clear!

And every time you can find someplace where somebody is off the beam, you will also find – these facts all go together – you will find someplace where somebody can't remember. He got a bum datum. Painful past experience, see; these are all of the same family of stuff, see?

He's got a painful area there that hurts him to look at, so of course that gives him a bad memory on that particular subject and this gives him wrong answers in present time. It's just a fact. Wrong answers all the time.

You'll find out he'll take irrational decisions consistently and continuously. If you ask him to design a door for a house, why, he'd fix up something a cat could get through but a man couldn't, you know? There would be something nutty on this subject. This thing, though, would appear at first glance to be very hard to locate because it has so many locks, it has so many appended associated experiences, things that are like it, and it's just a great, big pileup of stuff – a great, big pileup of stuff. Well, you start removing these things and you start getting down to the core of this thing and all of a sudden we find the traumatic experience of some kind or another, we find with it the big overt and we know now the misunderstood word and when we've got this thing unpiled, why, it flies apart like a clock that a baby has just slopped a hammer to, see? It goes blammmnggg! That's the end of that aberration.

He couldn't get it back if he tried. All of a sudden when he thinks, it doesn't get stopped by the clock, see, in there or something. He – we think – he starts thinking on this subject. He sees a door and the door is half open, you see? Well, formerly the door half open meant so-and-so and so-and-so and meant so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so forth and therefore he shouldn't probably go through the door because of so on, and it's very bad luck to have such a thing and so on, and the only – the only thing for it to do was to count the number of steps he had taken to the door, and then walk the steps backwards.

You say, "What the hell was this all about?" Well, that's what's the matter with it, it's what the hell is this all about? You see, the one thing which is – which is true about these things is their sum total answer is incomprehensible. The horrible thing you're watching in – in the field of psychiatry is them trying to make sense out of the incomprehensible. Well, you don't make sense out of the incomprehensible, you find out what caused the incomprehensible. You don't – don't enter it on the wrong side and say, "Well, let's see, how does this all add up? How does this all add up? Now, let's see, what does he really mean?"

Well, he doesn't mean nothing, man, he just means he's got a wrong answer. He means he's nuts, I mean that's all you have to understand about it.
We don't care what this bird's chattering about – we don't have to – we don't have to do anything about it at all! You see? It's just bleahhhh and so forth. And you step backwards in order to open a door, but if you didn't do that and something or other... And he feels depressed and blue all the time because doors are usually half-open. Somebody is trying to add this up, you see, on the other side of the ledger he's trying to add this up this way.

"Let's see, now he probably has something to do... And there is probably something in all of man that has to do with square shapes excite a complex."

You can't add these things up into general behavior because it's just this bird's aberration. You see? That – he's just nuts that way. That doesn't mean there is anybody else in the world crazy on the subject of doors half-open, don't you see? But this guy is.

Well, all you have to understand about it is, is the guy doesn't understand it. See, if you could just understand that it's – that it's not necessary to understand what the hell he's talking about. All you've got to find out is, "What – " Let's enter it on the other side now and let's say, "What started all of this? Where did this come from?"

And of course, you're going to get forty or fifty weird-sounding things come off of this one thing. And we find out that when he was four or five years old or something like that, why, it was he who let off the brakes of the family car and ran over his baby brother, and the reason his baby brother has been crippled ever since. And doors sort of add into this in some wild and peculiar way that he – you know, he had to open the door or something. And you'll find out it is some phrase in the engram like, you know, "Open the door and get at him quick," you know, or something like that. Or he's got a stuck picture of a half-open car door or something like that, see?

But that's – that's how it explains, is: What's the original experience that is the cause of this bird being aberrated or nuts on this particular subject so that he can't remember on the subject, so that he can't think on the subject, so that he can't get right answers on the subject, so that he is around the bend on this particular subject? You got it?

You know, nobody is totally crazy. Nobody is totally crazy. The wildest madman in the insane asylum is not totally crazy. And this has got everybody bugged. Everybody else goes crazy on this datum, see?

They say, "Well! Craziness should be a state! Insanity should be a general state!"

Here we got again this thing I've just gave you of memory, see? "Insanity should be a general state!" And we have – we have magistrates sitting there in their moth-eaten wigs, you know, and these fellows are saying, "Now, Mr. Sawbrain, the local psychiatrist, is now going to give us an opinion as to whether or not somebody is sane or insane." And so, after a few gibblings and dribblings and so forth, Mr. Sawbrain gets up and says, "I certify, Your Honor, he is insane. He's a – he's a kleptosis skidabuff ruffboof." And the – the psychiatrist then had made his pronunciamento, so the man is "legally insane."

Ahh, what kind of a comedy sideshow is this thing? Because nobody is totally insane.
Even the girl in the catatonic schiz state if you could get her to open one eye is liable to ask for a glass of water. Well, that's not a – an insane request, don't you see? So, it isn't an insane act.

But man, with his thirst for totalities, his thirst for allness – which you should recognize as just a desire to identify A with A and A with A and everything is A. It's just total identification, you see. Has to have, even in his legal systems, a thing called "insane." There is nobody insane. There is no such thing as a total insanity. So therefore there couldn't be such a thing as an "insane state."

He would have to be insane on some subject. Or he would have to be insane in some area or field of endeavor or action. And it's just that the rest of the sentence is missing. "This man is insane" is actually this kind of a sentence, an incomplete sentence that requires the dot-dot-dot on the end of it to show that it is incomplete. "This man is insane dot-dot-dot." They have never finished the sentence. "This man is insane on the subject of women." "This man is insane on the subject of the State." "This man is insane on the subject of green cheese."

But if they knew that much about insanity, they could cure it. Because what I've given you here is, of course, the missing link in the scientific research area. And it is in the definition of their terms, which is there is a state called "general insanity." And they always are trying to dream up new names for this sort of thing. They call them schizophrenics, and they call them this and they call them that and paranoids. They're trying to get this broad, pervasive label. And they're so interested in getting a new term to put on this thing, that they frankly have never asked what they're trying to label.

And if they would just realize that they just haven't completed their sentence, they would have opened a door to a cure. All they had to do was complete their own sentence, don't you see?

This fellow is dancing around in a straw skirt, and whereas this wouldn't be particularly odd-looking in Hollywood, this straw-skirt dancing, if it were taking place in Boston, would be cause for comment. Somebody would notice.

Well, it isn't even the environmental difference. The guy was nuts whether he was in Hollywood or Boston. But in Boston they have this sort of thing called "conduct" or "reserved conduct" or "unseemly conduct." They inherited it from Cotton Mather and the other jokers that were back there way back when.

Anyway, we get ahold of this bird, see? A psychiatrist says, "This man is insane!" Incomplete statement, see? He's going – he should have said, "This man is insane dot-dot-dot."

Your position would have been to open the cure for this fellow and an understanding of the situation. "On what subject?" would be your innocent remark. Well, that of course blows up the whole field; that opens the doors to cure. "He is insane on what subject?"

The psychiatrist says, "exhibitionism." Ah, that's not a subject, that's a condition. That doesn't say, "Exhibitionism. All right..." He – that's not good enough. That doesn't give you anything to go home on. What's he insane on? On what subject? Let's finish out the sentence here.
Well, they would have to observe the fellow for a few minutes to find out what was going on before they could finish the sentence, and that would force them to observe the patient and even – and at that point they would find out that there aren't any similarities in insanity, so you can't classify insanity.

So we observe him for a few minutes and he kept saying, "Boola-boola, ooga-ooga, boola-boola, uga-ooga." And we find out what he's insane on now. We find out that – why, we say – we say, "Why are you saying, 'boola-boola, uga-ooga'?

And he says, "Well, you have to. This is the South Seas, you idiot!"

Well, he's insane because he thinks he is in the South Seas. Well, now we've got the door open.

"Hey, bud. Please explain to me why you are in the South Seas."

Oh man, we are carving away on this aberration now with axes. See, we are going to town on this sort of thing. We don't have to cut up his brain because the aberration is being cut up, which is the proper target. And we find out finally – we find out finally that this bird is stuck in a movie someplace that he has observed and so forth and we find out he has a thwarted ambition in some particular character and we find out that in order to accomplish that ambition he committed a fantastic overt act at some time. He stole a whopping great big piece of money in order to go to Hollywood and be in the movies. And he was never caught but he didn't get to Hollywood and get in the movies either. And he didn't go off the rockers on this particular subject until he'd found out that the person he'd stolen the money from had as a result gone broke and committed suicide. Too much overt.

Now the gray walls start to move close to this individual and he doesn't quite know what all this adds up to. But we have now a traumatic experience. We get off the overt and he all of a sudden doesn't have all this nonsense going on. We carve it down. It would take adroit auditing. You couldn't do it in the absence of the discipline of auditing, you see? You would have to have that right on the groove, otherwise you'd never get the data, you'd never carve it back, he'd never be able to blow any locks.

You can't just stand over a fellow saying, "That isn't what's wrong with you! It's something else wrong with you. You realize, don't you, that you're an exhibitionist raf-raf-rah-rah-rah."

They don't blow locks when you do that. [laughter]

In other words, it takes the discipline of auditing to have carved down to that.

Now, what would we have accomplished at the final end of that line?

We would have found out the overt, we would have found out the basic experience with regard to it. We probably would have found a little bit of an underlying experience of some kind or another, we'd find a failure to understand something or other and when we got all of this up, he would no longer be dancing around in the streets in a hula skirt saying, "Ug-gooola-boolabua." And that's – what have we done then?

He'd also be able to remember that period of his life. And when you said, "Motion pictures" to him he didn't instantly go and get his hula skirt and jump out in the middle of the
street and go, "Uga-boola, boola-boola-boola." So, the right answer to a hula skirt he finds out was not jumping out into the street and going, "Uga-boola, boola-boola." Or the right answer to motion pictures – the right answer to motion pictures is "sit and look at them." And now he sees a motion picture he sits and looks at it.

Take a drunkard. This fellow is drinking to escape, or he is drinking to this, or he is drinking to that. But I don't think he's really drinking to anything. I think he's drinking.

Now, let's go it the other way, too. That – there we've got an overelaborated explanation. He's got a total solution to how to get through life: you drink. See? But you wouldn't even know whether he had it as a total solution or it was a symptom of something else or it was something else lying on something else, until you carved into it and asked him what this was all about.

All right, now you say, "He's insane on the subject of what?" And you finally find out he's insane on the subject of liquor. When he gets enough – a glass of liquor in front of him, he has to empty it. And when the glass of liquor is empty he has to fill it.

Now, you start pushing this back again and you may find it at two years old while he's lying in his crib, you – you may find the wildest piece of stuff. See?

"Drink your milk! Drink your milk! Drink it up! Drink it up!" Maybe the kid's got a temperature of 115, see?

has ideas and he puts the thing together and he has realizations and he – we give it the gen-
eral, blanket title of cognition.

Well, if you're not going down that track, in other words, if you're not processing what
the pc has to have processed, why, you of course are not going to get any cognitions. And you
know very well processing a pc who isn't cogniting is a waste of time. It would also be a
waste of time to process a pc who isn't aberrated.

But if you are processing somebody, you ought to be processing what they're aberrated
on. You have to finish the sentence, in other words.

The guy says, "Well, what do you want – what's – what is your general goal in proc-
essing?"

"Well, my general goal in processing is to get bigger."

Well now, if you're going to get anyplace on this thing, you're going to have to keep
your ears open. All right, good, he's got a general goal and he's going to get bigger. All right,
that's fine. Let's buy that for a little while and that sort of thing. But remember that this was an
odd-sounding goal. So we're going to press this thing. We're going to push it; we're going to
push it a little more.

I don't care whether you say "Why?" or "When?" or "What?" or anything else, let's
push it. And all of a sudden we are going to find out, "Well, you see, I'm very tiny."

"Are you?" This fellow is six foot two, see. "All right, you're very tiny." Well, you just
slid off of the rational being, didn't you, over into the ditch here someplace. The guy is six
foot two and he's complaining because he is very tiny.

Well, if you were to say, "Well, how big should you be?" Oh, well, I ought to be at
least normal size."

"Well, good, what's normal size?"

"Six foot two."

And the reason you don't find these aberrations in people, you're not looking for any-
thing that's nutty. See? You are all the time prospecting for something that is normal. You can
always find the normal. People are far more normal than they are crazy.

Something like somebody sent you out to look for a red rock in a whole desert full of
gray rocks. And you keep coming back, and you say, "Well, I found a gray rock. And I found
a gray rock. And I found..." "Sure, you found a gray rock, you idiot! The place is full of them!
Anybody can find a gray rock, how about finding a red rock?"

"Well, maybe they don't exist."

"Why, maybe they don't exist. Look for them anyhow. You know why I think it ex-
ists? Because your pc – your pc doesn't look good. So, I think there must be a red rock around
there someplace."

"All right. Well, let's – I'll go out and find it."
All of a sudden, if you really – if you really know your business, you'll pick up a red rock, you know, and you'll say, "My God. A red rock." You know, you hug it to your bosom.

"Oh, you – you want to be normally tall? Well, all right, well, how big is normally tall?"

"Six foot two."

Now, you have to be enough of an auditor not to say incredulously at this minute, "But, you idiot, you are six feet two!" Now you've found yourself a red rock, see, in a sea of gray rocks. See, you could find any quantity of gray rocks. Don't bother with them, you see? Just handle gray rocks until you see there is one edge sticking up of something that might be a red rock and then you follow that on down. Now you dig for this red rock.

And you find this fellow not only is not six feet two and is not normal size, but he's only three years old. Marvelous. Well, you try to plot it, you're – you're going to – you're going to be in trouble. You start – what we used to call "writing script" – you try to write this guy's script for him. You could never guess these corners because they are just totally aberrated, see? That's the trouble with them: they don't go in logical sequence. And you suffer from the fact as an auditor that you are not getting a logical sequence, so you try to hang it up together so it's logical.

And of course, the reason he is crazy on that particular subject is it is not logical and never will be!

Not till the sun perishes in the sky will that be logical. So there's no point in being logical about it. No, your attitude is you want to be informed. And you'll eventually find out all about it.

Now, if you know your business real sharp and with this new technology on the subject of overts and words in definitions and so forth, you're going to run it back to some traumatic experience of some kind or another where a word was grossly misdefined, where a word was really knocked in the head; you're going to run it back.

So you know what you're trying to run it back to, you know what he doesn't understand, you know where you're trying to get to and you all of a sudden would be able to put your finger on this and the guy says, "Do you know, I've always..." He tells you now, see? "Do you know I've always thought of myself as being three years old? And you know, I'm not. I just realized that. Huh! That's funny, isn't it, how being – I don't know. You know, there – there must have been something happened – that – that would make me think that sort of thing. I wonder what it could be."

Help him out, keep him talking, keep him plowing, keep your meter running, let's just see if we can find this and all of a sudden – you see he's going in on the top of the thing to that degree – you all of a sudden find – find this wild bit of business: He had always thought of himself as a little fellow, and he had to go on thinking of himself as a little fellow because of some weird, wild reason, and – and the word – the word "fellow" is misdefined, it means – it means, "a splendid being" or something, see. And it means that some ally always referred to him as a little fellow. And he's got it firmly fixed in his skull one way or the other – with overts and withholds and nonsense all mixed up – he's got it firmly fixed in his skull that if he
goes on being a "little fellow," then everybody will like him and he will be all right and he can get away with it, and see? And he can live. But actually a "little fellow" doesn't mean what he thinks a "little fellow" does mean, but it does mean it, but it doesn't mean it. And all of a sudden he gets this thing all straightened out and you watch that button come up on the adding machine! Now he can think on this subject of size. He can get the proper answers on the subject of sizes, he can get the proper answers on the subject of his relationship with other people, he can get proper answers with regard to children, he can get proper answers on anything associated with that particular subject. And on that subject he is cleared.

What does Clear mean?

It means, on any given subject, not nuts anymore! On any given subject, not nuts anymore.

Expand the definition: On any given subject where the person has been pretty confused, cotton-picking nuts, he is not now nuts!

I don't know how to make it any plainer without introducing more complicated words.

This fellow is now – you would have to put it into a framework of relationship. "On the subject of children, this man is a Clear." That would be an interesting attitude, but then, that would be a perfect, accurate one. Now, when you've got a majority of these points plowed up on the individual so that there are no great obvious ones around on which he is nuts, you would then have a person that you could bend the terminology around and call a Clear, which would only, however, be short for "a cleared person" or a "cleared ability to think." Now we're right down to rock bottom when we are talking about this sort of thing.

Now, when we talk of clearing, the basic business of an auditor on the subject of clearing would use any technique or any technology which located (I mean any Scientology technology; none of the rest of them will) which located areas of aberration – that would be the selection – located areas of aberration in the being. Areas of aberration in the being. Not tried to determine whether he was sane or insane or something of the sort. And then which followed those areas down until the individual recognized an earlier causation for this condition. And the nature of aberration is such that he actually couldn't put it back together again if you gave him mortar, sticks, stones and a psychiatrist. He couldn't go nuts on that subject again if he tried.

So, talk about the instability or the impermanence of a Clear is nonsense. The person who has been alleviated on one particular area can't really make himself crazy on that area again. He has an awful time because he's now not only got the thing gone which was being very tenuously held together by some horrendous series of mishaps and oddball circumstances, you see? The chances of becoming aberrated this way were very slight to begin with, you see, and it happened that all the right conditions existed for his particular temperament at any given – at some given moment and they all came together at that moment, why, the exact combination necessary to produce this condition occurred.

Now, by the time you've gotten back and chipped a few pieces off that, why, that all starts to fly apart. Well, he can't put that back together again because he'd have to have a new
experience of some kind of similar accidentals, and just the odds are against it occurring, you see?

Now, he also has the education of having been crazy on it and that is the real thing that defeats it. He knows he has been nuts on it. So then when he sees himself leaning toward a condition where this condition might occur again and so forth, he already preunderstands what might happen to him and it doesn't happen. Do you see?

So having had it is like being indoctrinated or vaccinated or something of the sort, see? Inoculated or vaccinated. Well, he's – he's got himself – he's got himself now – he couldn't go nuts on that subject again if he tried.

All right. The state of a – of a really cleared up alcoholic, somebody had really worked with an alcoholic and cleared him all up, well, just the way I've been talking about processing, you see, using this type of system approach; man, that guy trying to become an alcoholic again would be a – would – he would be a laughing thing. I mean, he'd be a very laughable object. You know, trying to, "Let's see. I guess I will be a drunkard." You know? Well, liquor doesn't any longer have the same effect on him that it did, don't you see?

And liquor, believe me, has different effects on different people. So, this sloppy degradation that he always used to experience so deliciously and all that sort of thing, that doesn't occur anymore, you know? It isn't that he doesn't get drunk; he can probably get drunk or something of the sort but it doesn't have the same effects. And he would – he could – he could probably sit there and pour down the hooch by the tumblervful and maybe nothing would happen at all. This would be very, very horrible, don't you see? No, you wouldn't want to become an alcoholic again. But I'm just giving you the reverse side of the coin that if he did, he'd have a hard time to.

So, talk about the instability of Clear.

Well, a person having to talk about how stable Clears are is simply being driven to the wall of having to make a statement without being able to explain the mechanics of the subject matter and he's having to make a loose statement just to satisfy somebody's curiosity and that's a very dangerous thing to do.

The actual facts of the case are – is once a person has been cleared on any given subject, he hasn't got a prayer of getting that way again. So on a subject on which an individual has been cleared he is not only stable, he is un-recurrable. It ain't going to happen again.

Now, how Clear can you get? Oh, I don't know. I'm sure you don't know. But I can tell you that it's not in the field – total clearing does not happen to be in the field up to IV. It doesn't happen to lie in that field or sphere of processing. It requires new skills and the state reached is not a state of being unaberrated on certain, given subjects. The state reached is cause over matter, energy, space, time, life and form and so forth, which is the state of OT.

So, the final state attainable is not a state of Clear but the state of total causation. It's a different subject, see. You – you – in the middle of a – of a flight, you are all of a sudden saying – having to say, "Well, this is a total absolute." Well, they are not only unobtainable in this particular case, there is no total absolute because it isn't the way it goes.
The reason it doesn't go that way is a person has to have a mind in order to become aberrated in that mind. You see? And clearing is something that applies to the mind. Clearing also applies to the individual in relationship to his mind or his mental abilities. And clearing is a subject which is very, very, very precisely related to a finite state of existence. "My name is Joe. I live at 64 Elm Street in Peoria, on the planet Earth at this corner of the universe. And I happen to be a news vendor." This is finite existence, you see, labelable, finite existence, the ability to survive and to handle a normal, what you would call average sort of environment.

In other words, we're now talking in the realm of man is a being who is inhabiting a universe and we are not talking about anything unusual or anything remarkable or anything else. We're talking about a being; we're talking about a mind; we're talking about thinking; we're talking about experience and of course we're assuming that it happens in the universe across a span of time. We're assum... we're assuming it happens from present time moment to present time moment to present time moment, to pocketa-pocketa, pocketa-pocketa, pocketa-pocketa time track. We're – you know, that existence is going forward. We're talking about an existence in which one goes home and eats soup at six o'clock. You get the idea? We're talking about living.

Well, we have run fresh out of that subject when we go above this level and try to make Clear into an absolute; we just go fresh out of it. Because from that point on, you don't clear. You get all the side effects of clearing, but you're off in a different direction. You are not trying to fix this guy up so he can think, you're not trying to fix this guy so he can ex... so he can suffer or react. What you're – you're not trying to even fix him up so he can remember. You're trying to fix this guy up – well, you're not even trying to fix this guy up! [laughter] Do you understand?

And the final product that you wind up with has no relationship whatsoever to a fixed-up guy. It is a total resumption of beingness at total causation. And it doesn't take place necessarily any longer in the physical universe. And it doesn't necessarily at all take place in finite time. The final product that you are aiming for and to try to call this Clear is impossible, unless you've now bent the whole terms of Clear all the way around backwards and said, "As escaped from, or sidestepped from" or something or other, or if you treated – well, you just have to bend the term so creaky. Yeah, we cleared him of living in the universe. See? It sounds kind of weird, see. So you've got to go off on a different tack.

So clearing is an assist to finite – meaning within limits – existence. Which just means that it's – a guy is living, that's all.

Now, a bunch of people who have been indoctrinated in the world of religion or spiritualism or something are going to try to bend these two things together. And they are going to take the supernatural or the unnatural or the totality of existence or the infinite mind in an infinite book or something like this, and they are going to bend all these things together and try to wobble it up against the normalcy of existence or something, and wow! That's how they got tangled up in the first place.

Man doesn't leap from a state of total aberration to a state of total divinity because of three flicks of a prayer wheel. It's a road that must be walked and it's a long road.
And the earliest part of that road is totally involved with the environment in which he finds himself. The girl next door, the cars, restaurants, theaters, bosses, economy and so forth. And they're all walked in that world. And if he walks long enough in that world and if he graduates himself up along the line, and he gets cleared of more and more of these aberrations, and he is more and more free, the gradient scale breaks down only at this point: When he tries for his next goal he is going for broke, he is going right on out. Don't you see? He is no longer walking in the finite existence. Now he's running things called GPMs. They are intimately associated with what makes a mind. How come he does all these things? Why is he on a time track? You see, it's handling a different kind of a problem.

And the people don't consider this normal, let me point that out. An individual to have no time at all would not be considered normal. Don't you see? You're talking in a different framework. So how you could explain this framework, Lord knows. If you tried to explain it on the basis of, "We're going to clear him totally" or something like that, I don't know what you're talking about. Because clearing is a finite existence of fixing the individual up so that he can get proper answers in a proper world. That's the – that's the place where it belongs. And that's about all there is to it.

Now if we're going to pull the big – the big medicine drum out, you know, and we're going to – we're going to bow down before the altars of God-help-us and figure out exactly what is man's relation to the cosmos? What is man's relation to divinity? What is the exact nature of this universe?

Why, we're propounding philosophical questions that he's never even come within kicking distance of. And most of the questions he hasn't even asked. You look in vain for a philosophy of what's man doing on a time track? You don't find it. Why, he hasn't even gotten up that high.

Now we've got a different thing. Now we've got a different thing. Now, actually, we have to shift gears and at this point we can no longer strip away from the being, just strip away, strip away and shed and so forth. We've got an individual who will appear as an individual now and through his understandings of what is around him and his exact handling of the masses and significance in his immediate vicinity, don't you see, and his gradual emergence and cognition of what's going on, we're knocking out his whole concept of existence and we're replacing it with a wh... a total knowingness of existence. And that individual is merging toward causation, not being cleared.

This individual is going to the point where he causes the past, not cleared of the past. The aberrations which you're taking away from in R6 are not timed aberrations. That's what makes them very rough. They are not something which when you date them on the meter, they go away. Try dating a GPM on a meter some day. It dates now very perfectly. It isn't something that happened in the year 2681 B.C. or something, see. That's quite different than an implant, something that happened within the universe. You can date an implant and it – I don't care if you know the line plot or not, it will go bzzzz. You've put on the time track, in other words, you've fit the thing in relationship to time.

Well, you fit it in against the GPMs in relationship to time, and of course you get some very interesting things occurring. You get any engram or experience such as we are talking
about when we are talking about clearing, and you only have to date it and it will tend to just go bzzzz. You find the exact experience you are looking for and date it — bzzzzz. PC wouldn't have a prayer getting the thing back.

Yeah, but where's this time come from that you are dating it in? Do I make my point that we are in an entirely different field? Now we are asking the question of "Where does the time come from that you are dating the clearing in?" Ah, well, now you're in the field of R6, you're in the field of OT. You are in the field of re-creation of the individual, you're in the field of the individual rising up toward total cause. It is a very, very long and arduous road, even then. It is not a short road. We can sit there and run GPMs, my God, and run more GPMs, my God, and run — you don't run out of them very fast. And you raise your head and look around at the existence in which you find yourself still surrounded and so forth and you reorient yourself a bit and move up the line and one day you happen to notice accidentally that you are moving much faster than you ordinarily would move. You just notice it in passing, because it doesn't bother you.

Somebody who lived around you consistently and observed you consistently from a normal viewpoint and so forth would notice one Christ-awful difference, if you'll pardon the French. But you wouldn't even notice, see.

You say, "Well, that's a funny thing, I don't think I've been worried about that for the last two or three months." "That's very odd, but I was able to finish up that job in fifteen minutes, you know? And it used to take me all evening to do that." You know, just a fleeting idea, you know, a comparison, so on, a little lock blew or something like that, he paid no further attention to it.

The individual is coming back up to where he is more causative over the universe; he's less worried about what the universe is doing to him. And so he doesn't add it up — he ceases to add it up to self-progress. Do you get the idea? See, he's no longer looking at it in this particular field.

I'm just trying to give you that there's a separation point here, where you walk from the finite universe and start into the infinite. The world of total philosophy, the world of total beingness, the approaches to — well, not only whether did the chicken or the egg come first, but who thought up the question, "Which came first, the chicken or the egg?" See? You're off into another line. Now we are going for broke.

Now, people who are interested in clearing are normally interested in their physical condition, they are interested in their mental responses, they are interested in their behavior pattern in its relationship to other human beings, they are interested in accomplishing finite goals in the physical universe, such as "How do I keep my job?" "How can I better my economics?" They're interested in this particular field. Of course, a person going up the other track, if he hasn't totally followed a clearing track and so forth, is still interested in those things, too. Perhaps not as absorbedly, but still quite interested. But people are only interested in that who are very interested in clearing. This is a subject which takes that area in hand.

Now, we get a long run of this thing and we take some guy who is a gibbering, screaming mess in some insane asylum and we're going to take off enough separate — understand, separate — aberrations off of him. We're not — you see, as long as we approach this as
an – as an all subject, we're going to lose. This guy is insane and we are going to return sanity to him. That is why you just can't take that little old needle and stick it into the bottle and get three ergs worth of lepidus guk 652 and squirt it in his gluteus maximus and have him all of a sudden be in perfect condition and so forth. It's perhaps a beautiful dream, but it's a very batty one and it shows that there is no understanding of what they're up against at all, see.

We're going to take this bird and there he is gibbering inside the gates and we're going to take up separate aberrations, the ones that we can contact, the ones that he could free himself of and one by one shake these things down. We are going to see that his general state improves. That is probably what makes people believe that he is being generally made saner, you see? He's not generally being made saner, he's being cleared of separate and distinct areas of aberration.

Now, we could also say that his memory is improving, but what – that leads us again into a cul-de-sac. We should say, "He can now remember in certain definite, specific areas" and we're – we've made a better – a better approach. And this fellow eventually is risen up to a point of where he's only worried about the bedbugs which are biting him all night long, except nobody can find them and we finally even get that one traced back. And this was the symptom that landed him in the insane asylum in the first place, so now suddenly people pronounce him sane.

You – actually you couldn't ever have said he was totally insane and he is certainly a long way from totally sane now, he just isn't worried about these bedbugs anymore. Anyway – that doesn't make him sane. You are not sane because you don't worry about bedbugs. You get the point? So there would be no sense in making a general statement about the bird. But let's say, now, he isn't any longer dangerous to society, so we can let him loose.

All right. Now, that guy has got a long, long road to walk, man. That road – that road is a very hard road to look down even with a great, big, signal spyglass. You – you have to look down with a lot of power on that glass just to begin to see the vanishing point of that road. You wouldn't ever see the gates at the other end of it. You've got to walk down that road. And he – because he had a lot longer to walk than anybody else.

Now, instead of just abandoning this fellow and saying, "He is now sane, so we're not going to worry about him," if you were going to carry him on up the line, you would have to continue clearing his aberrations. And it would just be the process of finding an area on which he was a bit rahhh and run this back, and find out what was the cause of that and knock that one out and square that up and now let's find another area where he is gluuup and let's locate the basic causation on that, and let's walk him down this road and all of a sudden this guy is flying.

Well, someplace along this line he ceases to be interested in becoming clear of his past. Somewhere along the line he ceases to be interested in this, and he begins to be very sincerely, not on an unreality, but he begins to be sincerely interested in causation: personal, individual causation. What is his relationship and responsibility in regard to the physical universe – with regard to the physical universe. What's his relationship to the physical universe? What is his relationship to other people? Exactly where is he going?
Now, you can also go nuts in this direction and think you are God or something of the sort, but that would only happen if you were still inside the gates.

So you start thinking in these other terms and immediately there is another road. It isn't this infinite road that walks endlessly to a distant and never-approachable horizon. See, it is another road. And it's actually a shorter road, but it is shorter in terms of is it closer to Alpha Centauri, you see, or Beta Centauri, see. It's still a long road, but it happens to be a finite road in its turn. Only it's now — you see, clearing now became almost an infinite road because actually you've gotten to a point of where the individual could recognize his basic GPMs, he could recognize where these things came from and that sort of thing. Well, there's no point in clearing him because, you see, ordinary clearing procedures won't touch him. So clearing at that point ceases.

All right, now you walk over here into the long road of running GPMs, and there's plenty of them. And there's lots of tricks in them and you have your ups and downs and so forth and now you actually don't start noticing your tremendous forward progress.

Your progress is probably two or three hundred times per unit of auditing time what it was under clearing. But a person is interested in different things so he doesn't pay much attention to the forward progress.

He very soon gets over the idea of wanting to blow out the electric light, wondering if he could and short-circuiting things like this. He very soon gets over it; he gets more serious-minded about the situation because it becomes more real to him; it becomes more natural to him. And he walks on up the line. He stops worrying about other people getting to be OTs and all kinds of little oddball things fall away. And he's got the — he's got an end of trail in view. It's finite. It doesn't la... I mean, it doesn't go on forever.

But there is your road, see, these are roads which we are taking and they are not one road, don't you see?

One has to do with processing somebody within the limits of time and experience and it has the deletional aspects of looking for things which — that delete. You have to delete from the individual in order to make him get right answers in existence, you see, and you are looking for those specific things and you are diagnosing them in certain ways and you're running them down. You've got a different approach now. You can strip away GPMs pow! pow! pow! But there's lots of them. You no longer have this same approach to auditing. Your auditing character changes, the individual's reaction to auditing changes. A lot of these things shift.

You could still take somebody who is running that road and you can put them back on clearing again. You can do various things.

Well, isn't that interesting that you can shift them from one of these processes back to another one. The odd part of it is, is after he has started on the OT road you can't shift him back too much or too far or his meter jams. It isn't whether or not he likes it or not, but you're liable to shift him back over onto finite clearing and he has already exceeded this. And what you'll do is in trying to give him finite clearing, he simply collides with the next GPM and it jams the meter. In other words, the only thing that is dominant or able to influence this case
now is a GPM. And the locks are all on top of GPMs, they're not any longer on top of traumatic or life experiences. These are different actions.

Well now, as far as Clear is concerned, let's go back to where we started out. If you leave yesterday's total on the adding machine without ever understanding it or cleaning it up, you're going to have a hell of time getting the right answer today. The wrong answer is going to add into every line. The button on the machine called clear, that's where we get the term Clear, that's what clearing is all about.

Why anybody should go into a violent fit because we have mentioned Clear in a national magazine, and somebody saying, "Oh, he's going to start that again..." Yes, he is, he's going to find the person that said that and he is going to start it again. [laughter]

Well now, that gives you an idea of the approach to the definition of a word and how much can go awry and how upset people can get over the definition of a word.

Now, actually trying to explain the definition of a word without the technology required in the explanation can only be done in the field of allegory. And you can only go so far in the field of allegory without getting into a hell of a lot of trouble!

So, I invite you to use all the allegory you want right up to the point you find yourself drowning on the subject and then to shift gears and get down to brass tacks. But you can't get in too much trouble trying to explain this if you really understand what it is. But it takes a lot of understanding.

The term in the first place is not an elevated term, it's a good, lousy, mesty, typewriter mechanic type of term. You know? It's corny. Clear. You can see the guy now on the bench all covered with grease and so forth, and he keeps yanking the lever of this thing and the damn thing won't clear.

Actually you are in the same boots in a much cleaner and more elevated position when you keep looking at the pc and the pc keeps saying, "But my father beat me and beat me and beat me." But you can't ever locate one single moment when his father ever beat him. "But my father just beat me day and night, day and night, day and night. Morning, noon and night my father beat me. And my father beat me and my father beat me." And that is all you can get out of this pc. Well, you feel like yanking his lever hard. And you can't find any entrance point on the thing.

Well, you must be looking to some point that isn't an entrance point on the subject of clearing anything. That's what you have to decide after a while because it isn't going anywhere and you weren't clearing anything, so you sure better find something that you can clear.

And that's what generally defeats the auditor when he approaches this subject of clearing, is he gets his pc into some area that either doesn't have to be cleared – the pc is already sane in that area – or the pc has leaped into some area which is not about to be cleared. There's some interim area in between those two that is approachable. And the auditor, unable to find this, gets desperate and says, "There is no such thing as clearing. You can't clear. There are no Clears. Nothing could ever be cleared." See, he gets desperate.
But his only error is that on one side he may have been looking for something that didn't need clearing, and on the other side of the thing he may have been looking so deep into this case that he is not about to produce a relief of anything of the sort. He is not on a track then that is going to produce relief. And that doesn't mean necessarily the aberration was too big or it was too small or it was too this or too that.

Also, it might not exist. It may be just advertising of another aberration. And then he is defeated, of course, also when he tries to get too logical about what's wrong with a pc.

If he tries to take how logical the pc's reactions are or illogical they are and make them logical by some sequence of events which he himself is explaining, he'll almost always be wrong about the pc. Almost always, because you see, he is describing something that is nutty. And of course, what makes it nutty is it doesn't make sense and the auditor sitting there trying to make it make sense is going to be wrong because it is nutty.

See, "I'm going to leave my husband because he is a brute and he goes out every night with strange women."

And the auditor, all of a sudden, can find no real infidelity on the part of the husband. As a matter of fact, a little bit of checkup finds out this pc has been telling this to other auditors. The husband is pretty desperate about this situation because his wife keeps saying this all the time. Husband hasn't been out of the house for fifteen years.

Well now, you can just see you now, sit there and try to figure-figure-figure out, "Now, why is this girl doing that?" Well, that's the wrong approach. That's totally the wrong approach.

All you have to do is recognize that she is not Clear on the subject of husbands because she is getting wrong answers. Wrong answers: She isn't Clear.

All right, what's the held-down five? Well, of course the thing that parallels a held-down five, of course, is a bad recollection of that particular area. So we could just improve recollection of the area. See? We could use other approaches on the subject of husbands.

Well, actually – actually old Creative Processing, you know, wasn't that bad. It was just because it bit a pc here or there and so forth when they'd get into the big GPM on the subject. You could actually have her mock up two husbands for a short while or something and something is going to change, don't you see?

But you've got to work on the subject of the datum she's got in wrong, either by improving her memory on the subject or by clarifying her view on the subject or getting her to recall a subject or, I don't know, call the husband and have her reach and withdraw from him for a while. It doesn't matter what you're doing. You've got to open up this track and you've got several lines by which you could open up the track. And you keep trying to open up the track, sooner or later the pc is all of a sudden going to start cogniting.

You find out it wasn't quite husbands, it was homes – homes, that's the one that is making sense now.

The pc starts cogniting, "Homes!" you know. "It's stay home and go away from home, and the husband goes away from home and it's home, see?" But home was always present in
the pc's statements, too, only you never heard it, see? "Ah well, homes. Well, let's get down to brass tacks now on the subject of homes. Well, how many homes have you had?"

"Ths-uh-duh-bvow, remember – remember – remember, da-da-da ... Homes, oh my God, yes. I must've lived in forty, fifty, I didn't have any home when I was a little boy. Boo-hoo-hoo."

Now, we get the mis-semantic of "a house." All of a sudden, "a house." And there's some misdefinition and incomprehension on the word "house." And it's all in backwards and it's all upside-down, it doesn't make any sense and it hasn't got anything to do with anything and that suddenly pulls out of the lineup and house was in there with the wrong association and upset and so forth and so forth. And that was – then caused a traumatic experience after the fact on the subject of house and homes and then caused a building aberration on the subject of house and homes, don't you see? And then caused lots of overts on the subject of home and then caused a justification of the overts on the subject of home, and then caused a tremendous necessity for motivators on the subject of home. And the motivators turned out to be the husband! The only person around the home – the home never kicks you in the shins, but husbands can be made to do so. So now we've got the thing all untangled, it all goes up the line and everything – life goes along beautifully after that.

You see how it worked out? But it just worked out by you getting in there any way you could to ventilate this particular area and move it back, by any type of process – and you have many of them.

And it winds up at the other end, you have now cleared this person on the subject of husbands, houses and homes. But don't be too upset if you find out next month that you've also got to clear the person on the subject of family! This was a separate one. But if they had one that was that crazy, that close, then they were pretty plowed in when you first came along. See, they had lots of them!

Because the closer the association between two distinct areas of aberration, the closer they are found to be together, why, the more of them the person has. It's quantitative. You don't have big aberrations and small aberrations. It's lots of aberrations and not many aberrations. You got it?

The violence of the aberration is usually pretty violent and the nuttiness is very nutty. But it isn't even necessarily dramatic or interesting. That's another thing that is upsetting to auditors sometimes. They're sitting there with their tongue hanging out to find the blood at the other end of this thing because maybe they found out it caused a near murder. And then they find out that it had merely to do with being hit over the head with a gin bottle when they were two because it fell off the sideboard. And they – they – it's like waiting for the other shoe to drop, you know? That was the total incident. The pc is trying to make more out of it and so forth, you know, drunken father, drunken mother, we find out suddenly neither one of them ever drank much and we finally find this gin bottle falling off the sideboard. There is – something happened and it will be very anticlimactic sometimes.

Sometimes it goes quite in the reverse. You're following down this line that the person just doesn't like to see threads around and that sort of thing, and you suddenly run yourself into a great, big, juicy murder.
It's quite unpredictable because it's crazy. And it's crazy because it's not susceptible to comprehension. And the person can't add it up because it isn't comprehensible.

But you can find – today find the source of it and plow it up and throw it away, so you can clear and clearing is permanent. That's all.

Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.
Thank you. All right, this is what date?

_Audience: Fifteenth, September 15th._

This is the 15th. What planet?

_Audience: Earth._

All right, very good. Fifteenth of September AD 14, planet Earth.

Well, actually, I don't really have anything to talk to you about. I've been doing nothing much. There are several things which one could cover. One could talk some more about definitions and wonder why definitions are so... something-or-other.

But... probably be a very good idea since Melbourne got itself into trouble with nothing but definitions. It's been sitting down there at an inquiry giving incomprehensible words in a long stream, ARC breaking everybody in sight. Peculiar genius.

My orders have been not followed in that area even vaguely. They were told to give a mild little PE course, and that would be the extent of it. And they – of course, every time anybody asked them a question, why, they answered it. Well, that's silly.

They weren't being audited, they were being inquired. [laughter] And the other thing was the earlier instruction to Peter was to go down and open up Sydney and make the main org headquarters in Sydney, and he didn't do that.

So between these two actions, of course, they've gotten themselves into lots of trouble. Well, any PE can get itself in similar trouble, and so forth. They're apparently for our – learning from the Melbourne mess, the similarities could happen along almost any line.

And those two areas of trouble would simply be: not following policy and giving words and data far over the heads of the recipients. And between those two things, why, they have made a mess. And I think that anybody could make a mess anywhere with those two things.

You have to understand something about policy. Policy is not something that I have dreamed up off the cuff. It might have been originally, and once in awhile I get real bright and solve something of the sort. But policy is the general mean action, that is to say, the action
which has been worked out, and which has been working and which has held true over a long period of time.

Policies are very often worked out and then reworked, and then pushed into a new form, and batted back and forth, and eventually why they'll settle down to becoming a fairly routine standard policy on the thing. In fact I don't think a new policy has been invented in Scientology for several years. And anyone here who really – who's doing any supervision on staff, if they knew all the policies of the Central Organization that had been worked out over many, many years, frankly would never have to solve a single problem. They would just quote policy.

It's quite interesting – it's quite interesting the fact that if I think it over very hard, on any problem that is offered me in an organization, if I think over what this thing is, and look at it real hard, and look over what policies that existed in this area, that I could uniformly and routinely give the answer by policy. I would state what the policy was that covered that particular field.

It's quite interesting for an organization as young as this, and now I'm talking about more broad time spans than Standard Oil Company and Earth time, but organizations that are in this universe very seldom are as young as this planet, if you get the idea. I mean, there is a bigger time span involved and they nearly all of them go in this particular direction of – well, they've got – they've worked out answers by experience over a long period of time, and everybody knows these things, and it makes communication possible between one point and another point, which is the main thing that it does by the way.

Policy is not the activity of forcing somebody to obey some archaic and moldy order. It's not forcing people to obey orders; that isn't the reason for policy. Policy is there to facilitate communication between two points. In the absence of policy you don't have communication between two points, because they're not agreed on anything.

Try to get communication between two points which are not in agreement, and of course you at once have trouble. And I point out the technology of A, R and C in support of that fact. So if there is policy with regard to how people are registered and if this is known and understood, it is (1) based on a considerable amount of experience on the part of Registrars and (2) the Letter Registrar, the Body Registrar who does the actual sign-ups, the D of T, the D of P, the Association Secretary and the HCO Secretary are all in agreement, don't you see? So they stay in communication on this subject of registration.

But the second you inject a brand-new, oddball policy into the thing, on which there has been no agreement previously and so forth, they tend to go out of agreement if this violates some policy in which they were in agreement. And if – that is there's a broader sweep to what I am talking about, by the way, than simply handling an organization.

We're talking about in actual fact, a civilization. And, a civilization has certain agreed upon customs and mores. In other words, guides and standards of conduct. Certain things which they have agreed are normal. And it doesn't much matter whether they are normal or abnormal or good or bad, just – this is all that matters – do they assist the general survival? It's the only real test of one of these things. It doesn't matter whether you have a policy or morals, or customs, or any of these broadly agreed-upon things. Does it assist the general sur-
vival of the individual and of the majority of the group? And is it agreed upon? And does it facilitate communication having been agreed upon. There are actually three points involved there.

So, we get into a condition here where we have a certain number of policies or customs – I don't care what you call them, or procedures or how do you go about it. You see there's not much difference between how do you sign up a student and how do you get married. I mean, if you put them both on the basis of this is the expected routine. When you go into a new area or new civilization the reason you feel strange, out of sorts with everybody, sort of half-ARC broke, and feel like you don't belong is because you simply don't know the customs or procedures on which they operate.

How do you walk into a cafe? And when you walk into a cafe does the – are you supposed to stand there and wait till the manager or the maitre or a waiter or somebody comes up and leads you to a seat? Or are you supposed to blunder on in and sit down at the seat? Because if you violate it you will then be strange. Don't you see? So it's because you don't know these customs, which are these sequential doingnesses. What do you do after you've done that? See? If you don't know these cycles, why, then several things occur.

One, you fall out of agreement with the people who are following these cycles. You're no longer in agreement with these people or you don't assume an agreement. You feel strange, and so on. And you might even have a better solution to how things are going along but the truth of the matter is if it is too wildly out or too wildly different from what the other people are doing, why, then they wind up clobbering you. You see how this would happen. And you wind up having them executed or something of this sort goes along like this.

When a space opera society moves in a – on some kind of a wild, gumboot, down-in-the-barn, milking-the-cow sort of a society or something even wilder than that, something like Australia. You get an almost immediate... oh, I can promise you my revenge against Australia is to give it a reputation. That's the only revenge I'm going to take. I'm just going to give it a reputation for being the most backward area on Earth. I could assure you it'll go ramming down the ages that way, too. Someday you'll have a cliché: "Oh well, it was a sort of an Australian society, you know?" [laughter]

They're real clowns down there though – they're real clowns. What they consider jurisprudence. The head of an inquiry, the judge, you see, announces the findings that he has determined upon, before he has heard the witnesses for the defense.

And two months before the end of the inquiry – he announces his findings, two months before the end of the inquiry and before he's heard any of the witnesses for the defense.

If he were to do that in England, why he would be up there – he would be up there on the breadlines right this minute, you know? Somebody would say to him, "Well, Sir Reginald Bard, we no longer have you in our midst. You have been withdrawn from circulation. In fact, you are impeached."
You know, it just isn't done. But this is apparently quite the order of thing in Australia, you see? All right? Well, there's nothing wrong with that. He probably had his mind made up before it began, but I'm sure they wouldn't find anything wrong with that either.

So anyhow, yeah that's my only revenge against Australia. I'm going to make their name a byword. Anyway, the situation – of course, what we say and do is liable to much far better to become a byword than anything they say or do. We have time on our side.

So when you get into policy and you get into custom, you get into that type of thing, you're basically facilitating agreement. That's basically what you're doing. Now, if a society is so – now I'll use a musical term, dissonant – it's all clashed up. In other words, they got lots of crime, and they got corruption, and they got politics, and they got Andersons, and other crud. And they've gone totally Australian, you get the idea? [laughter]

When they get this wild, they are no longer in actual fact, a civilization because it is – they're not living under a cohesive custom system. They haven't any agreed-upon anythings anymore, don't you see? They're way out. So that you actually have: Bill is not in agreement with Joe and it doesn't much matter where they are, there isn't anything for them to agree upon, see? Like how do you get married? You see? Well, I don't know, there's all kinds of methods of getting married today. But, all kinds of methods of getting married and not getting married, and getting unmarried, and so on. They're terrifically variable. There's no standard policy with regard to this thing in actual fact.

And you find it's violated all over the place right now, so it obviously must not have been a workable policy with regard to it, don't you see? There were a lot of things wrong with marriage as an institution or you wouldn't have this many divorces, you see? Obviously that something is in error here someplace. But then who marries? Well, does the church marry, or does the state marry or – and if the church marries should it then be able to divorce or – you get all kinds of wild things. You can't answer any policies up with regard to this, you see.

You have no little textbook anyplace that says, "Marriage: Policies Regarding," see – that everybody could agree upon as being a survival activity, see. Instead of that you have a bunch of mishmashes. In the first place the reason you have mishmashes is nobody understands what everybody else is all about anyhow. And there's a bunch of false technology around about the behavior of people and that they're all animals somehow. And if you ring bells, why, they should slaver. Pavlovian experiments applied to dogs have now been applied mostly to people, don't you see, through the various agencies.

And this idea of how they're supposed to react and so forth has invalidated the fact that they're entitled to have any policies at all. In other words, this whole parade that you see of animalistic psychology – it's arisen since 1879 – has invalidated the right of the individual, to have a custom. See? He isn't supposed to have any customs. He's supposed to be a stimulus-response animal. And you push enough buttons, he's supposed to react in some particular way, don't you see?

So it's all sort of a push-button society, you get the idea? You're supposed to be able to put an ad on television that tells everybody to feel angry when they – when they think of the other side getting in or "Eat Wheaties" or buy certain kinds of cars, and they're supposed to be
mad at Brand X and... You see, there's certain things that are supposed to happen here by stimulus response.

In other words, you haven't got policy, you've got manipulation. And human beings and societies grossly object to manipulation. Particularly hidden manipulation whereby there's supposed to be elements present which are pushing their buttons around, which they're really not supposed to be aware of, and there's some vast technology involved here, by which, if you push people's buttons in the right way then they will behave in a certain way. And they got it all figured out like dog training or something like this, you see.

Well now, that itself violates the right to have the right way to do things, see. That's a violation right there because they're saying this individual is just a stimulus-response-pattern animal, and these patterns are somehow or another ingrained from some quarter that we don't know anything about. In other words, they're sort of pressed on him like a suit or they're you know – they're – he's put in a certain kind of a mold and you pull a lever and something like that, and it goes scrunch, and he's supposed to walk out of there and after that why he walks pop-pop-gimp-ho, pop-pop-gimp-ho, see. This is all supposed to be – well, we've denied the individual the right to any sense at all.

His policy, his custom, is no longer based on whether or not it forwards the survival of himself or his group, but just is based on the whim of some bird who wants to make a quick profit or sell Wheaties or something like this. It's all up to him, you see.

So, when you speak of the dignity of man, actually, his right to decide for himself and amongst men as to what procedures and policies he'll eventually evolve, you see. And you give him some kind of a hierarchy of buttonpushing. You say you no longer have policy, you just have stimulus-response, see. Well, policy and custom and things like this are things of sense. They make sense. And you'll find in the final analysis of any civilization, even its most strange looking customs, as you see them a thousand years afterwards, would have made sense had you been living at that time. Because they had certain problems at that time they were having to walk around and having trouble with. And if you were aware of all of the problems they had, then their society and customs would make sense.

Take just a small matter of – well the way that – where we got the Ten Commandments – the Jewish Ten Commandments and so forth. Well, in their framework, the various things which they were fighting, they had no immediate and direct solution to it except customs. And they put together customs in order to follow these very definite problems.

Now, of course, policy gets to be very funny looking after the problem is gone and the custom continues to be followed. Then you get a very funny looking – funny looking hang-over, see. You no longer have the problem but you still have the policy, see. And, for instance, there's been a tremendous number of termites in Washington, DC, let us say, you know. The government employees got out of work and they started eating up the floor as termites. And so that, these termites just ran over everything, you see. Plenty of termites all over the place, you know. And so people started developing policies as to how you handle this sort of situation.

One policy had to do with the fact that – you see, I'm just dreaming up a ridiculous one here – there are lots of termites all over the place eating up all the woodwork, don't you
see, left and right, like they have in Australia all the time. You get this continuous – you never know, they leave the shell, see. And you're liable to lean against a pillar or step on a floor and it just goes *poof* and it goes into dust. Its very funny living in a country that's got a lot of termites in it. Because the wood is solid today and tomorrow it's not, see?

So you get the custom that when you enter the front door you put your foot forward, tap lightly once before walking in. Well, somebody comes along – somebody comes along and kills all the termites in Australia and something like this happens, and you find everybody still opening front doors and giving one tap with the right foot on the floor, you see. And after a while nobody can quite explain why they're doing this, so they say, "Well, it's impolite not to."

And of course, we've dismissed the whole thing now and we've thrown it all away as a good reason when we've said it was polite or impolite. So we now have a new method which is carrying on which had sense once, no longer has any sense, but we now have a sort of a bow and scrape as people go in front doors, see. No longer has any basis behind it.

When you get too much of this sort of thing you get a civilization which starts to look pretty silly. All of the problems which have long since gone away are still being solved by customs – and you get a very silly looking one.

I remember there was one of these things: People do tend, you see, to carry over into the future after the problem is licked. You can understand somebody getting out of an aircraft as I saw one time which was just in from the South Pacific, and a plane passed overhead flying rather low. And the bird – that's not just the bird, but all twelve of these guys who had just climbed out of this aircraft – threw themselves wildly and flatly down on the concrete apron there, you see, to get low because it was obviously a Jap plane coming over, and the only trouble is they were in San Diego. And there were no – no Jap planes. Well now, they had developed an immediate policy. That policy is when you see a low-flying aircraft – a low-flying aircraft, and so forth, duck until it's identified. And that's a good, safe, survival policy.

I remember one Dutch skipper right after the war, he'd gotten out of the South Pacific and he'd brought a Dutch corvette up through the Panama Canal. And for some reason or other, best known to the admirals, every time a ship left and entered a port during World War II, why, all the local flyers that needed practice on bombing runs were sent out to get low-flying runs on its bridge. And it was really very annoying because these things would bat you around on the bridge, and so forth, and you're trying to negotiate the entrance to the harbor, don't you see? And these wild, screaming aircraft would come down and practically run their wheels on the top of your dodgers. These birds were really close, you know. And this Dutch skipper hadn't run into any aircraft since he'd left the South Pacific and he'd left a shooting war. So nobody inquired what ship this was that was entering one of these harbors. I think it was Miami harbor. Nobody bothered to enquire what ship this was and they simply sent the usual squadron of aircraft out to practice bombing runs and this Dutch skipper just cut loose! And he just filled the air full of lead.

And Washington screamed and everybody howled and beat their chests at how horrible this was and nobody ever did a thing to him. Never – nobody did anything to that Dutch skipper. He didn't shoot down any aircraft but it wasn't because he didn't try. Now, his custom
and policy was based upon the emergency of combat. And you just don't let aircraft get that close to your ship! That's all. I don't care what they got painted on their noses. And Japanese can use stars and bars just like anybody else can with a paintbrush, you know. They're awful good with paintbrushes. And somebody starts diving your bridge, you see, you cut loose.

Well, that was his policy and of course the policy of Miami. Oh well, "There's a sort of a war going on someplace, and there's some suckers have gone to attend it, but we're the wise guys and we've got a good berth ashore," you know? I say that with not any bitterness, just truth. The policies are completely out. Policy of low-flying aircraft, policy of ships – dive-bomb the ships. Policy in the South Pacific for aircraft was never under God's green earth go anywhere near a fighting vessel. Just fly wide, brother. Don't give him any opportunity. Because, see, he's liable to mistake who you are. Do you see?

Policy Miami: they hadn't found out the war was there. Somebody down there is going to find out there was a war, someday. And what was going to happen? What was going to happen? Well, the best thing to do is take low-flying bombing runs on any ship that you see coming in and out of the harbor because the pilots need practice. We don't know practice for what. But they need practice, don't you see? So the policy there was practice, and the policy in the South Pacific was fight.

Well, look at the amount of traffic that's developed. Look at the amount of ARC which went up in smoke at this point. Boy, I remember the lines burning on this, actually, just for days! There wasn't anybody who had gold lace from his cuff to his shoulder that wasn't asking wild questions about what had happened down there, you see. It went around the world. The Dutch were asked if they'd declared war on the United States, you know? All kinds of wild things.

Well, what was the result of this? You just had two customs clash. So, to avoid this clash and to maintain – I'm just bringing this point closer home here – to maintain communication and so forth, why, it's a good thing to have customs.

Now, we in Scientology appear to be out of step and very often it may occur to you that we are out of step. Well, you're never quite asked with what. And you're only out of step with a new, Johnny-come-lately idea, that man is an animal that should have his buttons pressed and anybody teaching anything regarding freedom or freedom of speech or anything like that ought to be shot down in flames.

And this is a government ambition, and those organizations which tend to conduct themselves as governments such as the – well, as I say fascist-type governments such as the American Medical Association, the British Medical Association, the American Psychiatric Association, American Psychological Association, United States government and I don't think the government of Victoria is a government, so we won't include them. You have to have some semblance of government before you can call it one.

Anyway, they have to have some customs.

These other blokes, are – they got a new technology – they got a new technology of control. It's a brand-new technology of control. Now, you maybe think it isn't a new technology. But I was taught at Princeton, in their school of government and taught very well on a lot
of these points. And there was a lot of good Joe's there; they knew their business. And one of these things was: Law proceeds from the customs of the people. And law which proceeds only from a central directive source and is evolved only by a central directive source, if it interrupts the custom of the people or seeks to change and alter those, will bring about a revolution.

In other words, it can't be done – it can't be done. And here and there you might have somebody who was very smart – smart enough to see what problems the people are having and then give them some solutions to these problems that the people are having. And that would be perfectly all right, you see? Because there wasn't any custom there.

But how about a new one that violates the existing custom? That's going to bring about dissonance, isn't it? It's going to bust apart these people as communication points. Well, if they no longer have customs in which they are in agreement, so that they can act in coordination with each other, they go into disagreement amongst themselves and with the government.

It was custom in the United States to drink. So they passed a law called Prohibition – the Volstead Act. I don't know how many hundred thousands of murders and how many billion dollars of lost revenues and destroyed property later, they found out they couldn't do it. And they quit and repealed it.

Well, that's one of our most modern examples of the people have certain customs and somebody legislates against these customs and tries to alter them. And that will bring about every time a very nice, great, big, smoking, bunch of civil commotion. It's the finest way in the world to get civil commotion.

That when you try to pass a law which is contrary to the customs of the people, you've got trouble. And when they were teaching future military governors this they laid that point in with an ax.

Now, you're going to go into this area and you're going to say that a bunch of new ideas are just fine. But you're there to keep the peace. And this is how you keep the peace: You keep in effect the customs of the people. That's how you keep the peace. Now, if you want to not keep the peace, try to change or violate those customs. And you're not going to keep the peace and you're just going to have riots and commotion and upset all over, and you're not going to be able to hold this civil body in any kind of control.

And they had a good military reason for it because civil bodies which are out of control back of the front lines, are embarrassing to the military. So their real point of military government was not how nice we should be to civil populaces at all but is how do we keep the roads open, how do we keep our supply lines open, how do we keep down the incidence of guerrilla warfare, how do we do these various things? And the military government went in to do that.

They were taught very hard how to keep the peace. And that was the biggest lesson that was laid in – is don't change the customs of the people if you wish to keep the peace. Now, we look a little bit further, having a little bit more knowledge of the subject in Scientology, and we find out the reason why. It lies in the area of agreement and disagreement. When
you have an area—a community which is in agreement with one another, they are in agreement on the matter of customs. What is the expected cycle of behavior which is looked upon as the survival pattern for that area? That expected cycle of behavior. What is it?

You violate that, you've told everybody, you've said, "Die!" You've said, "Don't survive anymore." You've told everybody, "What you are in communication with one another about is false. The way you communicate from point A to point B is no longer the way you're going communicate." So of course, you've cut their comm lines, and what are you going to get? Do you understand why that's a comm line? Because when A does action 1, 2 and 3 and B does action XYZ, those two actions don't mesh. So of course, there's no communication. The communication is shattered between those two points.

If X—if A does 1, 2, 3 and B over here now also does 1, 2, 3, you'll find out they're in good communication with each other. That's all a custom is for. And those that promote their survival, or are looked upon in the broad sense to promote the survival of the individual in the group... and that means that even dueling could become a custom, because of course, this makes tougher, rougher, better men who are more able to—this is the way it's looked on—to protect the community at large, and is a natural selection system. See, they've got it all worked out, see. So even that's survival—not for the bad duelist but the community right away doesn't want any bad duelists, so they don't want them to survive, you see.

So what's the—what's the score here, is custom is simply a method of bringing about communication. And policy is just a method of bringing about agreement and communication—along certain matters which lead to a higher level of survival. And they lead to a higher level of survival if they're good policies and they lead to a lower level of survival if they're poor policies, and they lead to complete disaster if they're bad policies. And you're studying right now the ebb and flow of civilization.

Why is the Persian civilization no longer amongst us? Why do we no longer have an Egyptian civilization? And we don't have. Why do we no longer have a Roman civilization? The way it was once? 'Course, the Roman would argue with this. He thinks he still is the center of the world. But he hasn't looked up lately. But what's the whole picture here?

We get the ebb and flow of civilizations on this basis. And their customs could have become antiquated or could have become neglected. But it's much more often, in fact practically always the case, that the customs are neglected or smashed from some central source or from some exterior influence. And when the customs of the people are smashed by their own government or by an exterior force—such as barbarians or war with another nation with different customs—when those customs are smashed that civilization is smashed. You don't even have to defeat its armies if you can knock its customs in the head.

The communist, unthinkingly, and incapable of expressing those thoughts, nevertheless is engaged upon that, on the planet today. And he is using the media of psychology in order to accomplish this. But his psychology is the psychology of 1879. It is not the psychology of 1850 or 1800. It's a different breed of psychology.

Now, we are not in conflict with the customs and philosophy of the planet or the universe. Quite the contrary. It's not a case of everybody is out of step but Jim. It's a case of others want people badly out of step. And they're getting them pretty badly out of step. But if you
can talk to and communicate with anybody on the subject of Scientology, he agrees with what you'd say. He agrees very rapidly with what you say, unless he misses a word. If he misses a word then he won't agree with what you've said, but you are actually talking to him about things which have been with him as customs, far, far, far longer than any Johnny-come-lately psychology or mental science that has been foisted off on him in recent times.

You are talking to him about really traditional mental science. You're talking to him straight out of the school of Aesculapius of Greece. You're talking to him out of the Persian technology. Really! If a Persian priest were to come along at this moment and start talking to you about this, that and the other thing and the human spirit, you'd be in very good communication with him.

You'd actually be in rather poor communication with a vicar over here on the subject of the human spirit. But you'd still get somewhere, but then he's selling a pitch; he's selling pie in the sky, see? He's got a curve on the ball. And therefore he has violated the custom of philosophy which is: "Seek after truth." "Regardless of what you fall across, and regardless of what you find, still seek after truth. Only truth will set you free." And that is one of the oldest principles of psychology. And one of the oldest principles of philosophy. And has been consistently violated, more and more frequently, it's getting more and more frequently violated, as it moves on up through the ages of Western civilization here. That is really getting mauled.

Until we're even told – we're even told the other day by Washington that a government has a right to lie. Why I think that's very interesting. Now, all of a sudden a government virtue is telling lies. Truth? I mean you can look up the references if you want to. They made a big point out of it. And you – nobody contested this. A couple of columnists sort of said, "sneer." But there wasn't any row about this.

Well, that just goes back to a more basic human trait which you usually find in a good survival civilization, which is tell the truth. That violates this custom of tell the truth. Now, all of a sudden this government has a right – a right for God's sakes – to lie. Well, there's none of its people have the right to lie. See, the courts all enforce "don't lie." Everybody tells you not to lie. You're taught not to lie. George Washington and the cherry tree – don't lie! And yet the government can stand above everybody because it – you see it – I could say several things that marines say about its loftiness and pompousness. It now, all of a sudden, mysteriously develops the right to lie.

Well, there you have this philosophic idea: Seek after truth, know the truth, speak the truth as close as you can, as the traditional philosophic attitude. And that on the part of the people is mirrored simply on the fainter hue, as it usually is, "tell the truth." There's something valuable about truth. See, truth has a value. And these people should tell the truth. Now, that is a customary attitude on the part of people.

And yet to give you the idea of how wild it gets we have a government which has more guns and bombs than any other government on Earth, right now, all of a sudden standing up and saying it has a right to lie. Well now, this is not traditional. This is very, very, very wide from any moral code or standards or behavior patterns or anything of that character, you see.
Now, someplace, some places in Africa, there are some isolated tribes which hold as
great virtues lying and stealing. They are very decadent tribes, they haven't gotten very far,
they also had as their greatest ambition "slaughter all your neighbors," and so forth. They
were very – they'd never gotten very far. It doesn't seem to me like it was a very good idea. It
doesn't – isn't representative of what a high-level civilization finally becomes, you see.

So they either were at one time or another a fairly high-level civilization that degener-
ated, or they had a policy or a custom in this direction which was sufficiently debased that it
ever kept them from becoming anything. Now, we'd have to look then into the depths of Af-
rica, in another time, in another century, to find anything as decadent as a government has a
right to lie.

Now, what are they talking about when they talk about, "We don't follow standard
procedures with regard to modern psychology"? Well, that's a laugh because there are none.
There just are none, that's it. A subject which starts out and says, "We cannot define psych,
we don't know what it is and we cannot define the word which we call ourselves." I wouldn't
say was going to go very far. And it hasn't gone very far. It's not up to ninety years yet and
that's just a breath – that's just a breath in the breathing of eternity. And it's a very faint pant in
the breathing of eternity. Nothing.

This is very interesting, though. When they talk about traditional philosophy or when
they talk about traditional ideas about man, they would either have to talk with the tongue in
their cheek or they would have to say they don't know. And they do both. They do both. And
they are not – they're the ruddy, wild-eyed revolutionary, we're not.

And that's why you so easily go into communication with the man in the street. As
long as you don't use words which sound strange to him you'd find that he is in full agreement
with what you are carrying forward: That man has certain rights and that you should be able
to think your own thoughts and you should be able to give voice to your own thoughts and
philosophies. And that you should have a right to ideas and sort of, people should be left
alone on this particular subject, and so forth.

Well, that's woof and warp of Scientology, isn't it? You teach him the fact that man
has a right to seek freedom, he has a right to be free. See, these are – these are very old ideas.

Now, on top of a tremendous philosophic structure, a very, very large philosophic
structure which we have inherited as the traditional philosophic structure – we have then
added up a tremendous number of new answers which all of them, however, are directly in the
tradition of a – the traditional search of philosophy. Our target is not to make an insane person
more quiet. It would be to make an insane person sane. And that has been the target of mental
healing – that has been the target of mental healing since the Stone Ages! That hasn't been the
target of mental healing in the last half century.

You speak to a modern psychiatrist and you voice this thought and he looks at you
with his jaw dropped. "Where did you ever pick up such an outlandish thought?" Oh, you
think I'm joking? Well, you go around and ask one of these jerks – er, jokes – er, fellows, one
of these days, go around and ask this bird, "What are you trying to do with a patient?" And
you will stand there in vain waiting for the answer "To make him sane!"
You're sort of flattening a process or something; you're not—you won't get that answer. See? "To make him quiet." "To make him more amenable." "To find out what made him insane." You'll get all kinds of wild answers that will have nothing to do with the traditional goal of psychotherapy. That's why, you see, you are looked upon as very, very dangerous people. Because you're contrary to the new thought and the new thought is, "Man must be a slave, you must be able to push his buttons. If you can learn anything about him whatsoever, you must use it to his disadvantage."

Of course, we go on a tradition "if you learn anything about man that will help him, you help him with it." Well, that tradition is now being violated. "If you learn anything about man that you can manipulate him with you manipulate him." Well, that's not a tradition that was ever in vogue, that's brand-new, brassy new. You're going to manipulate men, you've got to change their definitions and change their goals and enslave them and do this and do that. These fellows would argue with the idea that it's a good thing for a people to be free. Well, oddly enough that has never been an arguable point in the field of philosophy or really seriously over a long period of time in enlightened times of government.

But yes, they recognize very well, that people would try to be free or people want to be free or they'd recognize these various points, see? Well now, they've developed a brand-new philosophy that people want to be slaves—that's a switcheroo, isn't it? And they're selling everybody on the idea that people really, really down deep are just a mass and what the person wants to do is cohere with this mass and be protected by the mass. And that is the new thought. The broader philosophic term for that is communism.

And it was practiced by a fellow by the name of, I think it was Lycurgus back in Sparta—and didn't work then either. You never saw such an intellectual broken leg in your life as Sparta. If any clever fellow ever got into the borders of Sparta the complete lack of originality, thought, thinking and so forth, was sufficiently great to actually drive him back into the hands of the executioners waiting at the border. It would drive him mad after a while. This total sameness, starry-eyed, hypnotic nowhere of the Spartan. Quite interesting.

Sparta had some other philosophies but they were not the philosophies given to them by the gentleman I just mentioned. The Russians, being very close to Sparta geographically and so forth, got infected with this and it's been running over the whole country and nobody's ever been able to invent a sufficiently strong penicillin to get Lycurgus out of the Russian bloodstream.

They found out the Spartan was very good at fighting battles. And when you're only interested in fighting battles and you're not interested in your people, of course, you will adopt only a Spartan philosophy. Study up your Greek philosophy a little bit, you'll find out the Spartan—the Spartan and the Communist, they're practically indistinguishable.

But there is one thing that distinguishes them; one thing that distinguishes them. There's a much, much bolder and much more degraded philosophy that has attended communism. And that's got a total switcheroo and a big curve on it that—the Spartan didn't even have that.

Now, not to get involved on this situation—what has this got to do with you? Well, it has to do with you to the degree—not because I say we should assume a traditional viewpoint
– that if you carefully look over Greek philosophers, if you carefully look over the basic customs and belief of man over a long period of time – I'm now talking in terms of tens of thousands of years, as far back as you can reach – you'll find out that you are echoing in Scientology his hopes and his aspirations. You're echoing the things for which he has fought – the things which he has tried to attain in life.

And if you very carefully study – not just a superficial glance – if you very carefully studied the utterances of the so-called man of science in the field of the mind today, you'll find a very degraded 180 percent – 180 degree vector to those old philosophies. "Man is just an animal. If you find any buttons, push them. Man is the property of the state." Oh, my God, I thought we got rid of slavery in the Dark Ages. But we didn't, here it is again.

All of these various things – all of these various things like bad old apples that man has fought against for a long time have now rolled forward into present time and become virtues. But whatever they are called, they are not traditional philosophy and they're not traditional mental science. And there we can smile like Cheshire cats because we've got it and they haven't got it. They are in violent conflict and disagreement with the basic philosophy of philosophy. They're sort of like a chemist who hates his test tubes. They're in wild disagreement of what are the purposes and uses of philosophy. They say to enslave man. And you say to make man free. Well, they've always been to make man free. Where's this new one come from?

So, what we have developed is not a new tradition of philosophy. We are in that same tradition. But what we have developed is the technology that can attain it. And we have been very successful in doing this and that is what is new in Scientology but the basic idea and the goals of Scientology are not new. Their expression, their organization, these things could be looked upon as quite new but only the expression – only the organization. But the basic thought, that is not new.

In other words, your success is very solidly based, and your advance is very solidly based upon the idea that you are not in the least divergent from what the mean average of all great civilizations at all times have deified as the ideal and have sought to achieve. Your ideas are not one hair off what these fellows were trying to achieve back through the countless eons. You're right there, see, you're right on that broad highway and it's the other fellow who is calling you names that's walking in the bramble bushes. He's the fellow who is walking around in the briers; he's the fellow who has lost his road.

Why is the psychologist studying psychology? Ah, well, if he could answer that question, if you could get – persuade an answer out of him, if he's a very young student he might answer you glibly, right from the tradition and custom of the race, from the people in the street. But if he's been trained at any period of time he'll no longer give you the first answer which might be, "Well, to help people." He'd give you that. But after he's been at it for a while, your seasoned practitioner, your well-trained person who is answering now with the answers of indoctrination will never give you that answer. He just won't give you that answer, that's all, because it wouldn't occur to him. It's not there.

Now, what are these – what are these fellows headed for? They're headed for oblivion. And I'd base that very solidly because every time any large group or organization in this uni-
verse has adopted policies which are antisurvival for the individual of the group as well as the group itself, that group has gone to dust. It has not survived because its customs are no good.

Let's call the doctor, the psychiatrist, the psychologist, call them collectively a civilization just to compare them in this particular way. And we find out that they have antisurvival policies and customs, they're very antisurvival.

Why, the maddest news story I think I ever read in my life is how this drug was killing off everybody in the institution and those it didn't kill off it turned purple and they were all having spasms but the doctor was saying, "But we've got to have it! It's the only thing that calms them down! But we've got to have this drug! And it's very catastrophic that it's killing them all off because we've got to have it and got to administer..."

Whoa! They should have had him in a cage! Even in an unenlightened period of philosophy such as Elizabethan times, they probably would have paraded such a bloke up and down the hay market – in a cage! "These pills are killing everybody but we've got to give them to them and it's too bad they're killing everybody because we've got to have these tranq..."

Why, you probably don't believe me. Very often you think I'm extreme and that I don't tell you the truth about such people – and all too often you go and collide with it on your own, and you find out there it sits.

Well, now how does this compare with the tradition of the witch doctor or even the Egyptian doctor or the old Greek physician or the Aesculapians or – how would you reconcile that? Well, it can't be reconciled. We've got to treat the patient. Well, why are we treating this patient? Obviously the answer is missing, if we've got to keep treating the patient this way although it kills him, then why are we treating the patient must then be out of agreement with what people normally assume you are treating patients for. Right?

The world at large assumes that we are treating patients for a certain reason. Well, this guy couldn't possibly have any of that reason for why he's treating patients. So therefore, his tradition is out and he is out of tradition.

And I would say that their days are – their days are not numbered because I am saying their days are numbered, but I'm just analyzing a general situation. And I wouldn't buy any bonds in that company. I don't think it has a sound management. I think its philosophy of doing business is wrong.

People who want to kill people will hire them. But I don't think this has much future. I think we have a group there which have antisurvival tendencies and customs and policies. And they're not only antisurvival to those with whom they do business, but they are antisurvival to themselves. And so their days are numbered. Just like the days of any civilization or activity or organization which has antisurvival policies. Their days are numbered.

So you will live to – you will live yourself to see all that fade away as far as they're concerned. You'll see another dawn. Oddly enough, whether you do anything about it or not. You don't have to do anything about it at all, they would fade away. You see? They don't have to be fought. They're going to blow themselves up – inevitable.
The germ of their own destruction is carried daily to their offices, daily through their conferences, daily through their chain of patients and daily homeward and daily to bed. So there isn't any reason to get hot about that because they aren't even a threat to you. You are on a much sounder tradition. You're taking the tradition of "man has the desire to be free," and "when you heal people, why, you make them better," and when things are -- "when somebody is sad you make him more cheerful again." And I mean these are the -- even the accepted thing, you see? That's it, that's custom.

What do you do with a sick man? What do you do with a despondent person? What do you do with these people? Well, you right away immediately will agree, "Why, make him well, cheer him up," something like that. Well, that's in agreement with the populace as a whole. You don't get a complicated answer like, "Well, what you do is put him in the hospital for a few days so you can charge his relatives and send them a bill." You don't get, "Institutionalize him for the good of the society." You don't get, as Rock-e-feller who didn't go rocketing to president, ah -- you don't form up concentration camps for young people who might go wrong.

You say, "Oh, he had that idea." No, no, no, no they have those camps in New York. Nobody ever heard about them. They're concentration camps for youths who might go wrong. They haven't done anything; they haven't been charged with anything. But they come from a family and environmental area which some psychologist has worked out produces a majority of criminals. And they do this by statistics, so if some fellow's father has brown eyes and the wife has green eyes and the Rh factor of the two of them is witterpoof spaf and the family income does not exceed five thousand dollars a month, why, the young man will become a criminal so he must be put in a concentration camp. Oooh, you think I'm joking.

Look, I'm pretty – I'm pretty good. I'm pretty witty. I can make up all kinds of jokes. But you know I'm not good enough to make up the jokes those guys pull all the time. [laughter] So you don't think like that. So you're not able to understand what they're all about and they don't think like the populace at large. It isn't that they don't think like a Scientologist, it's that they don't think like the public at large. They're trying to change the customs, you see, so therefore they aren't understood either. And they don't understand the public at large. They haven't any common ground with them at all.

Now, these are all things that it's interesting for you to know, but actually they're quite important. Because you should recognize where we have made the breakthrough and where we have made progress. We have made progress in how to accomplish goals which man has had as long as he has been man. And what he has considered good and what he has considered desirable in the field of philosophy, we have accomplished technically – and that is the breakthrough which we have made.

We aren't even too far out right now on the old witch doctor. Because we've got the technology of communication. Because we've got the technology of putting together a session. Because we've got an Auditor's Code. Because – you see that's all technical materials. Because we've gotten more technical materials, we can now take the old witch doctor's red rocks or whatever he was using. Oh, they're wild. You should read some of their treatments some time. They – girl's having a hard time delivering a baby, and so forth; the witch doctor
comes in with a – with a big swollen abdomen, goes through writhings and howls and screams and produces a great red stone out from underneath his smock. And puts it down and says, "There" and feels much better and right away the girl has her baby without any difficulty.

See, he did it without communication, but he did do it with duplication. They've got all kinds of symbolical magic. They did all kinds of things like this. On the Amur river, the witch doctor of the – the shaman, along the Amur river still to this day uses these techniques. They've been used far longer by man than any other healing techniques and you find them today suddenly rearing their heads again, in clay table work. Only why are we more effective? Well, it's a traditional approach, so therefore, it seems traditional to the person who's doing it.

Buried back along the line he's had plenty of witch doctors leaping and howling and producing stones from underneath the robe, don't you see, and taking out a broken stick and then binding it all up and then showing suddenly magically as he does the unbindings the whole stick is whole again. Oh, you know, anybody you're operating on has had plenty of this kind of treatment far earlier on the track than sawbones and setting bones and so forth. It's a higher level of healing because it's a level by symbology. It's symbolical healing. And it's by mass symbols and the assignment of them. Well, we can explain why it works. And because we can run a session and he couldn't, we can make it work far more often than he could make it work, don't you see?

Well, what's our improvement? Our improvement is not on the idea that a witch doctor called upon to heal a leg should have the idea that he should heal the leg. You see, we've not improved on that idea and that's a fairly marvelous idea. Now, the witch doctor should do his job. And that the better witch doctor in the tribe got more patients than the worser ones, these are all standard line ideas, see. That the proper thing for a witch doctor to do was to work for or with the patient and so forth. This was pretty good.

Of course, when I speak to somebody who speaks of the juju-type witch doctor of Africa, I don't make much communication because those boys have long gone the same route that the tribes went down there, that say it's good to lie and steal, see. Now, that's a sort of a reverse black magic idea and they're pretty Johnny-come-lately and they're pretty – they're pretty rare. They've gone into a witch doctoring which is squirrel witch doctoring, [laughter] like psychology.

So there's – but your tradition is there. There's the guy: guy's got a broken leg. What do you do? Well, witch doctor comes in. What's the witch doctor's idea? Heal the guy's broken leg. Elementary. Now, you've not varied that but the other healing professions which are in existence today have. So they're in violation of man's customs as they reach past the eons and I'd say their chances of survival were lousy.

As long as they had that idea and they didn't abandon that idea until very recently, very short time ago, they started changing everybody's customs on it. Not all parts of the world have these customs, or ideas. But they are general and they do go back much longer than other forms since then. So what's your approach? You just have got a better technology. See, your technology is better.
Wise man sits on a mountaintop and he utters wise things. And somebody comes up to
him and asks him for advice because they're having a bad time in life. And he sits up there on
his mountaintop and he says, "Well, now son, go ye forth and the first virgin you see, walk
around her three times and do not spit once. And you will have good luck for three days and
three nights." Well now, what tradition is going on there, regardless of the technology this
fellow or wise man on the mountaintop is using. What tradition? The guy came to him for
advice, so he helped him. That's the tradition. The tradition includes that there should be wise
men; the tradition includes that if there are wise men you go to them for advice. You see?
These are traditional.

Sounds – sounds sort of elementary, doesn't it? It sounds so elementary that you'd say,
"Well, of course! Everybody knows that." Well, everybody knew that but it is now to a large
degree being violated by the usurping Johnny-come-lately technology, see. Lord knows what
they'd do. And faced with the idea that there might be a wise man someplace they go mad!
They say, "Shoot him," "Kill him!" That's the right thing to do to somebody who was being a
wise man.

If somebody wants to go to somebody for advice, why, the thing to do is tell them,
"They're all quacks and frauds!" Why, that doesn't seem traditional. The traditional – if there's
somebody who can give you advice, why, you go to them for advice. You don't make a com-
motion about it and then not give them any advice yourself or give them some advice that'll
get you a bigger fee or something like this. This is not in the tradition, don't you see? And
there's never been any tradition that there is orthodox advice on the subject in certain fields
and there's unorthodox advice on the subject. If there was advice there was advice. You see
what I mean?

We have today, "orthodox science." What the hell are we talking about? The Dark
Ages in religion? "Orthodox science?" You mean an experimental research field has an or-
thodox science? You mean there's certain immutable unchangeable, never-to-be-varied prin-
ciples in this field? Oh, bull! How could there be an orthodox science? Why, in order to have
an orthodox science which was totally orthodox, and against which all sciences were evalu-
ated, legally, as to whether or not they were orthodox or not, you would have had to have
produced some kind of an effect with this orthodox science. You know, you'd have to actually
have gotten the whole universe wound up or done something like this, don't you see?

Without any proof at all right now, we find the fools over there in Washington, in the
Food and Drug Administration, we find these nuts, talking all the time about "not agreeing
with orthodox science." Craziest thing anybody ever heard of. They say a principle will work
or won't work if it agrees or disagrees with orthodox science. Well, this would be all right if
they'd laid out a textbook and said, "Orthodox science is written by a fellow named Black.
And his textbook is available from the Library of Congress," see. "And that's what we con-
sider orthodox science." But no, they never define orthodox science. So what's the trick here,
is that anything they want to do something to, they merely say, "It's unorthodox." Because
there is no orthodoxy.

Remember the gag I used to talk to you about? This fellow says, "You are doing
wrong," but you can't find out what's right. You know, you can always be hung with the idea
that you were doing wrong. Well, you've never – they have a hidden idea of what's right. Well, the art critic is always at this. Here is a field that isn't wrapped up at all. The arts, wow! I mean the arts! Well, what's art? Well, wow! What's art? I mean, there – you've asked the wildest question that you could ever, ever project out into the firmament. What's art? You can't answer it. You can make – you can make efforts to answer it.

But supposing, supposing we made it law. This is art, and that isn't art. And then gave a prison penalty for somebody for not doing art. And then had no standard art of any kind for him to do like. I'd say people would get confused about that time and they've done just exactly that today in science.

They haven't got a standard science. They went and knocked out laws of conservation of energy in the field of elementary physics. They must have because they all say they have. Well, if those basic principles of finite physics have been knocked out how could they even have an orthodox science if they don't have the basic physics? Well, then what is basic physics? Well, I don't know. I don't think anybody else does today. They've proven several of its principles to be false but there's nothing in its place.

So right away the art critic comes along and you've just painted a painting. And the art critic says, "Well, actually it's quite poor." Compared to what? You see? It's a totally invalid criticism. He could say, "Well, that line isn't straight." Well, great. The line isn't straight, that's all right. But he would have a hard time trying to – trying to really lay it down and say this is this and that is that, don't you see? He'd have to tell you what's art. He'd have to tell you what you should do like. And they usually get around it – say "That isn't like Rubens." You're supposed to be doing a Rubenesque painting and it isn't like Rubens. Well, that's a perfectly valid statement. If you're supposed to be doing Rubenesque work and you don't paint like Rubens, obviously. But supposing we make this remark to somebody without any comparison for a Rubens. We don't have any Rubens, you see. You say, "You're not like Boojum." And you say, "What the hell is Boojum?"

"Hmph! You don't know?"

Well, it looks to me like somebody's invented a way to punish those they wish to punish when they wish to punish them without any reason for punishment. It looks to me like a control mechanism about nine miles wide that is not based on any fact. And that is in violation of the basic tradition of law, science, adjudication, everything else. Find an excuse to punish people with which they can't – and they can't comply, so therefore you can punish anybody you want to punish anytime you want to punish them because there's no way they can say they have complied because what they're complying with doesn't exist. Do you see? And when I've given you that setup, I have, of course, given you the standard setup in any society which has no customs.

There is no right conduct. So therefore everybody can be berated because he is not conducting himself rightly. So it becomes a society of total criticism. It is no longer a society in which anyone can comply because there's nothing you can comply with. If there is no right conduct then how in the name of God can you do any right conduct? If there's no bridge to walk across how can you walk across a bridge? Supposing there's no bridge to walk across and everybody who doesn't walk across the bridge is shot. You'd say that's unreasonable. No,
it's not unreasonable, it's insane. And that's how far society can go on the subject of customs. It can go all the way out the bottom.

In other words, they pretend there is a custom there when there isn't any. They pretend that there is a reason when there is none. They pretend that there is a one-two-three-four procedure and then will never tell you what it is. And yet punish you because you don't comply with it. And that is the society which is gone! It may be still around. Its spires may be brilliant against the afternoon sky. But the sun is setting and it is setting at a high velocity.

It's interesting that the brassiness of the material wealth of the society is no test of its endurance. How long the society is to endure demonstrates that they very often have ceased to be vital societies at the time they were building their biggest statues. That was true of the Age of Pericles. Greece had already gone by the boards when she had her greatest period of art. Quite interesting isn't it? She'd lost her grip. She was no more and yet most of the things we've inherited have come from that period right after she was a gone nation.

That's all – that's all very germane to the point. So as long as you stay with the tradition of "When you say something you're supposed to be sensible." "When somebody's sick you help them." "When they are despondent you try to cheer them up." "If you're a practitioner you try to help people." "If you have technology you use it for the survival of the group." "If you have knowledge and so forth you should use it to assist others."

These are the traditions which have built the great civilizations of this planet. And the great civilizations of this universe are all operated on those traditions. Those are customs. They are proven to be survival characteristics. There's – doesn't mean that there can't be other ideas, that there can't be other customs, but it does mean that those are customs.

And then you follow this thought through a little bit further and you'll see then that part of a custom has to do with its communication. Because a custom permits communication, then the communication of customs is itself quite a technology. You follow? So it is where the custom has broken down in its communication that it is abandoned. The custom is not communicated anymore and even though it is still useful it is therefore not followed.

Now, the breakdown of the custom itself will cause a fall out of communication, you see. No longer get Joe saying, "How are you, Bill?" And it's customary of course, for Bill to say, "Oh, I'm okay. How are you, Joe?" See, that's very customary. So, one, two, three, one, two, three, see. That's customary. We no longer teach somebody who is moving up into this civilization that when people ask him how he is, why, he should tell them and ask them how they are. See? We no longer communicate the mechanism of communication, see. We forget to communicate this mechanism of communication, we don't teach people this anymore, we don't make these customs available any more. They aren't there. They're gone.

Then we get a breakdown on the part of a civilization. See, its customs are no longer taught to it. Somebody else is trying to teach him different customs or holding the survival value of these customs in question or invalidating customs or the nation or civilization is under a raid or something from some dissident source; some other organization or group is trying to cave it in. And so it's trying to knock these things around or fix it so they won't be communicated anymore.
Or new developments of one kind or another come along and sweep aside old customs for some reason or other. But that's the lesser reason, oddly enough, although it's announced by the sociologist as the primary reason. It isn't. It's the – really that the custom's no longer communicated.

And a civilization breaks down on this basis: that the means of communication are not any longer taught in that society. So its customs, its policies, this sort of thing, they're not taught. So therefore the people inside that society can't work together. You get very little – to use the old Chinese word – you get very little gung-ho. There no cooperation, see? Well, where's the no cooperation? Well, the people don't know the customs on which they're operating.

Net result of that is decay, decline and vanishment of the group. So therefore we come to the second part of what I told you about at the beginning of the lecture, which is teaching people Scientology. How could you be remiss? Well, teach them with words and terms which they do not understand. Louse up the communication so it doesn't communicate, in other words. Use terms which are not defined. Use various things which are undiscoverable.

Do a poor job of teaching them customs, in other words, and they'll go to pieces. Everything will go to pieces on that effort.

In fact your effort may be completely unsuccessful, but it may be just partially successful, and they haven't learned their lessons well at all, at all and they blow up in your face. And this is why any practitioner setting himself up newly in a district – if he got a bad reputation or so forth – this is the real reason why he would get a bad reputation. It isn't based on fact at all.

I can demonstrate to you very definitely that it does not – has nothing to do really with behavior. Behavior, conduct of practice have almost, nothing to do with it. It's rather frightening, because customarily we believe that if we conduct a good and effective practice and do a good job and so forth, why, other things will of course, immediately follow in sequence. And that doesn't happen to be – that doesn't happen to be it.

If you are successful, and if you mean to stay there a long time, these give you a long-term survival. Being effective in how you handle a case is not primary in having a good reputation or repute in your immediate area. That's interesting, isn't it?

There's something came ahead of that. It's being comprehensible. When you teach somebody something, when you do something for somebody, why, put it in such a way and handle it in such a way and handle your little courses and teachings, in such a way as they are comprehensible. Because if you're truly comprehensible they'll forgive you almost anything.

Your primary course of human existence, then, is guided by whether or not they can comprehend. This must be the basic and fundamental on which it is built. So they understand you; why, this opens the door for your effectiveness to become apparent. But if they don't understand you the door will close on all of your effectiveness. Do you see that?

So by all means, by all means, for heaven's sakes, be effective! Because you can be comprehensible for quite a period of time but in the final analysis you've also got to deliver. You see, you've also got to deliver. But delivery is not all – it isn't of the same magnitude of
comprehensibility. Doing the job is not of the same magnitude at all. Just a hole, a camouflage – well, just a hole can exist in a society into which a certain class of activity will occur.

I mean, it's only that they've got to have – they've got to have some doctors. They've got to have some doctors, you see, and the society's got to have some doctors. And just the fact that there's this terrific need will cause somebody to supply that demand. And you get the modern medico. He isn't going to – he isn't going to do much for anybody, you understand. He's going to make motions and so forth but it's the fact there's this terrific need for healing in the society which then brings about the fact that somebody steps into the breach. It's the need that creates the demand.

So if that exists and he still goes on and does this and he's ineffective at it, as long as there's the need, why, there'll be something filling that hole, see. So competence is not at the top rank there. So we get it something on the order of comprehensibility, necessity – that is to say, the demand. There's got to be a demand. You got to be comprehensible. And then if you want to keep at it any length of time at all and not have somebody shoot you down like we're going to shoot them down – just by existing we will do that, not that we ever have to commit an overt on it – now, you've got to be effective. Now, you've got to be very effective. And of course, if you put effectiveness into these other two things you are – the demand exists, you are terrifically comprehensible as to exactly what you are doing, and you don't let anybody get by with not comprehending you and so forth and then you do your job well and effectively, well, hell a General Sherman tank is a grasshopper compared to the way you would forge forward. Do you see?

But they're in something of that order of importance. You can't get along forever without being effective. But you can get along a certain distance even without being effective.

Now, if you did those things and so forth, why, the woof and the warp of future civilizations actually would depend upon you. It's that important. Because these things can exist, the philosophic tradition must be kept alive, these things must go forward. And you'll find out that you would succeed to the degree that you followed along this line and the degree that you understood what you were doing and people understood what you were doing and understood you and then this demand would be there and then you, of course, are competent in operating; why, how could you miss.

Thank you.
A Review Of Study

A lecture given on 22 September 1964

Thank you. All right, I like you, too. Thank you very much. And this is the what of what?

_Audience: 22nd of September._

Twenty-second of September AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. Is that correct?

_Audience: Right._

[part missing]

All right, today's lecture is a review lecture on the subject of study – a very rapid review lecture – and it doesn't mean that if you hear this lecture, why, none of the other lectures need be listened to or something like that because this lecture doesn't necessarily contain all that they contain; but I want to give you a fast review of this subject called study.

I've been meaning to write a textbook about it and I will do so in the very near future, but the textbook for this is not the type of text that you just dash off, because if I do a good job of writing this textbook on this material we now have here, you recognize that it goes into an area where there is no textbook or data or technology of any kind, which is study – how to study.

Now, you can look in vain up and down the corridors of the libraries at big universities and so forth for a book which simply tells the student how to study. I know that sounds, sounds fantastic, but that's all they teach, basically and foremost in a whole course on education, but they haven't got any book on it that says how to study. Not even in their – than their major courses of education do they have this textbook.

But here are all these poor blokes sitting around in a university being told at every hand that they don't know how to study, but there is no textbook on the subject.

Now, what do you suppose is going to happen with a textbook like that? If that just – textbook just sits down very calmly and goes about the business of what study and education are all about and how to study and how to approach this subject and what the bear traps are in it and what to avoid and what a good textbook is and what a bad textbook is and all this sort of thing, and if it just took this thing up, chapter by chapter, and shook it all out very nicely with no fancy terms and said, incidentally, as it went along, that this was data derived from the subject called Scientology, where do you think that book would land? Probably land in the hands of every student who enters a university anywhere.
Courses of education would have to be pulled down and thrown away, because they haven't got a course of education. One of the things wrong with education of children in the United States right now is there's nobody has any technology of education. It's something on the order of trying to fix radios when you have no instruction book of any kind and you don't even know what it is. And trying to fix a radio in that state of mind would be a rather exasperating situation since you wouldn't even know what the radio was supposed to do if you did fix it.

To show you that the technology is out in schools and universities, a series of tests were given to children over a number of grades in school. This happened in Johannesburg, accidentally, and it – children in one grade and in the next grade and the next grade and the next grade, in various groups, were given graphs, and it was very apparent that the longer they went to school, the dumber they got.

Now, I couldn't figure out why that was, except I could figure out there must be something unknown about all this, if this could happen and nobody was doing anything about it. And sure enough, that was – that was the data that emerged from it. In other words, the longer they went to school the stupider they got.

Well, what's this about "education is supposed to make bright people"? Well, there was obvious stuff there that it wasn't true. Here was the grade for the eight-year-olds and they got a certain IQ and a certain graph, and here was the grade for the nine-year-olds and they got a certain IQ and a graph, and the grade for the ten-year-olds and a certain IQ and a graph, and the eleven-year-olds, they had a certain IQ and a graph. And after these things were already graphed out and the factor was added that some of them didn't know as much language as another and that sort of thing, it made a terribly steep curve. Their IQ was going downhill.

The highest IQ that we have ever registered on any student was on a schoolboy in Johannesburg who was twelve years old. It was not on Oppenheimer or Einstein, see? It was a twelve-year-old kid – highest IQ ever registered. Well, that's an optimum age. He knows enough language so that he can read the test and he doesn't know so much language that he can't understand it.

So this showed me clearly that there was something amiss in the field of education if the longer you studied something the more stupid you got. Well of course, the longer you study something, we know now, the more chance and opportunity you have to run into words you don't know and there we go.

Now, in the field of the arts it is peculiar – well, it's just the longer you study the more chance you have of running into words that you aren't acquainted with and can't get defined.

So in the fields of the arts – since it is just misunderstood words which bring about this condition – in the field of arts particularly – and this is a field with which I'm very, very well acquainted – the working, workaday artist, the boy who's out there making his coffee and cakes with the drawn line or the airbrush or the paintbrush or something of the sort, you know? And whether he's selling it to Mr. and Mrs. Gotbucks or whether he's selling it to the local studio or he's making a sidewalk exhibit someplace or another, that's immaterial. The point is this boy is in the workaday world; with the writer, similarly; with the – oh, heavens!
poets; even – you could even include various of the fine arts: architecture and that sort of thing. All of these boys have certain peculiarities which I never quite understood.

Peculiarities were these: When you reviewed a tremendous number of writers who were pros and who were good, and who were landing on the mark every time, you found nobody who had graduated from a course in writing. But nobody! I mean, this isn't – this isn't even the exception that makes the rule. He just wasn't present.

I remember sitting up in Riverside Drive at one time – sitting in a big, swanky apartment – Riverside Drive, New York – and the whole place, the whole salon of this apartment was jampacked with some of the best stellar names in the field of American fiction. There they were – all of them, practically. And scattered in amongst them were some of their agents, you know, sort of keeping to the background and trying to look like the radiator or something. And this subject came up, not just the subject of writing but the subject of education in general.

And a census was taken on the spot and noses were counted on the thing and nobody there had ever finished the university amongst those writers – much less writing. They had never finished the university. They had all been kicked out – almost uniformly had been expelled – or they'd never gone near the place. And that was it, and then a check-over demonstrated, clearly and conclusively, that not one of them had ever taken a course in writing, from anywhere, from anybody about anything.

Well, this was also quite startling, too, and it's not something that you would write in a writers' magazine about, because it would be very unpopular with the magazine because of its advertisers and their fond ideas they have and their advertisers who sell courses in story writing and that sort of thing. So it isn't the kind of thing you have written up.

And I was about ready to dismiss the whole subject, you know, and say, "Well, that's it," because I had been sitting there keeping the notes for two or three other eager beavers who had been taking this over. And I was saying, "Well, I guess we've just about got that taped" or something like this you know, and everybody was laughing about it.

And all of a sudden here was a very faint voice over in the corner that said, "Well, your figures are not quite correct."

"What?" you know? "Wha-wha-what? Who was that?"

And "Well, I – I have a P – PHD in literature, and a – a couple of other degrees, and finished – fini – finished the university and several other universities, and I've taken a lot of courses in writing, and – and so forth, so it's not true of everybody in the room."

And everybody turned around looking at this guy trying to find out who it was. And of course, it was a literary agent! [laughter] He wasn't a writer. He'd never published a line in his life. All he did was sit around and tell other people what was wrong with their stories. But he had tried to be a writer and he'd failed.

So about this point I said, "There's something very peculiar going on here. There's a bunch of swindlers selling courses in writing that don't teach people how to write. Won't name any names because you don't have to. It's every big, brassy university in the United
States. What's going on here?" Well, could have been a lot of things, could have been a lot of things going on.

But in the years following I ran the subject down. I got that interested in it that I ran it down a bit further, and I found out that no writing course teaches writing. They don't teach writing. I'm not sure what they teach but none of the technology which they employ and say is a writers technology, is the writer's technology. You get the point? See, they say there is this piece of technology but it isn't that piece of technology, you see? Writers don't use this technology, period!

If any of you have ever taken a writing course, I'm sure you heard about foreshadowing? And I'm sure you've heard about other writing gimmicks of one kind or another? And writers don't use them, and when they do use them, they don't call them that. Do you see here? There is a technology, then, which writers use but it is not taught in universities and it's not taught in courses in writing.

I remember with a horrible start one time, getting up to make a talk to a short story group, and I was about ready to draw a long breath and say, "Well, ladies and gentlemen, how are you this evening? Is there anything I can tell you about?" So I was just – and right in front of the desk, lying there, was one of my stories, wide-open, which they had been using as a text. And every paragraph of it had some weird symbol or word written opposite it to show what I was doing at each one of these points. [laughter]

Why, I would have wrapped myself around four telegraph poles if I'd ever tried to think of all that at the same time. This area was a foreshadow and this was a characterization and this was a this and that was a that, you see, and it was a tzsa-tzsa-tzsa and it was all supposed to have been laid out. It just stopped me cold, see? And I found myself looking at a piece of technology which I never used. And this was the pretense, you see? And here were these poor blokes trying to study writing, you see?

Well now, there is a subject called "writing." There is such a subject. The trouble is writers are professional liars and when they start telling people how they write they just go on and create. [laughter]

The most weird dissertation I ever read in my life, I think, is by Edgar Allen Poe on the subject and it's used in every textbook, I think, in short story writing I have ever collided with, and I think it's Poe writing about how you write. Why, I think it's the most marvelous piece of stuff you ever read in your life. If you want to read that – I did one time, just for kicks. And you don't find anything in his stories that agree with what he said.

They either want to be the only ones and cut down the competition or do something, but they never really say what they do.

So no technology is – exists in this particular area, but there are a lot of pretended technologies in this area. I'm just talking to you about a field which is offbeat which I happen to know well and which is a noncodified field which is one of the arts. And there's that field, completely uncodified.

Only when it starts to descend into technical application, like the graphic arts; the graphic arts are just a cut down from the arts, you see? They're the mechanical representation.
of the arts. They're "How do you take a painting and how do you handle this painting in order to reproduce it in a magazine?" It's not a creative art, in other words; it's a graphic art.

Now, that technology – boy, boy! You start doing something a little bit haywire with that one or you start doing something a little bit offbeat in the way you take your separation negatives – you know, the red negative, the green negative and the yellow negative that you've got to take of this thing in order to get three printing plates to run through the presses, you know, so that each one superimposed on the other one and – ooooooh, boy!

You've got to have the patch of gray that can match from each negative. It's got to be on every negative, and it's got to be at least a quarter-of-an-inch square, and it's got to match exactly on a densitometer. Boy! There's technology there, man. Wow! There's technology. There's exactly what is the factors involved in this: there's the various types of ink, there's the various types of pigments, there's various color charts, there's various systems which are employed. There's all types of reproduction equipment on the subject of fine lines and dots and – oh, my, my, my, my, my! Wow! There's a terrific, terrific technology – the technology of the printer.

The technology of – well, you take retouching. Bears about the same resemblance into photography. There's somebody who can take a picture and he can take a various type of ink or sauce or something and he can take this photograph and he can alter the features of the person in it. He can do this, he can do that. Terrific technology involved. Applied art, but very applied. Big technology.

Well, how come you have to know this when right next door to it, the thing it's a cousin to, which is the original writer, doesn't have any codified technology. Has actually a false technology. And the second that this thing that is written or the thing that is painted moves over into reproduction, moves into the high channels of communication, moves over into that field at all, drops into one of the most complex and exacting of technologies. It gives one to wonder how these things are even cousins.

Here's this whole area of writing; there is no technology. Everybody pr... it's worse than that. Everybody pretends there's a technology, that if you just studied it real hard, why, you, too, could starve to death in a garret, see? So – and right next door to it, here's this other.

Well, it bears some kind of a resemblance between – I mentioned retouching. You take any photograph that is a portrait of anyone, I don't care where or who or how or why. The number of times you get a perfect negative that you can print and make a copy of, you know, and frame it or enlarge it or do something with it and enlarge it and give it to somebody so they'll say, "How nice Izzybelle looks these days." You have to retouch it and all your big studios retouch. Sometimes they over-retouch. Sometimes they practically take out all the features in their excess of enthusiasm to make somebody look good. But any picture you've ever had taken in a studio which was ever framed and enlarged and presented to you as a presentation piece, it had to be retouched. Well, this retoucher is not the photographer. They bear the same resemblance as the duke and a steward, see? The photographer's definitely the duke, you know? He's the boy who goes through all the stuff that gets the picture and so forth, and nobody much pays much attention to the retoucher. The retoucher is rather heavily paid, but he sits there quietly drawing his heavy pay, you see, with his very exacting work.
Well, the number of tricks you can do in retouching are absolutely almost unlimited. You can do one of the wildest things with retouching. You take this negative, you know, and you take a fellow who, or a girl – girl doesn't like to be plump, you know – and you can take this thing and you can thin her down, man. And this fellow doesn't like to look so old. Well, you can't take too many lines out, because his character disappears, but you can take a few lines out if you're very good – and boy, you can take about fifteen years off his age, you see?

Thud! And he thinks that picture's beautiful, because he's – of course, the people who are buying these pictures are the people who are having them taken and naturally they only buy something that flatters them. So the whole world of photography is – in portraiture – is bent in the direction of making somebody look better – not more dramatic, but better – and... because people don't like dramatic photographs, really; they like pretty ones.

I read a dissertation of why they don't let the public judge an art exhibit the other day. It's because the only paintings or the only photographs or anything else exhibited would have to do with cute little kittens falling out of baskets or wearing babies' clothes or little children with jam all over their faces and those would be the only pictures that would ever get a winning award. And they have another penchant: If it's not sharp – the public at large has an index by which they judge a photograph – if it's not sharp, why, it's no good. Well, think if you took an expert picture of a mist, a very misty morning. Of course, it's not sharp but it's a beautiful picture, and the public would turn it down.

So judging has been taken completely out of the public hands for these particular reasons, you see? But portraiture is never taken out of the public hands, see? So it's got to be retouched within an inch of its life. Everybody's really got to look prettied up, you know? Tsk! It's wild! Some of those pictures don't any more look like the people they're taking a picture of, you know, than the man in the moon.

Well, what about this? What's this relationship? How come? Well actually, the retoucher steps in when the photographer fails. You can do everything the retoucher does with your camera and the lights. You can do the whole lot with the camera and the lights. But when the photographer falls down, the retoucher picks it up.

Well, they have various things – not to give you a whole bunch of nomenclature; don't pay much attention to this nomenclature. It's just, it's just words. They've got things like barn doors – very expressive, beautiful word. They put them on the sides of a spotlight and – so the spotlight won't shine into the lens or so that you can flap them over and keep the light from hitting somebody in certain portions. And then they have things called headscreens which stand up here on a big – like a square cardboard – and that restrains the light from hitting somebody's ear, see? You can tip the edge of this board in so that this person's ear is not well lighted. You see, his ears are too big, let us say, see? Well, you can take that shadow and throw it just exactly across his ear, see? And his ear looks smaller.

Any part you want to emphasize, you put light on, the formula is. The parts you don't want to emphasize, why, you just let it drift away, and the parts you want to practically take out of the picture, well, you just hold the light off of them and there they go.

And because photography, of course: photo –, light; – graphy, writing – it's just writing with light. And when you've written well with light you get a perfectly retouched picture.
You can turn people in certain ways that make them much thinner. You can make their noses longer and you can make their forehead shallower and their chins stop jutting and so forth. Of course, you can just easily make a strong-jawed person into a weak-chinned person and so forth. You can do all kinds of wild things.

But when the photographer doesn't do his job, why then, somebody's got to step in and straighten it all out. And there's where the technology builds up. And the technology builds up in the area of correction.

So I think you'll find in the field – this is a broad statement and might be subject to a great deal of modification – in any heavy, heavy technical subject, but if very, very, very technical, I think the technology is built up around an area of correction. It's dissatisfaction with something and the correction of that dissatisfaction. Do you follow this now?

All right, the photographer doesn't do his job. He doesn't put the head screen over right so this guy's ears look like a pair of donkey's ears, See? Well, all right, nobody's going to buy that picture, so when the thing is all finished and so forth, well – I mean it's been developed rather, not completely finished – and it's in its proof sheets, and so forth; they don't even show him the proofs. They won't even show the customer the proofs.

Retoucher takes ahold of that thing and he cuts those ears down and he subdues those ears and he makes that look better and they reproof it. Then they show it to the customer and the customer's very happy with it. Correction. Correction.

Now, you can say when it isn't done right in the first place it's got to be corrected. And where it is going to be corrected a great deal of technology will arise. You follow this?

Audience: Mm – hm. Yes.

All right, if it was done right now, then there would have been no further technology. But where it's done right you would then have something moving along the line very smoothly and very easy to get along with indeed, if it was being done right. If you had the technology of how to do it in the first place, in other words, everything would move smoothly from that point there on.

But let us say there's a bunch of technology missing at this point or it is not known or it's not practiced. Now we're going to get a very heavy complicated technology arising just on the other side of this thing which we're going to call a lower-scale subject and it will simply be totally corrective of the upper-scale subject. Where you – ever you have tremendously heavy technology, then that is all of a corrective basis. In other words, it was based on a correction. There had to be something corrected at this point. It wasn't running right in the first place.

Now, let's get on this subject of bodies. Let's take it a – a finite line. All right, the photographer didn't do his job well and so therefore we had to pass it over into the hands of the retoucher. And the retoucher had to go all over this negative and take out pieces of it and do this and that before he printed it, and so forth. Well, let's not stop there.

Let's move over just a little bit further, and how about building these bodies? Well, somebody didn't build them right if people are that dissatisfied with them. There's something
going wrong over there. And I'm merely pointing this out to you – there's no technology known there. There's geneticists, there's all kinds of "Eat Wheaties," there's various types of false technologies. But they frankly – there's a second dynamic, Freudianism, and so forth, but they really have nothing to do with making bodies. I don't know what the second dynamic has to do with making bodies. It's just because they get connected and they are inevitable in sequence, but they do not necessarily proceed from one, two, see?

Now, what's all this? And we're into a totally unknown body of knowledge, aren't we? And there's a lot of false superstition and other things connected with it, so there's some bird down in Vienna in 1894 could say, "The whole trouble with the human race is they have no technology of building bodies," or "They've got it all in backwards," or something like this, you know? There's something wrong, see?

Freud, he builds up then psychoanalysis which has proven very popular. It isn't effective, it's popular. See, it depended upon the communication cycle of the analyst whether it was good or bad, not on Freud's theory. Surprise? If you had a good analyst that knew how to communicate with the patient and so forth, why, somebody would get better. Accidental though – they never studied the technology of communication. They didn't know anything about that and they thought they were dealing with the second dynamic. And they weren't.

Funny, you can read over Freud's records and you find out every time the guy got off an overt, he recovered. And you know, Freud never noticed it. You know, that's so remarkable. It will be buried somewhere in the notes, because it's not emphasized, and then he's – you're given the wrong reason for the recovery and that makes it very hard to relocate what was going on in this particular thing, and we're not riding a hobbyhorse trying to apply Scientology to it. It's one of the ways it's one of the places we got the overt. And there seemed to be one present in every recovery; a disclosed overt and a recovery. They seem to go hand in glove, so a further study of this particular zone and area brought about a resurgence of technology in that particular field. And the importance of this thing was able to take place.

All right, but look-a-here, look-a-here. Here is the only thing I'm leading up to, rather circuitously, but to give it to you – more thud, to show you there's some background to it, with the idea of you understanding it a little bit better. Do you realize that all of education as it is practiced today is a complicated corrective technology? It's a corrective technology. It isn't education at all. See, there's no effort to relay an idea from point A to point B or mind A to mind B. See? There's an effort, however, to keep the fellow from or to keep him at it in some way or to do this or to do that. In other words, the educational system is built around the fact that education has already failed.

So you have this fantastic technology and some poor bloke could go to school for many, many years learning how to be a teacher and all he would ever learn is how to correct the corrections.

Now, it isn't that that data is un... is useless. Let me tell you, when an engine has gone into the ditch it's a very good thing to know how to operate a wrecking train to get it back on the rails again – very complicated technology, but it's a very good thing to know. But this doesn't make all of railroading lifting trains back on rails that have gone into a ditch, because
railroading done right has the train on the rails all the time! It's only when railroading doesn't
go right.

Well, so how about education where the students are committing suicide all over the
place the way they do in France, and so forth? I don't – I don't know what this has to do with –
education's somehow or another linked up with something or other and survival or something
and they got it all in backwards and crosswise. And the poor students over there in France
come up for an examination, you just start reading the roll call: "Pierre," you know?

"Oh, he's dead," and so forth. [laughter] "He took cyanide last night. He couldn't con-
front it any longer."

And they have a heavy, heavy suicide rate, because apparently in France if you don't
get through this particular type of examination, or something like this, they execute you any-
way. I think you're executed socially or something, and France hasn't any colonies anymore to
ship anybody off to so you just have to stay home, in total disgrace or something. Corrective.

Well, look at the amount of force and dure ss which must have been on this student.
Terrific force, terrific discipline, heavy! To what? Well, to keep him at it and make him study
his examinations. Well, I don't know, I never had any trouble getting anybody to study some-
thing they were interested in.

So I think that if this much duress can exist in a field to drive students to suicide – and
very often in England and the United States they go off their rockers, and so forth – if there's
this much duress to get them to learn, then I would say it must be some kind of a corrective
technology that moves over into this field so hard only because – it moves over into this field
– only because the students missed it all in the first place.

Now, what kind of duress do you think it would take to get Johnny to learn what B
was when he'd already missed what A was? Now, you're getting accustomed to this in han-
dling it with definitions and that sort of thing and I'm talking to a rather informed group here.
Supposing, supposing somebody came up to take his examination to you and you were check-
ing him off and so forth and you stuck in on the second paragraph. You couldn't get past sec-
ond paragraph, he couldn't seem to remember any thing in the second paragraph or so forth.
Well, your technology now says that you should go back up and look just a little bit earlier to
find the word he didn't understand. And sure enough, you'll find one just before he went
blank, in other words – just before he went blank, there was a word he didn't understand.
When we trace this back we find this word; we get this word defined and straightened out. All
of a sudden, magically, he understands that paragraph.

Well now, supposing we didn't straighten out the word and supposing we told him that
he was going to be expelled if he didn't learn the paragraph. Now, supposing we compound
this with about ten – somewhere between ten and fifty thousand instances and texts and we
did this every time. I would say we'd have an adequate explanation of why the child at nine
was dumber than the child at eight, the child at ten was more stupid than the child of nine, the
child of eleven was more stupid… See?

In other words, this amount of duress became necessary because nobody would ever
have understood anything, they wouldn't have been educated at all and perhaps better than
nothing – perhaps. I don't think so, myself, but you could add it up this way. And if every
time this fellow hit a rough spot on the road you simply applied the lead boot or the pincers or
the brass basket full of rats or some other interesting medieval torture and said, "Now, if you
don't get that next paragraph, you're going to have had it, bud." Now, what do – what do you
think he would finally wind up? Well, he'd be in – he'd be in an interesting state, wouldn't he?

He'd be far removed from any idea of what he was doing. He'd be far removed from
the subject and he would be treating the subject as something entirely different than the sub-
ject, certainly. He – you know, well, he'd say: "Well, there's this thing called physics, and I'm
just trying to fix these weights here, and of course that physics, it doesn't have anything to do
with these couple of weights I'm trying to fix on the counter here." It'd wind up in a nonappli-
cation.

There'd be a – he'd have to short-circuit. He'd have to get all that duress out of his pe-
rimeter. He'd have to get all this stuff out of his circle of understanding. He'd have to move it
all over here someplace and just squash it and suppress it and say, "Well, the devil with it. I'll
have to make up my own mind about this," or "I'll have to try to walk my own way through all
this," don't you see? You would leave him on a total only-one basis with regard to his subject
matter and his information. And instead of helping him you would have taken away all the
information that could have helped him. So I would say modern education was making it im-
possible for a person to utilize his training.

Well, this then should indicate to you that a decline of IQ could be expected to follow
a misunderstood word. That sounds absolutely w ild, but the longer you went past that and the
more you had to know that, the stupider you could be expected to get. Do you see?

Of course, we have all the corrections for this, and so forth. We've got clay table and
clearing and definitions and all that sort of thing now. So we're talking from a point of view of
considerable savvy. But I'm just trying to show you what the world must look like.

Here you got engineers out here putting up skyscrapers. Man, I'm – after I've learned
this about education and so forth, I hope they were put up by the foreman who was never near
the college because otherwise I'd expect them to fall down on me head, I would. I don't think
I'd trust one very good. I've noticed a peculiarity in this particular field to get unreal or kind of
revengeful toward the subject or to do weird thi ngs or to slough off when they got near their
trained area.

Now, here is another datum: How does the state suffer in various terms from misedu-
cation? How does the state suffer from miseducation? Well, there's a country, you might not
have heard of it, called Russia and it went by the boards a number of years ago and it im-
ported a German philosophy called communism and it had a ball, and it nevertheless is trying
to go forward and make something out of itself, and so forth. It probably would have gone
forward as fast as the Western world if it hadn't adopted a squirrel, offbeat philosophy. The
Western world has advanced exactly the same distance and further during the same period of
time. See, they were not mechanized either back in 1917. They were pretty bum.

If you don't believe it, one of these museums, go into one of these motor museums and
so forth; look at a 1917 model – stuff. Well, that's a modern Russian car. I don't mean to be
catty; they did copy a jeep. They got a lot of jeeps in there during the war and they copied them.

But they're pretty corny; and what they're trying to do, over there in Russia, is spread a civilization out into a very, very, very backward Asian world. Russia is basically Asian, it's not Western. And I will say that with all their handicaps – political and otherwise – they are making some progress of one kind or another and they've got an awful lot of virgin territory to spread all of this into. They've got the whole of Siberia to spread stuff into it, see, and they're really in a state of a sort of a pioneer country. And people have said, "Well, they're really entering their Victorian Age," and I imagine that they are. They're way behind. They're almost a century back of anybody else. Oh, just because Great Britain sells them some machinery and they change the labels on it and export it to Japan as Russian field tools or something is no reason why they're good in this department. They're not.

These boys are up against a tremendous frontier, and they have the frontier of ignorance and the frontier of this and that. They've got a vast wilderness. They have millions and millions of uneducated, backward people to try to do something with, you see? Their problems are fantastic! They're trying to solve them with education, and here's the outcome of their solutions with education. Of course, you can imagine a Russian commissar operating over a Russian student. This would be pretty grim.

And the figures are these: That on-the-job training of a great number of students who were trained at the full expense of the government and the industry which was training them to take future key posts in there left it one hundred percent at the end of their on-the-job training period, which was a two or three year period. One hundred percent took no further activity in that plant or that line of work. In another plant and an area – this is one specific plant – another plant, two out of several thousand did stay with the plant. And these are not just selected figures. These are the broad coverage estimates for the whole of Russia.

These are young people who have been educated under communist duress and have been moved out into a plant to be given on-the-job training to take over future posts in that plant. And at the end of that time, because things are milder over there now, they had some power of choice as to what they did now. And they all left. That was the exercise of power of choice.

Now, if you know education – and you know our technology of education now – you will see at once exactly what must have happened. Way back here in kindergarten or somewhere the communist love of the reevaluation of words caught him. The favorite trick of the communist is not to change anybody's vocabulary but to make it mean something else. They change the meaning of words so therefore everything sounds familiar. The next thing you know a person finds that the word means something else entirely different. I'll give you in lump example of this: Orwell's 1984, wonderful changes of semantics, the change of meanings, of words which went through 1984. "Freedom is slavery," you know?

Well, even Roosevelt was at it. We had freedom for a long time. Everybody knew what "freedom" meant. Roosevelt, he made it "freedom from." You had to be freedom from something. That was what – the freedom we were now fighting for, we were fighting for "freedoms from." Well, that's an interesting way of looking at it. "Freedom from." Well, that
means you must be fighting it so you couldn't possibly be free of it. "Freedom" means "freedom." It doesn't mean standing up against something and pushing it away from you or worrying about will it catch up to you again, or something like this, or working day and night so that it won't happen to you. That's not freedom.

So, here's a change of semantics. Now, the Russian, of course had this entire Asian population, this huge mass of people, 200 million – one of the bigger populations of Earth in one country, all divided up into different lingual groups and different customs and so forth – and he moved in on them and then he had to change everything in order to get it all lined up and get them to work together at all and he had to reevaluate all their words. So that in 1964 we find he's lost his revolution. How did he lose his revolution? Well, he trains several thousand young people to take over the Pujas River Project and they're going to be the executives and the big shots on the project and they're go – they too are going to be able to drive around in Model T Fords. And at the end of the on-the-job training they all leave the Pujas River Project. That means he's going to run out of people to run things.

Material which we've got right now in Scientology, oddly enough, was of great interest to the old man Stalin himself because he smelled that it might exist in the studies which I was doing and was – I was in contact with Amtorg in 1938. And the whole line of – is, "How do you evaluate the relative ability of a person to work? How can you find out which person will produce more than which person?" And I was engaged in a study of that at that time and had some rather revelatory information regarding it. I was extremely pleased with this information and it got noised about the Explorers Club. The next thing you know, I was backing up at a mile a minute trying to keep my foot off that boat of going to Russia and talk to Stalin about it.

He had problems. He had worries in 1938 – plenty of worries. He was looking for help from anyplace. But where was his missing technology? The missing technology was "How do you get people to understand something and how do you get people to do things?" Those were his areas of no comprehension. How do you get people to understand things, how do you get people to do things?

Well, he thought he had solved "How do you get people to do things." "You set up enough machine guns in front of enough walls and give them enough examples, they will work." Only you can't keep it – keep at it forever that way. That'll play out sooner or later.

Now, when you start working that along an educational line, you run out of educated people fast. They just get stupider and stupider and stupider. So that I think that the way the leisure class and the upper class was wiped out in England and suborned was not through any political revolution. I just think they educated them to death. [laughter] I think actually they got too stupid to hold their position. Something to think about, huh? I mean, as a class they were just educated to death. Everybody had to go to college.

Of course, what did this leave? This left a bunch of commoners around who didn't have to go to college, so it didn't matter about birth or anything else. It left these boys who were on the outside smarter than the guys who were on the inside so the guys who were on the inside lost. I mean, it doesn't take much to understand that. That must have been what happened.
So we can make a further point; we can make a further point here. We could say, then, that the continuation of a culture is entirely dependent upon possessing a technology of study. Russia is going to lose hers!

We have an example of the upper class of England having gone through Oxford into oblivion. We have examples of – all around us – of changing face of Earth and so forth and that hinges basically on people; the future of the human race hinges oddly enough on people. And if you don't make people who are good people, you're going to have trouble.

And in the field of study if you don't have any technology of study, then the poor little bloke who goes into kindergarten and who starts running into incomprehensibles and who then is threatened with being flunked or shot or whatever they do to children in kindergarten if they don't get their blocks piled up in the right pile, moves on into the first grade and here he is shown a word which is cat and he says it's tac and everybody looks sad; the teacher paces up and down, writes notes to the parents, the father goes into a decline, holds his head in his hands for a half an hour, you see?

This is the standard accepted procedure, you see? "What is going to come of you?" you know? That is the question which is left burning in the middle of the air, you see? "You will never succeed in life," and all that sort of thing. Why do they have to put this much duress on? Well, it's because they don't know how to teach the kid to read cat instead of tac.

So you get this terrific cultural pressure. You get a bunch of cultural technology on "How do you keep a kid in line?" Then you hire a whole police force all over the nation to try to sit on him when he becomes a teenager. And then you have a real ball, now. You get the Mods and Rockers and so forth and your this and that. Well of course, these people by now have been taught thoroughly that they're no part of anything and that's the way they act. They act as though they're no part of anything, they don't own anything and that's it.

It's quite interesting to watch some young boy and so forth who's been catapulted out into the responsibility of the care of a family or something like that at ten or eleven, twelve years of age. It's very interesting to find. Today you can – in spite of child labor laws – occasionally find such a specimen. And he bears no more resemblance to the modern teenager, and he won't because he's already had to wrap his hands around this thing called life, you see, and carry on somehow and he hasn't had time – all the time necessary to sit in school and be made stupid and he's liable to become quite a success in life or something weird like this is liable to happen to him, unlooked for.

They're trying to bring in law and order while operating in the schools to create illegal activities and disorder. They're operating in schools to create it. And the last person in the world that would stand up and take any responsibility for it is Miss Prince-Nez, there at the – Public Local Number 18: "Well, we just try our best," you can see her now, you know? "We just try our best." [laughter] Christ! Why don't they hang a sign across the door and say, "Juvenile Delinquent Factory – "

Well, all right. So once more we have this experience in Dianetics and Scientology in this line of work. Once more we have this experience of colliding with a zone or area of the society in which there's a pretended technology where actually there is none. It's not only that – it's absence, it's – there's a pretended technology sitting in its place.
Now, I don't think, however, you're going to have too much collision with it. I don't think there's going to be too much upset, but I could foresee there's going to be some upset about it. Anything we write on this subject is sooner or later going to be challenged in some quarter or another. But this isn't a codified field that is returning a great deal of money. Teaching is not really a vested interest because it doesn't make enough money and that's about the only reason why.

Medicine, however, is a vested interest and drugs are a vested interest because somebody is making money out of it. The multibillion-dollar drug empire and healing empire and so forth will be defended to the last stethoscope, see? Those guys will be standing around there – you'll still – I mean, twenty, thirty years from now there'll still be some bloke down here trying to cause trouble, you know? He says, "Rowr-rowr-rowr."

And you say, "Well, you don't understand some word in healing."

"Yeah, I understand all the words in healing."

"Well, you don't understand some word in Dianetics and Scien…"

"Oh, yeah, I understand all the words in Dianetics…"

"What the hell's the matter with you?"

"I'm broke!"

Well now, the teacher doesn't make any money and the school contractor doesn't care what's built in those buildings that he's contracted to build and the state doesn't really like to shell out this much money, because kids don't vote. It's not an area where you can buy many votes. You can buy them – buy the votes of their parents somewhat but people really never connect the school to the administration. They're always somewhat disconnected. So you have no active vested interest there to go up against and I believe the whole area can just be gobbled up because nobody has ever seen it as a profitable area.

We're not looking at it as a profitable area, but they won't defend it because they don't see it in a profitable area. If medicine were a lot less profitable today, we would have no trouble taking over the field of healing. It's just the self-interest in the thing which keeps the opposition raving. I don't say that bitterly. I mean that's just a completely considered statement.

There isn't such an area in the field of education, so therefore I think a proper textbook which just goes down the line rat-a-tat-tat and doesn't find any fault with anybody and doesn't shoot anybody down in flames, you know, but just goes right down the line and takes up the whole subject from the word scat and carries it on through – why, it's pretty hard to get over the chapter of how you can reduce IQ in a person because IQ is a piece of the technology that'll have to be presented. But it'd be presented gently enough so that it won't have people fighting that point.

And the next thing you know, why, you'll be in another business. But it's not in another business that you've ever been absent from. Your part of the business is making people brighter, you see? Processing people, clearing people, that sort of thing. Well, that fits hand in glove with this particular type of activity. Then you have Scientologists to teach so you need
the technology and that was the only reason the technology was developed in the first place – just to make it easier to teach more Scientologists – that was why it was developed. But it's going to go further than that, you watch it.

Now, if we don't take some responsibility for how far it'll go, we're liable to be in more trouble than if we just released it and forgot about it. Therefore, I'm not releasing any small book on the subject. I have to release a definite text. And I think you will find out that gradually, as this starts to roll, that it will be necessary for you in your area to make it possible for teachers, on a Saturday and a Sunday or something of that sort, to drop around and have some lectures on this subject. And I think that you'll find that it sort of will tend to stand separate and distinct from anything else which you're doing, and you will say, rather faintly, "Well, you know, we can raise people's IQ."

"Oh, yes, yes. Now what did you say about…?" and some educational question will come up, you see?

And you say, "Well, you see, you can process somebody in order to…"

They'll say, "Well yes, but now in teaching a child, do you…

And you'll say, "What the hell, which way is this cat jumping." Well, I think you'll eventually see which way the cat jumps, and the way the cat jumps is the fact that they want to know all about education. And you better let them walk all the way through education before you start showing them that they actually have entered the field of philosophy.

And I don't think they'll route any other way because in education what you're actually studying is the difference between a Level 0 and a Level 1. And what sits there is this band called "education." And that's what's been established here is – that's of importance to us intimately and immediately. All these other ramifications, all these other complexities of education are not terribly important to us.

So the society of Russia will not be able to perpetuate itself. I'm afraid that would cause me to yawn almost wide enough to dislocate me jaw. So it won't be able to perpetuate itself in history. Too bad! Oh, that's terrible! The various other political regimes and so forth won't be with it. I'm afraid I just – that the state of mind I'm in with regard to these blokes, I'm afraid that I wouldn't even pick up a shadow for them if they dropped it. They're just not important.

But people are important and their systems are not important. Now, when their systems are built on lies, those systems must therefore be destructive. And the whole educational system as I see it of total duress, of total squash on the individual, in view of the fact that it's a system that's full of lies, I think it's about the most destructive thing you could have around at all. I think it would be very rough to have to live with this kind of a thing. It's definitely incorrect – wrong.

But you're going to find yourself in this business and the only real point I'm trying to make to you here is: don't then consider – because you can't talk to them about processing when they're busy studying study – don't then consider that you have moved them over into some other field. Recognize that you're moving them up through the top of Zero into the bottom of One. Recognize that this is a necessary step. These people are not bright enough at this
particular time to even sit down and wonder, "How come they've got this technology?" You know, they've put it on some other basis entirely.

So you come in and talk to a group of them and you say, "Well, study is so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so – and the IQ of your child could be increased by study, not decreased. And you could have a brighter child," or something like this or, "Your school could run with less upset," or to a group of police, "Juvenile delinquency is caused by miseducation. Proper education would reduce juvenile delinquency."

This will all sound to them like good roads and good weather. And they'll be very happy to cooperate upon this particular line and so forth. And you don't have to say anything else. And they won't really ever wonder, "Now, how the devil does this person know all this? Yeah, where is this information from? What's this all about?" Unless, of course, they're totally ARC broke and then that's out the other end. But it never really occurs to them to ask intelligently, "Ah, what part of the information and so forth? It says throughout this textbook that this is part of a body of information called Scientology. But then it just says 'Scientology' and everybody knows what Scientology is. It's a study of science, of course, naturally. Truth, and that sort of thing. And it's so on and so on and so on and…" See, they wouldn't even think about it.

And why wouldn't they think about it? I want you to get so you can see this one little point. They can't think about anything! See? You're wondering why a fellow with blinders on can't see. See? What you haven't recognized about this individual is the most fundamental thing about this individual, and that is he can't see at all.

So you ask yourself, "Why can't Joe and Pete see this and this and this?" You see, you're asking yourself too complex a question. See, you're asking yourself, "Why can't Joe and Bill see that so-and-so, so-and-so, so-and-so? And why do they always argue, and so forth and so forth?" Well, you yourself are just being too complex with your question. Your question is based on the fact that you haven't recognized that they can't see! Do you follow this?

You're trying to stretch it out into, "Why can't they see something?" see? Well, your basic thing is, is just, "Why can't they see at all?" Well, they can't see at all because they've never been – they've been trained into stupidity. And you're talking to blind men, that's all. Well, how do you talk to a blind man? Well, you talk to him damn carefully! You get smart about it.

You know this guy's blind, so you – naturally he's sitting there, he can't see at all, and you're trying to talk to him about the rose garden, which you can see right outside the window. Well, you say – you wouldn't say to him, "Well, you silly ass! Why don't you look outside the window and look at the rose garden?" Well, you wouldn't say that to a fellow who couldn't see at all. See, you wouldn't.

You'd say, "Well, over there to your…" You'd have to think it over, you see? You'd have to say, "Well, over there to your right there are a certain number of windows. You possibly can feel a cold draft coming in on you occasionally. Well, that's windows over there and there's light which makes things visible and show up so that you can see things back of things. Like, you hold your two hands together, you see, like this. Well, the light would fall on the
first hand, but wouldn't fall on the second hand, so you'd see the second hand, you see – you'd see the first hand but you wouldn't see the second hand because there's no light on the second hand. Now, you can hold those up and you can feel it that way," and you gradually infiltrate it into his experience, don't you see? And you'd have to sit there and figure for a while on "How am I going to give this guy some dope so that he can get some idea of there's a flower garden outside the window," see? And you gradually build it up, and you'd say, "Well, outside the window there's a lot of space. You know, the last time you went out of the room, why, you walked for quite a ways before you got into another door. Well, that was all space and that's the outdoors. And you've noticed sometimes that you've gotten rained on and so forth while you were in under some spaces, but not into other spaces, see?" You know? And you take it up like this, "Now, there's a big wide space outside the windows."

And then you'd probably recognize, "Good God! The next thing I'm going to have to explain to a blind man is the aesthetics of color. Ooh! Well, let's see. How can I do this," see? "Well, all right. Be brave. Let's do this. Let's attempt it." You get the idea?

And you eventually find yourself – and the guy would be sitting there saying, "Yeah, you know? Yeah, yeah, yeah, well I now know what a flower garden is," see, something like that. You really would have communicated something because you recognized in the first place you were talking to a blind man. But when you fail to communicate, you do so for one big, awful reason. You don't recognize that you're talking to a blind man.

And when you start talking to people about Scientology, you are actually talking to them above the strata where you should be talking to them to. Somebody says, "Well, on this new PE Course, how do we get in ARC?" Well, you don't! ARC is too high. That's very advanced data; you've got to undercut this.

You've got to give them the idea of a datum and you've got to give them the idea of the comprehension of a datum and you've got to give them the idea that there are data in existence. You've got to give them the idea that they can learn something. Sounds incredible but this is your leg up, this is your edge in.

Then you can give them the idea that there is knowledge, because 99 percent of the people you're talking to have had the experience of "The technology taught did not operate." Most of them do not expect anything to happen even if they know the technology. So they're not able to give that extra little push that makes it work. When you run into these failures it's because of this, see? It's that little extra thing. They don't expect – what I'm trying to tell you is they don't expect anything to work because nothing ever has. So they really – don't really know what knowledge is.

Knowledge is some sort of a fakery that people think is, see? If you gave them the task of describing what is knowledge, you're liable to run into something like that. Well, these people don't know there's anything to know.

Look at the arrogance of the medical profession. They don't think there's anything to know about the subject of the mind or the spirit or healing. They brush all this off, they – wow! You know? The arrogance of these fellows! They're not producing any results, yet they think they've got it all wrapped up. Well, where do you suppose that comes from but Latin? Imagine, starting somebody to handle the human mind by getting them to go over into the
next county for some word of a dead language that has no resemblance whatsoever to any-
thing he has any experience with and say, "That's where you begin on the human body," and
then you wonder why in the final analysis this guy is so eager to carve up human bodies and
choke people off. Well, he wouldn't ever do anything else, don't you see? You've said, "This
is the tibia," and you've looked for where the tibia is. It's this word in the book: tibia.

Actually, education is getting worse and worse. In desperation recently, Great Britain
has taken a fantastic turn in the field of education, about which you're not reading any articles
and with which you're – probably aren't getting much data. You've probably heard something
of this, but I've just been getting it hot and heavy over the lines because I was working out to
find out where Quentin could go to school and what he had to do to figure out some various
things, so of course, typically me, I just got in touch with everybody on this subject and got
the gen down.

A lot of interesting data is pouring in on the lines. The British college does not expect,
within four years, to teach any degree course which goes consecutively to school. They want
nothing to do with it. They consider this is a total failure and they want nothing more to do
with it. And they tell you consistently, "You want to know what the expectancy of enrollment
is in 1968. I wish we knew, but one thing..." one or several have said, "...that we can tell you
for sure is the courses which are now available to enroll in will no longer be enrolled in."

"Sandwich training" is what they're using today in all technical fields. They say, "The
arts – who cares? Any of these old, dead-language subjects, and so forth, and dead degrees
and so forth, who cares about those? But we have found out that our engineers can't build
bridges and we're jolly well doing something about it. And we're upset in the field of educa-
tion, and we're just tearing it to pieces."

So all the big companies and the governments and the local councils and everybody
else who can put his shoulder to the wheel is knocking out anything that has resembled engi-
neering education in the past here in Great Britain. They are just knocking it in the head left
and right. They found the school room was no place to make any engineer, and the future of
this culture depends completely upon the quality of their engineers. They have recognized
that entirely. So they're just reforming the whole thing. And by 1968 it won't even look the
same.

They'll go six months to school and they'll work for six months. That's what's going to
happen to the student, and he's going to go six months to school and he's going to work for six
months. And he jolly well, damned better be working in the subject he's studying or he can't
enroll in it.

A whole new face has been given to the field of education. Well, that is a corrective
measure which is a recognition of the fact that educational methods have failed. But it's a cor-
rective measure in the right direction and we may even have had something to do with it be-
cause, remember, we've been teaching an – we used to teach an awful lot of teachers up in
London, and it was our idea of the familiarity of things and so forth. We may have more to do
with the evolution of the culture than we believe. Perhaps we could overestimate it, but I
think we commonly underestimate it. I see a lot of things happening. I noticed the other day
something or other happening. It was straight out of our textbooks.
Oh, yes. There's somebody drew up the profiles of Home and Heath and whatever its name is – Mr. George something – anyway, drew him up and printed our personality analysis in *The Guardian*, and plotted these boys on our personality analysis, somewhat alter-ised. But they never took one of these things down and gave it to somebody – typically the psychologist at work – never gave it to poor Home or Heath or Wilson or any of the boys, see, but went around and asked some students what they thought of these fellows and put that down as the results, and then advertised this as the actual graph of these people. I think it's very interesting. It's only something that they would do in the field of psychology. You understand what I mean? They just asked some people their opinions of whether these fellows were, you know, this or that or up and down, you see? And then they put down whatever anybody said and then released to the public that this was the personality of these blokes. I thought it was fascinating. But nevertheless, that was our graph sitting there staring us in the face.

We've already infiltrated this field to the degree that they're already out the backdoor and playing in the yard and don't even realize that we're sitting in the parlor twiddling our thumbs. That's about the way the situation is as far as command and knowledge and technology is concerned. But we are at a very – we're a very unreal group to these people and we're unreal because any further knowledge is unreal to them, don't you see? They recognize instinctively that there is knowledge somewhere, and when we talk to them they recognize that we are talking that way, but it's all on a sort of an unconscious basis. And then they don't really connect this up and they're sort of hunted about the whole thing, and we make them nervous.

But frankly, our command value over such a person is rather fantastic. It's almost an hypnotic command value which is sort of interesting. They recognize that you're talking the truth but they are not quite able to add you up to it, so the words which you're saying as you speak to them are engramic, almost, as you speak them. It's all very interesting. Scientology could be in this state and simply put the whole society into some kind of an obedience basis without even trying. But that isn't what we're trying to do.

The way that you would follow this through – you'd have to get somebody into a state where he could learn. This is the way you'd bring somebody into Scientology, see? You'd get him into a state where he could learn and you'd show him there was something to be studied and then you would show him that there was a body of information about study and then you would show him that there was a body of information to study. And it's about in those – in that sequence that you would make a big win.

And you have never really tried to approach it from this particular angle. Your normal approach to the individual is, "We can help you, we can make you smarter, we can do this for you, we can do that for you, we can make you well." We have tried to talk to him and so forth and we're talking to somebody who can't learn.

All right, if this individual can't learn, why, then of course he can't learn even the words we're saying to him. So he's in a nonreceipt. It isn't that we're even talking dully or un-cleverly. He's simply not receiving. See, if he can't learn in general, why, he couldn't receive your – even your sentence.
So your approach isn't failing, it just isn't reaching. Big difference between those two points. So all you have to do is move the person up to where it reaches. See, you take your first step first. You pull him up to where it'd reach him.

Well, so he'd be very happy to learn that there was ways of studying. He'd be very happy to learn this. He'd be very happy to learn there was ways of broadening his information about the world, about things.

But right away, of course, you recognize you're dealing with a present time problem. He has a lot of things that he is having problems with, that, if he could learn more about, he would be able to handle his problems. So you must be at that point colliding with a present time problem on the part of the person you're talking to. Do you see that? His basic present time problems have to do with not knowing. See, if he could just learn more about women, he wouldn't have so much trouble with his wife. I mean, let's get it down to that simple an index, see?

But of course, it never occurs to him that there's any way to go about learning that he isn't going about. So if he were just to know that there is some way you could learn more about women or learn more about anything or if there was some way of approaching this field of gathering data or becoming more learned on certain subjects and so forth, why, boy, he'd be on your side right now because he would be applying them to his present time problems, not on a direct processing basis but on just a direct indoctrination basis.

You say, "Well, there's something you can do about your life. There is some hope for it."

"Why?"

"Well, you can find out more about it."

"Is that so?"

See, not that you become clever or anything else, but "You can just find out more about what's going on around you." 

"Oh, I can? Isn't that interesting? Hey! How do you do that?"

"Well, there's techniques, various techniques of learning more about things that are quite surprising, quite surprising, and so forth. And one of them is to observe."

"Is that so?"

Well, you get how fundamental this gets? You observe. You think you have to be clever to teach somebody something like this. No, just be obvious; observe.

"Now, you – you say you want to know more about your wife? All right. Now, there's a good example. All right. Now, has it ever occurred to you to observe your wife?"

"No." [laughter]

"All right. Now, I'll tell you what you do. Your first lesson in learning something about study is to just learn how to observe. Just learn how to look at something. Just – that's it. All right, how do you look at something?"
Well, leave him wallow in it, man. How do you look at something? Hell, you look at it! That's the answer. And that's the answer he'd finally come up with. But how does he look at something? Well, he looks at it, see? And that would be his problem for the day, you see? He'd think there were trick ways of looking at things. Do you look at them through various colored glasses, you know? Do you look at them cross-eyed? Do you use eyeballs? All kinds of things, see? Let him solve that one. How do you – how do you observe something? Well, let him draw up systems of observation. If he wants to know more and have less trouble with his wife, well, he'd better learn how to observe his wife.

Now, that would be a primary method, then, of handling his personal affairs and his personal life. That would be right there or right down the middle of Main Street. He'd learn all kinds of things that just never occurred to him before. He's taken it for granted that observation is going on, don't you see? You've taken it for granted. You say, "Two people are living together, they both look at each other."

The only time a wife ever looks at him is when he comes home with a smear of lipstick. She can see lipstick. She puts it on her mouth all the time.

In fact, she put that lipstick on him that morning when he left for work, but she's forgotten that so now she has grounds for divorce: He came home with lipstick on his face. All day long nobody happened to tell him he had some lipstick on his face, see? But she can observe – lipstick on his face. End product.

You talk about observation. In any very big city – in any big city you can pull some of the wildest tricks to demonstrate nonobservation you ever cared to have anything to do with. The wildest things go unobserved in large cities. You wouldn't believe it. I, myself, used to make a gag out of this. I used to make a very amusing gag out of this; it paid off in many ways. Why, I used to tell some girl – if I were ever walking down Broadway in the vicinity of 42nd Street, you could always count on me to tell the girl I was walking with, you see, "Do you know that New Yorkers never see anything?"

"Oh? No!"

"Oh yes, you can do almost anything. I mean a fellow could drop dead out here, somebody could pull a gun out of his pocket and shoot somebody dead and the passerbys wouldn't even pause in their stride. You'd have to actually actively block the pavement. If there was a fight in progress, they would only stop if the pavement got blocked so they couldn't go by and then they'd stop and eventually watch the fight. You can excite curiosity by blocking the pavement and looking up, but you have to block the pavement before you look up and then they will also look up. But it's very, very funny but they never see anything. They don't pay any attention to you and if you don't actively block the pavement, why, they never notice."

"Oh, I don't believe you!"

You see, you get some girl from the Corn Belt or something like this. "Do you know that I could stand right here on the corner of 42nd and Broadway and kiss you and there isn't one single person would even glance in your direction."

"I don't believe it!"
"All right, I'll show you!" [laughter] Yeah! Never failed, never failed. Wonderful technique. [laughter, laughs] Yeah, there'll be a fee if any of you young fellows try that. [laughter]

Anyway, the score is that you take such – take such very unexciting words as "observation" or "inspection" or "familiarity," you see, the very unexciting words. You can actually build them up into mountains. They become very, very startling indeed! And when you're teaching somebody about this, what you want to do is take the obvious and expand it. Don't go going overboard to give them all – well, we're sitting in the driver's seat now. We've got the technology of education, do you see. It's contained in these lectures and so forth. There hasn't been very much to add to it, either. It appears to be quite complete.

Now, you're going to say, "Well, am I supposed to teach somebody education, huh?" Oh, no, no, brother. You're not supposed to teach anybody your technology of education. Let's teach them the introductory aspect of education. Which is what? How do you learn about things? Well, you could sit down and ask yourself that.

Well, how do you learn about things? Well, you learn about things by looking at them, by feeling them, by hearing about them, by reading books about them, by seeing what they relate to. You could lay all this down very easily, but of course you get out of it such things as "feel" and "observe" and so forth.

Now, if that's the breakthrough that you make on your very, very introductory and elementary approach to learning, you see, if that's the breakthrough which you make, realize that all of these things can be applied to all of the problems which any person at Level 0 or Level I has. You could give all kinds of gratuitous information about all kinds of gratuitous things which are being brought up with regard to this. Let's look at that.

So, it isn't for you, then, to say, "Well, let's see. I'm going to teach this fellow about Scientology. Well, there's such a thing as ARC. That's affinity, reality and communication and they form a triangle and so forth, and so on..."

"Where am I at? What – what's going on?" see. Well, he doesn't know there's any knowledge in existence anywhere that he doesn't know. That's one of the first things he doesn't know. He thinks everything in the world has already been found out. He doesn't know that the society is in any way deficient. Look at the way somebody out in the street will complain about a past life or complain about something or other.

You can take some bird who's howling like mad about the fact that there's no such things as implants and start to say, "Well, say this word," give him an item in a Helatrobeus line plot, and the meter goes blue, and he goes blue, and give him the next item, "Say that word." Blue, blue. Well, if there's no such thing as an implant where's all that coming from? Meters don't run for the fun of it, see? But to teach him something like this?

So what you in Scientology are up against is actually not the meanness of the society or the cussedness of the society or the unwillingness of the society to be helped or any of those things. What you're – you're not even up against the ignorance of the society; you're actually up against the incorrect study technology of the society, which prohibits them from learning what you're talking about and prohibits them from learning that there is more to
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know. A technology that stultifies the intellect, that freezes the individual into a noncomprehension of anything, which puts him into a woodenheadedness the like of which nobody ought to be put into.

In other words, you're talking to a stultified even ossified individual who has been carefully and systematically – but accidentally and unintentionally – destroyed since the first day he set his foot on his mother's knee and said, "Mama, what's a cat?"

And then she said, "Don't bother me now."

"Let's see. Cats are 'don't bother me nows. " He's the product of an educational system which has threatened to shoot him against the social brick wall with all the social machine guns if he doesn't get "A" in every subject and graduate out of the top of his class where he didn't even understand what the word "school" meant.

Everything has militated – everything has operated against this individual ever becoming brighter or more educated. And now you expect to come forth with a great body of knowledge that this individual would welcome with open arms.

Well, in the first place, he's been shot down in flames on the subject of study to begin with and this would just mean more study to him. Furthermore, you couldn't possibly exist because all study materials are bad because you get shot if you don't know them or something weird like this will be going on in his head. In other words, the communication line is jammed. What's the communication line jammed on? The communication line is jammed on study. So this is study in dissemination.

And do you see that the study itself is an excellent dissemination tool and would work like a shot and I'm sure that you will find yourself, if you start to use this, being pulled in faster than you know.

And I will only give you one little caution with regard to it, is don't get too studious about study in your address to the subject. Just pick the very obvious points of study and make them very studious points because it doesn't matter how studious you get about the obvious. A person can still see it. Do you see?

So that you say – you – some person, he wants to get things built up into some tremendous tower of complexity on this subject. Well, you just let him build it up on the subject of observation until it likes to reach the sky. He isn't going to get anyplace but observation, is he? He's going to get, in the final analysis, the fact that you observe by observing. This is what final conclusion he will have to reach. No matter how many systems he develops in order to do the observation, he will eventually reach that point.

He can't help but learn things and learn things about learning if he observes things. So you've got any broad, fabulously simple point of this character which, if you put across and got it across, you would all of a sudden get tremendous agreement with. And you'd get that little "Hey! What do you know?" you know? "What's – yeah! Yeah! If I observed my wife – ah, yes! What is she doing? How does she look when I'm talking to her? Why, I have to check up on that." [laughter] And by the very familiarity of reach and withdraw by observation of his wife, he'd have less trouble with her. He'd become more familiar with her, he'd understand her better. You're talking to people who have withdrawn totally from life.
Study, of course, is one of the best methods in the world of bringing them out of it.
Thank you.
GRADIENTS

A lecture given on 29 September 1964

How are you today?

Audience: Fine.

You alive?

Audience: Yes.

Let's see if there's anybody who isn't. Doesn't seem to be. All right, this is the what of the what?

Audience: 29 September AD 14.

What date?

Audience: 29 September AD 14.

[part missing]

Ah, yes, you're more certain about that. Twenty-ninth of September AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. Going to talk to you today about a rundown of levels and classifications, and give you some kind of an idea on how this is all packaged together. And also give you a couple of elementary actions about auditing pcs. This seems to be a scrambled sort of a lecture to give you all at one and the same time, but believe me it's the same lecture. And you could call this lecture "Gradients."

A gradient – a gradient is an extremely interesting concept, very interesting idea, and it has bypassed a great many Scientologists. The idea of a gradient. Whenever I see you sit down in a session and have difficulty pulling a withhold, I know what you're up against. You're not up against the fact that you haven't got nerve enough to pull a withhold. That's what you think, you see. You're just up against a gradient when you're up against that, that's all. Whenever you have trouble auditing, you're having trouble with gradients. It's the only thing. And if you knew gradients like crazy and you knew what a gradient was and you had it straight, you'd never have any trouble with any pc you ever had anything to do with.

Clichés such as "You have to learn to walk before you can run," that's a gradient. You can't enter the hundred and fifth story of the Empire State Building without going into the ground floor, that's a gradient. You can't climb a vertical hill, but you might climb one of a ten percent grade, that's a gradient. And if you really had this one mastered you'd never have any trouble with any pc you ever had anything to do with. And you notice my lectures tend to go toward definitions, basics, very definitely. Notice I was talking to you about Clears and clear-
ing. Well, we got the clearing technology. It's the first thing I've been trying to straighten out is what is this thing called a Clear and what is clearing and what does Clear mean.

All right, now let's get into the fundamentals of an auditor's auditing, and we find we're up against this word called "gradient." And you haven't got that thing grasped so that you can wrap both arms around it and say "buddy," you're going to have trouble! And every student on the Saint Hill Sp... Briefing Course, and I've seen them down the time when we were – from the basement of the Manor and so forth on forward, and they're sweating and screaming and having a horrible time trying to pull somebody's overts. He wasn't having any trouble with overts. He was just having trouble with gradients, that's all. Having – not having trouble with it, he just had never learned what a gradient was. That's all. That's the principle that was missing in his auditing. A gradient.

It wasn't there so he couldn't pull any overts. Elementary.

So what – what you have trouble with is usually not what you're having trouble with apparently. It works in training the same way it works with the pc. The pc says, "Oh, I'm having terrible trouble with my wife, well, you know, and my wife and I..." Well, you process it and so forth, and the next session, why, "I'm having terrible trouble with my wife" and so on. And you process it, and next session, "I'm having terrible trouble with my wife," and so on.

You say, "What's the matter here?" Well, you're – one, you're not advancing his case. I call to your attention that it's stuck. [laughs, laughter] The main trouble that you're having in this particular case is – this particular case – is the fact that you're not auditing what's wrong. Otherwise something would happen.

Now, there could also be a gradient error here in pc isn't having trouble with his wife, man, he's just having trouble on such a broad line so that he can't possibly orient himself and he's just merely blaming it on his wife or something like this, and he isn't then attacking that part of his life he can do something about, so he's foisting off on you the fact that he's having trouble with his wife. Well, all right, so he's having trouble with his wife. Great. But if you processed it for a session or two and nothing resolved in this particular direction then that isn't what's the trouble. That's one of the things that could be there, that isn't the trouble.

The trouble must be something else because this trouble isn't folding up.

And you see, you can't – you can't get somebody over a trouble he isn't having is the point I'm making. It's very hard to do. And you're up against the problem of gradient there, and it's the gradient of confront. What can he confront about his existence and so on. And he claims he can confront his wife, see. But no, he claims this, but his analysis of his case and his difficulties is just too high for what the thing is, see?

Now, you ask him – if you were to ask him – let's apply a gradient to this. I've given you the other ramification, he isn't having trouble with his wife so therefore you can't do anything about it. He's just blaming his wife for all the trouble he's having, you see. There's – be a difference here of some kind or another. He may have attacked his case on the wrong gradient.

Now, there's this foolish gradient – and this is a silly one but it's a very good example – there's certain rural parts of farming districts will always breed this particular joke. And that
is if you took a calf and you lifted him every day from the time he was a tiny calf up to the
time he was totally grown, why, you would eventually be able to lift a full-grown bull, of
course.

There's that joke, and then there's the wrong way gradient and so forth is that they're
trying to cure this horse of eating by reducing his feed one straw per day, and by golly before
they taught him not to eat he starved to death, you know. I mean... Silly jokes of this particu-
lar character.

Nevertheless, they do have something to do with gradients, even though they're wrong
way to and impossible, don't you see. But they're still a gradient.

Now, someplace in this fellow's existence he would be able to put his feet on the road
of something he could do something about or some direction he could go and this is some-
thing he could do. And then having accomplished that he would then find the little more that
he could do, and then that, we would find a little more that he could do, and having found
that, a little more that he could do, and find that. Now that's built in as an automaticity into
many processes. "What can you confront?" would be a built-in automaticity here. You'd say –
well, automatically if you assess the pc what he could confront you'll find out that he eventu-
ally will be able to confront more and more and more, see. Do you see that?

You have some fellow – well, you can see this. You can say, "What in this room can
you see?" The fellow says,"Well, the whole room, yes, yes, the whole room."

"Well, what particular point of the room could you see?"

"Well, that and that and that and that and that and that, and all of a sudden
he'll brighten up, and he will see the whole room, don't you see. So you've seen that work as a
gradient, and the mind just goes in this direction so of course it very rapidly lends itself to
being an automatic process, see. Automatically. If the fellow starts becoming familiar with
something, he will become more familiar with more. Well, because it happens anyway and
because the mind goes in this direction is no reason that you must go on leaving it on auto-
matic. Do you see? I know I'm using some GPM terminology there, but you're up to it.

The point – the point I'm making is here that... Yeah, "automaticity" is one of the – a
word of that character is one of the items in the GPMs which is probably why you become
very devoted to it. [laughter]

But here is – here's the point: If you ask somebody to confront something they will
confront a little bit and then will confront more and confront more and confront more and
confront more and more and more and more and more and then he'll be able to confront a
whole lot, see; that's a gradient. But just because he does that without you doing anything
more about it than utter the repetitive process is no reason why you can just abandon yourself
following the gradient. See, you've got to follow this gradient, you've got to make this come
about. Not with that particular process, that will happen anyway, don't you see? I'm talking
about the fact that your address to the case has to be planned on a gradient.

You can't just say, "Well, all these processes automatically follow gradients," see. No,
you've got to plan the gradient. Now, he's saying, "Well, I'm having a lot of trouble with my
wife and a lot of trouble with my wife and trouble with my wife and trouble with my wife and
trouble with that." Well, this is a gradient. "Well, what part of all that trouble have you felt you could do something about? What part of it?" And he comes down to some part that he actually can confront and he can do something about and then he'll move further on into it and be able to confront the whole problem and then you'll be able to audit the whole problem. You got that?

In other words, you could take some little section of this pie and address this section, and then move on into other sections. Well, you normally regard that not as a gradient but as taking a part of the whole thing. Actually, it is part of the whole thing but it's also a gradient. You're taking a little bit and going on to a little more and a little more and a little more and a little more and a little more and more and more and more and then you've got the whole thing.

Processes are all designed on the basis of starting in with a little bit and winding up with a lot. All processes are designed that way. Classification, which I said I was going to say something about, is also designed that way. This fellow can handle a little bit or a little piece of auditing and a little bit of a pc or a -- or a kind of a routine pc. He can sort of handle a pianola pc, you know. "Pianola," an old term, plays itself. So he can handle this pc – pc would – this pc... I'll give you the gradient of pcs, you see. This pc say, "Well, I have a headache – well, it's gone." See? Well, a guy at Class 0, you see, well, he could handle that. Says, "Anything wrong with you?" Person says, "Yeah, I got a headache."

"Well, how do you feel now?"

"It's gone."

You see, he could handle a very easy pc. Well, the gradients as they go up the line progress into tougher pcs, but not -- they're not graded against tougher pcs, they're graded against more of the case, don't you see? But along with this, you also get the tougher pcs. So as he goes upstairs in his classes, as he starts walking up the grade of his classes, he of course can handle more difficult pcs and he can also handle more of the pc's case. And this is what is being asked of an auditor in an advanced classification. A very early classification, we don't expect him to handle very much of a pc's case and we don't expect him to handle a very difficult pc. See?

The way we handle that is we don't try to train this fellow up instantly and immediately and give him a full HCS Course in the next three or four minutes as we're coaching his auditing. We just say, "Well..." -- he just isn't getting anyplace on this pc at all. We'd have to figure out what kind of a pc is he running here? Well, he's running a tough one, man. I -- this... I'm -- I remember this pc because this pc's given us a tough time in instruction and this pc's given us a tough time here and there, and we've got this fellow and what's his -- what's his class? Well, his class is that if he's trained very, very hard and puffed his cheeks up very hard and got very red in the face he would be able to push a grain of a sand one millimeter. See?

Well, we can't demand this of him. We handle the situation actually by saying somewhat offhandedly and grandly, we just simply say -- we don't try as the HAS Co-audit Instructor to handle this case and so on, we just say, "Well, the best thing for you to do," we say to the pc, "is get some HGC auditing." Easy way to solve it, or "field auditing," or the best thing, if we're running a field PE and so forth, "Best thing for you to do is get some auditing over the weekends and we've got auditors who can audit you because you're difficult -- more diffi-
cul case and so forth than this particular level of training calls for." You'll find out very amazingly this guy'll say, "Oh, I'm something special, I'm called a difficult case."

Well, go ahead. Remember some auditor somewhere along the line will have to run out the fact that you told him he was a difficult case. [laughter] But if you knew your gradients and you knew this, then you wouldn't bang your head up against this thing of saying, "Well, Joe Class 0, you certainly aren't handling this pc, Mr. Mountain. You certainly aren't doing a good job of itsa there because Mr. Mountain is just getting ARC broke and he's just a-blowing and he's having an awful time, so you just aren't doing a good job."

No, he's doing a fine job of Class 0 auditing. He's doing exactly what he's supposed to do but Class 0 auditing just doesn't happen to be up to handling Mr. Mountain. You see that?

All right, now supposing we ran into the HAS Co-audit – that's the difficulty of the case – now supposing we ran into the HAS Co-audit the fact that they were only going to run GPMs. Well, that would be complete psychosis, because it – you're saying to the beginning of the gradient, "Handle the whole, total case at one fell swoop." Well, of course nobody'd get anywhere. Nobody'd do anything. Every once in a while you see this ambition come out all the time, somebody wants this one-shot Clear, you take a twenty-two grade horse needle or something of the sort and shoot it into the gluteus maximus and this guy goes "Spung!" and he's instantly OT and so on.

Actually, it is very nutty, but it is not unusual, because practically every psychiatrist in the world is walking around in this delusion, and there's some little outfit – I've forgotten its name; Harvard, Harvard, some little school – that sends out demands for contributions all the time because they're trying to find this magic ingredient in biochemistry. And they've got a big biochemical project going and they want lots of money in order to find the perfect biochemical thing that'll put everybody back to battery instantly with one shot in the gluteus maximus. And of course, they're getting that straight out of our early rumors of the one-shot Clear, this sort of thing. They probably read that and they said, "Well, they've got something called a 'one-shot Clear' so therefore that would be a shot in the gluteus maximus, there." [laughter] And therefore their thinkingness, "If we could just get together enough money and put enough people to work on it, why, then the problem would solve."

Why, I think that's a marvelous idea they have in modern science anyway, that if you put enough money on anything and enough people on anything that it would solve. I call to your attention that it doesn't work in government! Governments are now hiring one government official per citizen. I mean that's about the ratio, and that's enough people working on something, isn't it? And let's talk about enough money, well, they're getting something like a 105 percent of everybody's paycheck, and they still haven't solved mankind or war or anything else. So it doesn't necessarily hold true that if you put enough money on something and enough people on something that it'll solve, see.

What is true, however, is if you tackle the first fundamental that needs to be approached and handled you could probably eventually handle the whole thing providing you were content to walk this grade. If you go up this gradient, step by step, take a little more in stride, if you figured out what's missing...
Well, I did an interesting one the other day. I got a long, involved letter from the British color council. The whole world of photography is on its ear on the subject of color. And they've got it all planned out, color harmony and color this and color that. They're having an awful time. They've got some new toy called "High-speed Ectochrome" or something of the sort. And it'll take color. So right away they all figure they have to know more about color.

Well, of course the designers and the architects and the paint companies and everybody else, these people are all interested in color. And then there must be something mysterious or peculiar that they haven't known yet about this subject, so they're hammering and pounding along this line. And then in addition to that, big advertising agencies that wish to compel more sales on the part of more citizens are interested in color from the standpoint of ads and packages and so on. So color is big money these days and it's a big problem these days, and you've got a lot of bums -- I mean a lot of chaps, a lot of fellows -- standing around making an awful lot of money producing nothing in the line of color research. See.

But what they haven't done is attack the fundamental problem that has to do with color. And the fundamental problem that has to do with color is color is essentially light wavelength and light wavelength can't be looked at by anything else. We'll go into this slowly: You cannot look at light with something else.

Now, let me give you an analogy. You can look at sound. You can take electronics and examine the living daylights out of sound. And as a matter of fact sound engineers of recent times can synthesize, put together, just out of drawing sound waves in electronic patterns can produce sound that sounds just like a piano and sounds just like a guitar, sounds just like anything. In other words, they can resynthesize the harmonics of any instrument and produce the instrument. And I heard a record the other day whereby they had just worked and fiddled around with electronic waves until they'd produced a whole orchestra. And somebody had really had a ball, you see, they just kept playing this tape through and adding new electronic vibrations to the thing till they had a whole symphony going on the thing.

There was an earlier one called Nola. They had a piano going there playing ragtime music and that sort of thing, and of course there wasn't any piano and there hadn't been any piano. What they did was just calculate the harmonics of the sound electronically and then feed those things through an electronic recorder and mix them, and at the other end the thing sounded like a piano, you get the idea?

But you were looking at sound with electronics. Well, now the wavelengths of light and the wavelengths of electronics are the same thing, see. What are we going to do here? How can we -- see, what are we going to look at color with? See, sound, that's a very gross vibration. That's a big vibration. It's very easy to use light to look at sound. But you couldn't use sound to look at light. There isn't anything smaller than light with which to examine light. So of course then they can't determine what are the harmonics of light. They can measure a wavelength, they can measure this and that. But what are its harmonics? What are its dissonances? You know, if you thought -- talked of light in the same form as music, you'd say, well, music has clashes and it has counterpoint, it has this, it has that. Well, obviously the same things exist in light. But how are you going to measure them? You don't have anything...
smaller with which to measure them. There's nothing to look at light with. If you don't believe it, turn out the light and try to see something.

But there is something that can observe color. There is something that can observe color and can react to dissonances and clashes and smoothnesses and chords, if you want to put it into music. And that's you. See, there's a thetan. Now, he can inspect color. So when they try to work out color harmony or what color should you paint the walls, it then comes down to taste. Something we call taste. A person feels some particular way about seeing red with green polka dots, you see. He feels in some peculiar way about this, and so therefore somebody – and because he felt this way, then he decides there must be a law about it so he said, "Red with green polka dots won't do." See.

So then if you set up an authority like this, then the authority passes a law. And it says, "There shall be no green polka dots mixed with red." But you see, they don't know. And yet the amount of money that's being spent in this area of research is fabulous. But nobody is attacking the basic problem of it, because you've got to have something with which to look at color which can be measured or which is capable of measuring beyond the idea of mere opinion. And then you could put together a science of color.

Ah, but there are billions being spent on this right now. Tremendous quantities of money being spent on color. And there are more authorities walking around saying, "Well, it's very complex of course, only an expert could understand this." You see, you want to be aware of these subjects where only an expert can understand them, you see. You say, "All right..." I'll tell you how to throw them. "All right, I'm an expert, get me to understand it." [laughter]

"Well," they say, "Well, you don't know this and you don't know that and you don't know something else."

"Well, I'm perfectly willing to learn your vocabulary and your terms, and understand it." This outfit will, of course, very – get very fast driven to the wall. Then, they will have something else. They will say, "Well, you haven't gone to the right school. You may know all the subject, but you haven't gone to the right school, so therefore of course you couldn't understand it." Where are we winding up here, see? We're just winding up into the old hedge, see.

This guy is backing up. The more you say, "Look, I'm willing to understand it, let's try to understand this situation, let's try to get a grasp on this situation," and so forth. Well, if they – if he doesn't immediately lead forward and try to give you the understanding that is there on it, well, you can assume then that there probably is no understanding but a great deal of fakery connected with it.

I was giving you color. I hope I didn't miss any words. They're very unimportant if I did. But the whole point is the world has a craziness about this sort of thing and they will go for ages and ages and ages studying the upper story of something. They're always skipping the gradient, see. And they've got engineers that they're training right this minute, that they're training how to fix up bridges and how to supertest the high tensile strength of supersteels, you see. All of that just – you know, they're just training them within an inch of their lives, you know, that sort of thing. And they've neglected to train them such little fundamentals as what does two plus two equal. What is – what is the basic idea of stress and strain? Why do
you have stress and strains in the first place? What do these things mean? You know? What's the vocabulary of engineering? You know, I mean, little – those things – these are the things these guys have a hard time with.

There they are, up there, see, "Oh, we're going to build it. We're going to do that and so on, ruh-ruh-ruh." They couldn't even bend a pin! See. They just jumped this zooom! see. They're way up on top. And in the world of color here they're building this fantastic structure and they have not studied this basic area, "What are you looking at color with? What could look at color? How could you look at color so as to produce a constant record of reaction?" See? I mean, they're really closer into our department than they are into the department of engineering, because the only thing I know of that can look at and record color is the thetan. He has taste. He has feeling about it.

He says, "This room is very harmonious. These dark green walls with the light green striping and so forth, that makes me feel very nice." See? So he's measured the color harmony of the room. He says, "Color harmony of the room, very good," see. He goes into this room and it's orange, it's got orange walls and the room has got an ultramarine floor, and the thing is a bright shade of lime all over the ceiling, you see, and there's magenta or purple carpets. And he walks into this room and he says – he says, "I don't like this." [laughter, laughs] "I don't like this."

Now, that's as close as they come to it. Of course, they have certain mechanics, they find out that certain colors cancel out certain colors, and interact one way or the other in pigment so as to make gray and in light so as to make white. So they think they're onto something. And they've found some of the harmonics of the wavelength. But I never even heard the word "harmonic" used amongst them.

They say these are complementary and they're this and that, as though – as though a band of waves which begins with A and winds up with B is always a circle. Well, it couldn't be a circle, because it's just a stretched-out band of waves, that's all. I mean, one wave is – let's not use the color terms – but you say is one inch long and the other – next waves up the line are two inches long and the waves up the line; we get on up the line in the thing and the bands are one mile long. Well, we wouldn't then be able to join the one mile into the one inch. So it can't be a circle.

I mean, these are the things that have not been examined. It isn't huge complications and millions and billions and that sort of thing. They haven't – they haven't taken a look at this thing and said, "You know, this thing we call a color wheel doesn't always produce immediate and direct results, so therefore there might be something wrong with it. Let's see if we can't work on this color wheel a little bit more," see. Well, they go off into these terrific terms.

You read a book on this subject now and it'd just crack your brains. You could just feel them crack right down the middle. I'm not kidding you. Ooh! Mireds and Greek letters, and densities and percentages of transmission and you get to looking at this thing after a while and you say, "Boy, there must be something known here, it's so impressive. Something very impressive." Well, I'm afraid it's that impressive because somebody has skipped. They haven't
ever tried to come in the front door of this thing, they're still trying to get in the top of the building, see.

Now, how is it that you can join up a lineal – that is to say a straight line – series of wavelengths which would run – as I'm giving you the wrong measurements, just to give the idea – from one inch to one mile, and then say the one mile one then joins up at the one inch one, that there's a one mile one right next to the one inch one. Well, you'd have to do that, you see, in order to make a color wheel. There's some place on that wheel where the wavelength is one mile joined up to one inch. And that is supposed to be the progressive point of the wheel. No, the wheel wouldn't go that way, don't you see? You couldn't possibly have this little tiny wave right next door to this great big wave and say, well, those are the adjacent waves. Couldn't be done. No stretch of the imagination. But that is such a fundamental observation that it's never been made. They don't make that fundamental type of an observation, don't you see?

So the reason they're in trouble and the problems they're having is because they have never started to walk that path where it starts. They never tried to clarify, "What problem are we having?" They've never tried to clarify, "What are we doing?" They've never said, "Well, what are we working with?" See, just that fundamental. "What's got to be licked around here?" You know, this sort of thing.

Instead of that, they've invented this fantastic amount of balderdash, you see, which has got all kinds of signs and symbols and laws and rules and authority and you can't read a book by Zuck because it's in contradiction with a book by the name – by Zack, you see, and he is a big authority because he studied Monet.

Well, Monet didn't know anything about these things. He was a good thetan. He knew what was agreeable and what was disagreeable, don't you see? Just a good thetan on the subject of color. And he also was capable of hitting an average. He not only knew what he liked, but he had a feeling for what would be liked. See, so he could register color like a lot of people could register color, don't you see? So therefore his work was pleasing.

There'd be no point in studying Monet. You'd have to study Scientology, then you might get someplace. What was Monet? Now, we'd have to take Monet apart, and we'd have to admit the fact that there must be something else there besides some meat.

You can take an awful lot of meat and put it up against an awful lot of color and it won't register anything. You see where I'm getting to? So here's a top-heavy subject.

Now, you probably missed a lot of that, but I don't care because it's unimportant. You can get as stupid as you like on this subject because you'd just get stupid as everybody else is on it.

But here's where you join up: When you don't know this thing called gradients you get into the same condition and you try to build a castle on top of a palace on top of a complication that you call the pc's case; because you never walked up the gradient, then you never see the case, don't you see? You arrive instantly at the totality, and of course you can't get any right answers to this case. You might have the theoretical right answers in Scientology, but to this particular case you never get the right answers. And the reason you never get the right
answers is because you never picked up anything that was fundamental that the person could confront. You never picked up anything that the person could start with. And so, of course, neither he nor you ever observed his case. And you wind up with psychoanalysis. Or you wind up with some squirrel process. But you certainly wind up with a fantastic notion of the horrible complexities of existence. It's overpowering.

I mean, you say, "My God! That poor fellow. He's got all these problems with his wife. And he's got all these problems about his job. And he has all these psychosomatic difficulties. And the best thing for him is some paraglutinous magnoid shot into the rectabulous skootum." "Doctor, hand me the flit." [laughter]

You see, your answers... observations are nonsense, so therefore the solutions are going to be nonsense. And you can put those things together any day of the week. And you see a bunch of nonsense solutions then you know darn well that the observation has been nonsense. Those two go hand in glove. So you sit and look at this pc and you say, "Ron said we should observe this pc. All right, I'll sit and observe this pc. My God, problems about his wife, problems about this, problems about this. Isn't he a confusion!" Yeah. A confusion to him, too.

But if you keep trying to observe the totality of the case without ever once finding one little thing you could observe about that case, you'll never get a gradient, you'll never get on the track, you'll never get the gradient that leads toward an observation of the case. Let's just look at it from the standpoint of observation. Let's sit and just look at somebody for a while. "What's this guy doing that I can understand?" Let's take the poor auditor, not the complexities of the case. "What's he doing that I can understand?" And you actually have to take that before you can remedy a case.

You see, he's "Sooooo wwaahhll and so on and it's all ... Oh dear, and trouble with my wife, and so forth. And then there's my sciatica, and of course if I get rid of my sciatica I'll lose my bonus, and I'll lose all of this other stuff you see, but actually it was my mother and father, they fought like cats and dogs, you see, and my father was a circus animal trainer and he used to beat me all the time. And so life has been very complicated, and when I was psychoanalyzed before I got the electric shocks..." And you say, "Woooow."

Now, if your observation of this case is based on the fact that you've got to grasp all of this then you haven't started a gradient observation, and you'll never really be able to remedy a case. The Book of Remedies when it comes out will be nonsense to you. What have you got to do to start to remedy this case? Well, you have to notice something that you can understand about the case, and then you'll find something more that you can understand about the case. And then having found that you can understand about the case, you'll now find something else you can understand about the case. And the next thing you know this case... Well, actually you never do get up to understanding the complexities of the case, because if you understood it that far the case starts to fall apart and you haven't got this complex case sitting in front of you any longer. Do you follow this now?

In other words, this person is in terrible trouble, this person is an awful state, this person is very complex. This person is all messed up. You give him a solution, you see. "Well," you say, "well, actually if you get a divorce, wouldn't it be mu..."
"Oh, no, I couldn't do that, you see, because my mother is dead against divorce; she's Catholic."

You say, "Well, are you a Catholic? What could you do about your mother?" and so forth. And he says, "Heh. Uh – um..." You're lost. He's had you. Well, you're trying to understand the incomprehensible. You're trying to understand the totality. You're trying to reach out and grab everything. And you're just going to get loses all the way along the line if you do that. Well, what could you understand about this case? And you look this case over very, very hard and you look over your situation and if you remember what I'm telling you about this self-discipline on the subject of gradients you won't make this mistake.

You'll say, "What can I observe about this case? Well, he isn't getting any tone arm action. Good. All right, well, let's look it up in The Book of Remedies. 'No tone arm action... no tone arm action... no tone arm action... no tone arm action and ingrown toenails!'" [laughter] "That's it! He's also got ingrown toenails. Therefore, we run this." And you run that and the case starts falling apart, see. You got the idea?

You're always setting yourself to climb the whole road. That's because the pc is always giving you this. Well, what state actually is the pc in? Pc is in the top of a gradient he hadn't climbed. So of course he's always inviting you to be at the top of a gradient that isn't climbed. And you get suckered in on it. Every once in a while you get pulled right in, and you say, "All right, we will solve the whole case in the next two days."

Well, in the next two days if you found something about the case that could be resolved you would be making progress, wouldn't you? But if you tried to solve the whole case in the next two days, you wouldn't, would you? So the road of the gradient leads to big, permanent wins. And jumping all the gradients leads to a total loss.

Now, let's take up this whole subject of overt. And let's take up the whole subject of overt at one fell swoop and wind them up on the subject of gradients. You sit down and you say to the pc, you say, "All right, pc, have you ever committed any crime that would land you up in jail if it were found out about?" [laughter] I guess that's the end of that overt pulling! [laughter]

We fly at once to the top of the building, ask for something that we might conceivably get after maybe fifteen or twenty hours of auditing, we ask for it right now, we don't get it, but we restimulate it. ARC break the pc nicely. Upset the thing. Then we decide that we can't pull overt. You see all the nonsense that proceeds from jumping the gradient, see.

Well, what's the first thing necessary for the pulling of an overt? What's the first point of the gradient? Well, we have to consider the line that the overt is going to be pulled on. And that is normally called a communication line from the pc to the auditor. Now, if it consists of a little wire which is a ten-thousandth of an inch in diameter and you say ten thousand volts must now go over this wire, it's going to blow and break, and that's going to be the end of that wire.

So there are two things you can do here actually; the thing is very susceptible to solution. You can get yourself a stronger and stronger wire. Pc is more and more willing to talk to his auditor. That's because it's building up a good strong communication line, see.
And then, we start feeding on this communication line some little overts that easily carry on it. And then we'll find quite wonderfully that bigger overts will follow on this. And bigger and bigger overts will follow on a bigger and bigger communication line, see? And all of a sudden, why, we're sitting there looking at somebody whose – all of whose overts are pulled. And we say, "Well, that wasn't very tough." See? Do it by gradient.

Now, there are two gradients involved. One is the gradient of the pc's willingness to talk to the auditor. That's one gradient, had nothing to do with overts. It's just the fact that it's got to be there before you can pull any overts. And the other is the gradient of what overt is he willing to talk to you about.

Now, let's go into this a little bit further. Did you ever notice that there were people around that you were willing to say good morning to, but not to discuss how good it was. And then, there were people that you could discuss how good the morning was to, that you would not discuss personal plans with. And then there are persons that you would not discuss personal plans with, you see, or say good morning to or anything else. In other words, there are different degrees of willingness to communicate.

Now, here's this bloke, he sits down in the session, he's in the state of willing to say good morning to you. He's not willing to communicate any further than that to you, the auditor. All right, so now let's pull a big overt.

Then we have the auditor practically in tears saying, "I can't pull overts." Well, of course he's given us the wrong analysis of the situation. The analysis is incorrect, entirely incorrect. He hadn't got a communication line to pull overts on and he isn't trying to pull the overts that the guy can confront. So there are two things wrong here. This is no communication line and no gradient of overts. So there's no gradient of communication, no gradient of overts. So of course he can't pull overts. Elementary.

Now, if you merely built up the pc's communication line to the auditor and never did anything with it the pc'd feel much better and think you were a great fellow. This perhaps could be a profession in itself, but is not where auditing ceases. Having done that, then you can do things with this line. The pc along this line is then willing to communicate. But what is the pc actually willing to communicate? The pc is now willing to communicate what he, himself, is willing to confront. It isn't whether you feel odd about it or not, it's whether he would feel strange about it or not.

You see, it's the datum in his own reaction to his own data, see. We've now got it pretty well straight that he's willing to talk to you, but now we've got the factor of his own reaction to his own data. In other words, what could he confront in his own bank? What of his own misdeeds is he willing to confront? Well, that's the first overt that he will give you. And of course, having given you that one, then he's willing to confront a greater misdeed. And having given you that one then he's willing to confront a greater misdeed. See?

So we build up the gradient of communication, he's willing to say good morning to you, he's willing to discuss his personal problems with you, he's willing to discuss his very intimate problems with you, see. We build that up along that gradient, and then we get what he could confront that he has done, he himself, and then we get a little bit more that he could confront, then we discover some things he's done that he didn't even remember or know he's
done. This stuff starts to fall out of the hamper, and if we handle all these things well and maintain the communication line while we're doing it, the guy unloads all of his overts, see.

Well, it's – therefore, you can arrive with this thing accomplished, providing you follow a gradient. And of course you get nowhere by not following gradients. It's the difference between being able to walk and the difference of being – and not walking at all ever. And that's what gradients mean. Unless you walk the gradient with auditing, unless you attack the thing on a gradient scale, unless you approach these auditing activities – a little bit, is followed by a little more, is followed by a little more and a little more and more and more, and a lot and a lot and a lot more than that and the big lot and so forth – why, nobody will go up through the grades.

Training, similarly, is arranged on what could the person confront as an auditor. What could the person accomplish or do as an auditor. And you can't just say, "Well, all right, get in there and pull all of the GPMs." Well, my God, that – we have enough trouble with a Class IV Auditor who's been in the snake pit for many a year confronting pcs and so forth, and you should see the green look around his gills when he first starts to run some GPMs out of a pc. He looks pretty pale. His hands are pretty nervous. He starts in with this and these tigers are awfully big tigers and he then, of course, gets belted in the brisket a few times, gets restimulated himself, you see, and knocked in the head and so forth, and he is definitely of the opinion that he's handling a tiger.

Well, this is somebody who's walked the trail, somebody who has had successes in auditing, somebody who is in pretty good condition to be able to confront. And if this is his reaction on confronting, what do you suppose it would do if you started to run them on an HAS Co-audit? What would happen? Well, they wouldn't know what they were confronting, they wouldn't know anything about it, their mystery on it would be total and you'd have people curled up in a ball and chucking their cookies and winding up in the local hospital and being operated on by the local brain shrinker. Wow, see! I mean, you'd just be confronting total catastrophe. You'd just wind up people in the hospitals and mortuaries and so forth just left, right and center. Bang, bang, bang! You wouldn't miss.

Somebody gratuitously the other day on the west coast of the United States from here gave a lecture on Clay Table. Well now, you say, well, come off of it, Clay Table. I mean, couldn't possibly do anything on Clay Table. He managed! Somebody went home, woke up the next morning, lips all swollen up, terrible condition, so forth. Clay Table! He just showed them how you symbolize something in clay, see. Well, it was too restimulative for his audience.

Now, that's interesting because it would never occur to you that this would be too restimulative for anybody. Not at your state of training. Not at your ability to – level to confront at this particular stage. Never occur to you that this would knock people in the head. Yeah, well, I invite you, I – that – at this low level, you say, "Well, you represent stuff in clay. You just take a piece of clay, you see, and you draw up a mountain in clay, you see, and isn't that nice and so forth." And that's the person's present time problem. [laughter] Have somebody quietly keel over in the audience, you know? Well, you're dealing with – you're just dealing with the ability of people to confront and approach things.
Well, you get around some people – you get around some people just discuss some mild locks. Think yourself of the least, you know, what you do is think of the least possible restimulative thing that would still have something to do with the bank. Not the least restimulative subject you could think of but the least restimulative thing that you could have to do with the bank. And then say something about this to a green, fresh, new group of people. And exert your power of observation and look them over. Somebody there is going to turn green around the gills; if not all of them.

You say, "Well, all right, there's locks. Person has operations and so forth and later on every time they see a knife or every time they see a white basin or every time they see somebody in a white cap..." he's giving little examples, see, "why, they feel that their head's being operated on or drilled into, so forth. Well, now that is a lock." And you'll see... [shows something – laughter] well, you're so accustomed to this line of thought that it would never occur to you that somebody would come dreadfully ill over this, see. That's your gradient, see. That's why on PE you must attack the gradient of definitions. Don't talk about – much about the thing that is being defined but talk about the definition.

Define life, you know; what do we mean by life. Take up dictionary definitions, don't even take up Scientology definitions. You find out you'd get along fine, but you'd still be stretching – not overreaching – but you'd still, here and there in the – in an audience that you are addressing, be stretching the gradient. Life. And somebody'd be sitting there, "Life." [breathes hard]

You say, "What's the matter?"

"God, I just realized I'm alive!" [laughter]

Well, you actually have seen things like this happen in PEs and things like this. You see these – what appear to you to be totally nutty cognitions. And you look, and you say, "What! How could this be?" you know? Well, on a broader basis you've probably had this experience yourself in the early days. Just spot three spots in the room, three spots in the body, all of a sudden recognize that you had a body sitting there in the chair.

I've had somebody emit a piercing scream! They suddenly found out that they were in a body and that there was a body there, and so forth. Well, this is – you say, wait a minute! That's the most ordinary type of a – of an action you could think of. And of course everybody in life considers it ordinary. Well, what's ordinary about it is nobody pays any attention to it and nobody confronts it. That's what's ordinary about it. And now all of a sudden you start to actually pick apart the pieces of life, and you start showing these things up on a gradient of just this is the name of. This is the name of, see. "The thing which you have there, the arms and legs and so forth, that's a body. B – o – d – y, body."

"Body."

And you – right away, you'd have some girl thinking, "Well, you know, they're pretty nasty things." And somebody else will be saying something or other, and so on, somebody else will be saying, you know, "It's this body, and they're awful heavy and get in the road and so on, I have a lot of trouble with my body these days. Body, body, you know, brrrrhh." Locks flying off. I know it doesn't seem likely to you, see. But you blow a whole chain of locks. And
somebody goes out the door he feels wonderful! What the hell does he feel wonderful about? He realized all those people around him had bodies. And you look at this and you say, "How could he be so far out that that would be terribly significant? That this would be an upscale walk for him?" Well, it's just how far out he is. See?

What is the gradient you've got to start with in addressing people or addressing a subject? And of course, the top gradient that – I mean the – pardon me – the gradient that you could approach – about the bottom gradient that you could approach is thought. People can confront thought, oddly enough, more easily. You know, they can confront think or significance, to give you some other words for it. They can confront that more easily than they can confront masses or things.

So if you give them definitions about think then these will be the easiest things there are to confront and that will gradually walk forward to a definition about a mass. And they can get a definition about a mass. But the reason they don't grasp definitions about masses is they're actually upscale. You start telling somebody, "This is an E-Meter, this is a table, this is a floor." You can get them to notice and ask them where these things are and so forth, "But this is the definition. Now, why do you suppose this is called an E-Meter?" and so forth, and start concentrating their attention on that sort of thing.

You can get much further by saying, "Now, worry is the condition you see, by which an individual becomes and feels confused, his survival is threatened, he conceives his survival is threatened, and he worries. And you will very often see people worrying. And they worry for various reasons. But actually nobody worries unless he is – feels that his survival or the survival of something that he is very interested in is threatened."

And people say, "Wow!"

What you – what you've done there is you've entered up – close as you came to mass is the survival of things, you see, but they kind of brushed off, they're just all whole masses, you know, they're all indefinite, they don't have to be real and that sort of thing. But you've got this thing called worry. He's very accustomed to worry – this worry. And he right away says, "Tsk tsk! Three cheers." You know. "Worry. I know what worry is." He'll go out of that course thinking, "Beautiful, beautiful, absolutely beautiful, I know what worry is. Somebody thinks he's threatened. Something's threatening him. Therefore he worries about it. He is seeking to figure out what to do about something that is threatening him, so that is worry. And when somebody is worrying, then he feels he is being threatened or that something else is being threatened in his vicinity. Yes."

They'll go in the next morning to their boss, and they'll see the boss sitting there, you know, worried like that. And they will say to the boss quite brightly, "What do you think is threatening? Is it you or the organization that you think something is threatening you or the organization? Now, what do you think the threat would be?"

And the boss says, "Well, so-and-so and so-and-so," and of course it isn't a very steep gradient, it isn't very much, there's not very much relief to be gotten out. "Well," he says, "Well, if you think of it that way, that's pretty – this Blitzen Company with that new machine that they put on the market, man, that's going to cause us a lot of marketing, and so on. Yeah. Yeah, I've been worried about Blitzen Company. I feel better," fellow will say. Yeah, because
he's – what he's done is make the person perceive what the person's action in this particular department was, you see, and so he's had a win. You get the idea? In other words, he can then see how to apply the data that you're giving him, because he himself can see the data you're giving him. But when he can't see the data you're giving him, he can't apply it. And he flies up into the top floor of the building and adds a bunch more complexities to this data and considers that it's very complex and that there's no fundamental there, don't you see? So he invents a whole bunch of nonsense with regard to this thing and misses it entirely and never gets any result with it, do you see that?

So you have to be very careful about gradients when you're training. Now, in auditing a pc, if you ask a pc, "Well, what in life do you think you could – have been successful in handling?" you're liable to get yourself an hour or two comm lag. Because the idea of having been successful at handling anything is quite foreign. This he has never had as a cognition. He has never thought of himself as having been the successful in handling anything. And he gets a long comm lag. And he goes over this and over this and over this and he'll finally give you an answer. And he'll very often feel lots better for having given you the answer and for having asked the question. I'm not saying that's too steep a gradient, don't you see?

But that gradient would just be an upper border. It takes him a long time to answer it, don't you see. He has to grapple with this thing for quite a while before it comes home to him. Then finally, why, he comes to a conclusion about it or he gives you an answer to it. Well, that's not bad, when you run into that. What you want to be afraid of is glibility. You haven't had any new words lately; I've been very nice. And that isn't a new word; I've used it before. He gives you very glib answers. And you very often run into this in pcs and you wonder, "Well, this fellow is so good that I couldn't possibly process him upstairs any place because he's there." You get glib. You say, "Well, what could you do?"

"Oh well, I could build the Empire State Building."
"Well, what could you do?"
"Well, I could move Earth."
"Well, what could you do?"
"Well, I could turn the sun off and on at will."
"Ah, what could you do?"
"Well, I could collapse the universe," and so forth.

No comm lag. And he'd explain to you also quite glibly if you ask him, "If – well, all right, if you can do all of these things, why are you getting audited?"

"Ah, well, trying to teach you how to audit." Or something like that. You'll get – you'll get various responses. All unreal. It's nowhere.

Now, trying to find a gradient for that fellow to enter in on, because he's already stuck on the top floor. Now, trying to find a gradient that he can enter in upon, approach and go forward in life, I mean in processing and so forth, is fantastic. Because it'll be the size of the reduced image of the shadow of a grain of a molecule. Small. See, tiny. You actually have to fight around for a while before you can find your first gradient in because obviously nothing
is real to this person. You sometimes find out a guy walks in; he's only got one leg; his ambition is to be a ballet dancer. You'll run into this once in a while in Clay Table Clearing. [laughter]

It's not for you, man, it's not for you to question this ambition. But you certainly better recognize that your gradient on this must be a very slow, low approach. So right away there's something to understand about the case. If you listen, why, you can always find something to understand about the case and enter in on a gradient of solution to the case. Your gradient of solving the case, of course, is finding something about the case that you can grasp yourself. See? Not try to find something the pc can grasp. Let's not be so introverted as – and transferred or whatever you call it, and then go ahead along the line and see some progress.

Sometimes you undercut a case too far and the case is insulted. But that's only when you undercut it on the basis of sanity or some other unreal measure. You're not undercutting on the basis of sanity, you're undercutting – or insanity – you're undercutting on the basis of ability. Let's find out what the guy can do and then let's get him to do it better. That was the old line. But that first one: let's find out what he can do. That's easily missed because if you listen to the pc, very often he can do everything, you see. But he can't do any of these things, and so we really miss, we're thrown.

All right, now the only time you really have to start investigating a case and looking it over real hard is when the case isn't making an expected line of advance. Case isn't going along and getting better and feeling happier and more cheerful and so forth. Well, about that time you'd better start looking. You'd better start looking. And you'd better find something about the case that you can grasp. And along about that moment you'll say, "Well, he isn't getting any TA. I can certainly understand that about him." All right, well, let's solve that one before we go on doing something else. Obviously no TA, got a present time problem or something of the sort.

Next time you start to pull an overt on somebody and you feel queasy about asking this person for overts and so forth, well, just sum it up. Where are you entering the gradient? One, have you got a communication line with this person? Is he in a state of being able to say good morning to you? Is he in a state of telling you about his personal affairs? Would he naturally and promptly confide to you some of his deeper secrets? Well, if the answer to all of those things is no, you certainly had better build yourself a communication line. When you haven't got – do anything else but build a communication line, that's the only thing you're going to do; you're not going to pull any overts. What you going to pull them on? There's no line. What are they all going to do, magically and mystically develop because you think a thought in some yogi position? No. You got to have a communication line.

Then, now – now that you've got that one licked, recognize that you've now got your next stages which is what can the guy himself confront? Now, you got to start there and that might be very small indeed. And you start asking, "What have you done?" And there's various ways of approaching this sort of thing. "What have you done?" Well, he can't confront having done that so you can ask the reverse question, like justifications, don't you see? "Well, why wasn't that an overt?" He's got it all explained. Well, that you'd – that – you got that one from him in the first place, you got that "done," what he said he did, that he then had justifications
for, showed you that he himself was not capable of confronting what he had done. So there-
fore, you got – what you've got to find out is something he will tell you that he has done that
he can confront having done. So that is your next action in the pulling of overts.

You not only get a line to pull them on, and that itself is a long gradient, but now
you've got the next line and so forth. What does he confront that he can tell you about? Now
that you've got a nice line there. Then you have to keep the line in and – while you're pulling
overts. And how do you do this? How do you do this? Well, that again is very elementary. It
is a problem of overts – just a problem of gradients, gradient overts.

You're sitting there and you're saying, "Well, you say you upset a cup of coffee. All
right, thank you very much. Now tell me this, 'Have you ever tortured animals for the fun of
it?'" There goes your communication line, man, you can just hear it snap. Why? Well, the first
place you – he may have, and you restimulated the living daylights out of him. You've ARC
broke him. He doesn't consider you real, his reality drops and everything else. Well, it isn't
anything that you've asked him that's socially incorrect – is you just asked him for more than
he himself could confront if he had done it. See, that's the problem.

So it actually isn't a problem of being polite or holding your finger right or smiling in
a certain way while you're asking the E-Meters or being pleasant to the pc or... That is not the
problem at all. It's just simply the problem of asking the guy for overts that he can confront on
the gradient that he can confront them. And you ask him for these things and you'll find out
that it'll build up on a nice, smooth gradient and he'll give you more and more and more overts
and you'll find out as long as you're doing that your communication line doesn't snap and your
actual attitude has nothing to do with it. And the communication line itself won't even quiver,
as long as you don't jump this thing.

But you instantly, having given him some very easy ones to answer, you all of a sud-
den ask him something that he has been hiding from himself for a very long time and you ask
him for it suddenly, quickly, without any gradient whatsoever with no approach and so forth,
communication line itself will snap, too. Now you've really got a job on your hands; you've
got what's known as an ARC break. And that's either a session ARC break or it's something of
that sort, and you get ahold of it, but you've restimulated some bypassed charge and however
you get it off you get it off. Or you get somebody around that can do it to get it off.

Now, the point I'm making here... I mean, that's only for a very lower scale auditor. He
shouldn't be permitted to handle ARC breaks because, of course, his gradient of training is
such that he hasn't got the data of how you handle ARC breaks, so he starts handling ARC
breaks and all he does then is re-ARC break the pc, so now he has two ARC breaks where he
only had one. Now he starts to handle these two, don't you see, and he's going to have four,
and then he's going to have eight, and he's just heading for the long chute. So he should find
somebody who knows how to handle an ARC break and get them to do the ARC break as-

Do you see, it's a matter of gradients?

Male voice: Yes.
This is where it goes. Now, in training, similarly, you start pushing too much in on a person too fast and too suddenly that they cannot confront or have anything to do with, you also have a jumped – a gradient on learning. And they get very, very confused. The fastest way to jump a gradient on learning is to, for instance, teach somebody to read a foreign language which you haven't taught them to read the alphabet of. I think that would be a marvelous way to jump a gradient. Not let them define any of the letters that mean any of the words. You haven't taught them any ABCs, you see. And just say, "Well, there's that squiggle-wop with a curly tail, and so forth. Now, explain to me what that word is. Explain to me what the word is."

"Oh, I can't pronounce it. I don't know what word it is."

"Well, you should know the word, you've been studying Arabic now for a month."

He'll miss, very often miss, and not see how the gradient is being shoved. See, he'll not see how we're jumping the gradient, and he just ARC breaks on it. He thinks we're being terribly unreasonable. We're actually not being unreasonable, we're just being out of gradient. We didn't teach him the alphabet; we don't – he doesn't know how those words sound, because he doesn't know how those symbols that represent the sounds are. He doesn't know how they're pronounced. So therefore he can't add it up to the sound of a word. Now, if he could add it up to the sound of a word he might possibly then remember having heard the word or knowing what letter comes first, he could at least look it up in the English-Arabic dictionary. See, he could do something about it if he had the alphabet.

But let's take some poor bloke and let's teach him German. And never point out to him that the German language, which looks very, very similar to English in its – very similar, but it isn't the same. And not point out to him that that particular type of use of letters and that sort of thing are different, and let him get no familiarity with these letters and how they're formed and how they're pronounced. And then all of a sudden start taking up "hausfrau" and this sort of thing with him. Then we wonder why he can never make any progress in German. Well, you're never going to make any progress in German. He's going to – he could go to school for years without making any progress in German. Then if nobody came along and pointed out the fact that he had never learned the German alphabet he would simply be telling you the rest of his life, "Well, I tried to understand German once, but I wasn't good at it." This is as close as he got to understanding what was wrong between him and German, see. "I wasn't good at it."

Well, I don't know, he can learn a new word out here, somebody drives up and says, "This is a new Spitzburgen type super snap," you know, drives it up, "A new Spitzburgen type super snap. It's got twelve roarers inside." And he says, "Roarers? What the hell are those?"

"Well, that's a new capping device that goes on the cylinder. It presses the fuel down hard and it actually injects solid fuel. And that's what they call roarers, you know?" Some crazy word like this.

"Roarers? Is that so?" And you find him next day, using it like that. But he tells you, "I couldn't understand German." Well, what was German but a whole bunch of "roarers," see? See? So there must be something peculiar going on here that he can't get on to a – he can't speak German, and the only thing peculiar about it is, is he never walked the gradient neces-
sary to learn German. He didn't walk that gradient. And not having walked the gradient he then walk – wer... wounds up in the upper story with the conviction that he can't speak German.

See, he never analyses it, so we have this person out here who is having an awful time in life. And he's never walked a gradient toward livingness. See? He went in over his head someplace. And he never passed that point of the gradient. Man, he's still there. And when we pick up those points of the gradient he has bypassed and get him to understand them and so forth, we call this clearing. Because at those points of the line he had wrong answers or he had omissions or something of the sort, and when we've got those cleared up, of course, then he can live life, because he has wound up on the gradient to the point where life can be handled and confronted. Very easy.

Now, that doesn't mean that you always have to approach things slowly. You very often will find a student in school and he'll say, "Oh, this is arithmetic." And you're getting – opening your mouth to say, "Well, you see, that's a 2, and that's a 2, and when those two things are added together you get 4."

And he's already been scanning the textbook while you were talking and so forth, and he says, "Yeah, it's also the square root." Now, we mustn't become so dedicated to the gradient that we say, "No, you're not ready for that yet." He just happened to – what throws us in education, why we have very little good experience on the subject of education, I mean we have very little purely-viewed data on the subject, you see – we have in Scientology now, but I mean the world at large – is because they never recognized that people have been educated before. People are up against all sorts of back-pattern jams on the subject of education, and also back-pattern educational things. For instance, we've got a carpenter out here now, he was raising chickens and having an awful time. One day he picked up tools and all of a sudden found out that he could – he could make most anything he laid his hand to. And he could use all the tools and it was all very simple, so he went on using tools and he has been a carpenter ever since. A gradient of exactly nothing.

Well, the way life explains this – people explain this – they say he had a talent for it. [laughter] He didn't have any talent for it! They had a staff auditor here one time, old Robin, she was auditing him busily and so forth and, my God, they picked up more deaths as a ship's carpenter than you could shake a stick at, and they even found his last grave down here and a few little things like this. Very unacceptable data to society at large because it restimulates them.

But nevertheless here's this fellow's – this fellow's accidental talent, you see, and ship carpentry was based upon, well, probably ages and ages and ages of carpentry. He had also, must have been based on the fact that he had walked a smooth gradient on the subject of carpentry. He hadn't done many other subjects, but carpentry, he at one time or another, whether in the Roman republic or some place, had learned carpentry right. Somebody had said, "Now, this is – this is a hammer. And you hold it and you bang it down, and so forth, and my God, they picked up more deaths as a ship's carpenter than you could shake a stick at, and they even found his last grave down here and a few little things like this. Very unacceptable data to society at large because it restimulates them.

But nevertheless here's this fellow's – this fellow's accidental talent, you see, and ship carpentry was based upon, well, probably ages and ages and ages of carpentry. He had also, must have been based on the fact that he had walked a smooth gradient on the subject of carpentry. He hadn't done many other subjects, but carpentry, he at one time or another, whether in the Roman republic or some place, had learned carpentry right. Somebody had said, "Now, this is – this is a hammer. And you hold it and you bang it down, and so forth, and that's what that is for. And this is a..." – we'll go back earlier – "...piece of flint. And this flint when rubbed over a stick will cut shavings off of it. Now, let's see if you can do that," see. They didn't come in to him and say, "All right, now, we've got a new palace to be built out of san-
dalwood here – and you've just started in on this job and so forth – we've got this new palace, it's all supposed to be carved and gilded and so forth. And there's very careful joisting and fitting that goes into this place, and I want to make sure you've got it right, now finish it up tomorrow." The usual gradient run in life.

There he would stand, you see, and that would have been the end of his carpentry. But a gradient started right is running right. Now, you've noticed that if you start auditing a pc with some little wins and the gradient is correct and so forth, the pc goes on up the line, and you keep that measured well, you keep the pc winning, little wins as he goes along, and so forth. You notice the pc just gets better and better and better and everything seems to run all right and you don't run into any trouble. Next pc, he didn't get started right, started by somebody else, of course, and he has just been running wrong ever since.

Well, if you straightened out his auditing, it's not... this is why you get education mixed up with auditing. He thought something about a session which wasn't right. In other words, he thought something was true of auditing which wasn't true or he had auditing added up in some way that had nothing to do with auditing. And as elementary a thing as that could prevent him from ever going into session.

Considerations he has had about auditing, almost an itsa process, might straighten these things out, wham. And all of a sudden put him right straight back in the groove. Of course, he's had enough experience since to learn that what he thought earlier wasn't true but he's never reanalyzed what he thought earlier. He'd never collided with this. So all of a sudden you can turn a pc from a fast progress – from a slow progress pc to a fast progress pc.

Now what is the total thing you're using in any one of these cases? You're just using gradients. Whether you're training somebody, whether you're processing somebody on a routine approach to auditing, whether or not you're trying to remedy or straighten out a case, fix up a case that wasn't running well, whether you are trying to pull overts, whether you are trying to get PTPs and so forth, they're gradients. It's what can be done that will be real, what can be accomplished, what can be confronted, what part of this fundamental situation do we have to know about in order to resolve the rest of the situation. How do we take this problem apart so that it can be approached. This is the whole – the whole think on the subject of gradients.

And if you haven't got that pretty well taped, sooner or later you're going to say, "Oh, my goodness, I can't pull overts." Or "Something is wrong with my auditing in this particular quarter or that particular quarter and so forth." And I think you almost inevitably find that it would boil down to a failure on gradients. Either your own gradient of training was jumped too quick at some point or another or you're jumping this pc too quick or you had several pcs that you've made gradient mistakes on so you began to get a new notion about what pcs are like whereas actually you just keep making the same gradient mistake, see? You try to pull overts before the pc is in communication with you, you see. If you kept making that, pc after pc, you'd only audit four or five pcs to suddenly decide that you couldn't pull overts. See, you'd have new false conclusions. And those false conclusions come into being only because you had jumped a gradient.

The early training somebody gets in Scientology is doubly – trebly important to what it ever was before. But we haven't actually done too badly in this. We have made a few mis-
takes here and there inevitably, but I think we have done pretty well. And Mary Sue was go-
ing over – as far as gradients are concerned in this society at large – Mary Sue was going over
Founding Scientology reports and letters from people and so forth last night, and she was
quite astonished at the tremendous number of wins and so forth on the part of people who had
only read a textbook or who had only read this or read that. They had approached the thing at
the proper gradient. Those people who didn't approach it at a proper gradient or weren't
steered on a proper gradient into their studies, didn't make it, didn't have those successes, you
see, and so forth, and they're no longer with us. So in the future, all we have to do to swell up
the ranks of Scientology and so forth is just remember that in training, auditing, and the intro-
duction of the work and so forth to hit it on a proper gradient. And we've got it made all the
way.

Thank you very much.
Cycles Of Action

A lecture given on 13 October 1964

[Part missing]

What's the date?

_Audience: 13th of October._

Thirteenth of October. Well, that's a good day. You're very lucky. The 13th fell on Tuesday this week, didn't fall on Friday.

[Part missing]

All right. Today's lecture is about cycles of action. Cycles of action. And you'll find this very fundamental material. And it's quite good for man and beast. You can put it in tea or coffee, take it without taste; doesn't leave any aftereffects in an auditing session, can be rubbed on horses, dogs, is only sixpence the bottle. And you ought to buy some. I think it'd be a terribly good idea.

It's not that I am particularly cross on this particular subject of cycles of action. Nobody has been throwing their hands up in horror over the idea of completing one. And it's a relaxed moment when it doesn't happen to be a crisis. So this is one lecture which is given when there is no crisis to prompt it. That makes it peculiar in the field of lectures. [laughter]

The crisis, by the way, is getting your auditing question answered. And then some of the – some of the wildest goofs I've heard in a long time.

"Well, how are you today?"

"Uh… I just got my car back."

"Thank you."

But this, of course, does, too, apply to some degree to a cycle of action. A cycle of action cannot go on unless all the elements of the cycle of action being used are common to the cycle of action. Do you follow me?

In other words, you can't have a cycle of action that goes from white to black, you see, to gray to black. Do you get the idea? A cycle of action would rather have to go from, let us say, black to gray, to less gray, to less gray, to less gray, to more white, to more white, to more white, to more white, to white, don't you see? Then, possibly, if you wanted a complete cycle of action, less white, less white, less white, less white, slightly gray, grayer, grayer, grayer, black.

Now, what do we mean by a cycle of action? This is probably one of the things that would be the most puzzling word here to collide with: _cycle_. Because cycle is applied in many
different directions. There is one you ride. They – also, there's types that have motors in them. There are wheels that go round so that the cycle of a wheel is the point that the point of a wheel returns to.

In other words, you've got a wheel and you've got a point at the top; the wheel goes all the way around, and when it has returned to the top, why, it has completed a cycle. Do you see?

I'm just showing you there's various confusions about this word. You didn't laugh at the right joke, so that's all right – but the upshot of this cycle of action is that it has many odd and peculiar connotations and is therefore rather difficult to understand or collide with. You follow that? You could have a wheel that turns all the way around and comes back to the same place, see?

Now, a story cycle of action that began in the field of modern story writing, and so on, would be a story something like this (this is a very modern story, you see): And there's a bum standing on a corner and he is totally degraded and he has just lost his job, you see? And his wife that he wasn't married to has run off with another man, you see? And he's standing there and he gets an idea that he might be able to pick himself up out of it and go have a cup of coffee, you see?

So he goes and has the cup of coffee, and it's cold and it's very bad coffee. And he reaches in his pocket and he finds out there's a hole in his pocket and the nickel he had, you see, has - lost. And so he is ejected from the place, but not even dramatically. He's simply told to go with considerable contempt, don't you see?

And we find him back on the same corner, in the same position, in the same mood, worrying about the same thing. That is modern story writing.

If anybody wants to steal that plot and sell it with their writing, [laughter] they're perfectly welcome to do so.

Now, I remember when this modern school first started up. By the way, the modern school has now become very antique. It's so old now that a lot of people have heard about it. When it first started up, they had a story, "Big Brother," and it wasn't even in English. When it first started up, they had a story, "Big Brother," and it wasn't even in English.

But they had a tremendous fixation on the idea that a story had to start and end at the same place in the same situation. And they were trying to give an appearance of no change. So that was what they understood by a cycle – that nothing changed. And you'll find now and then, you go to some arty movie made by somebody down in France who didn't have any money and didn't have any film either. (And frankly, they'd have been much better off if they'd shot it with an empty camera!) But you'll occasionally see these things; you'll pick them up at foreign theater stands, you know, and it'll be something like this. And it'll always begin and end at the exact same place.

So cycle has gotten into the field of art. And cycle is in the field of mechanics – as different from engineering – as a completed revolution. Cycle in the field of art, meaning no change of time, or everything came back the same way, don't you see? And in mechanics, it is a total revolution.
Now, in engineering and physics, it means something else again. It means the motion between the ending of one wave and the beginning of the new wave. And I think you'll find out that that is probably a better expressed definition than the usual engineering definition, but that is it. You take the end of the last wave, which is the beginning of the next wave, and it goes on through then to the end of that wave, which is the beginning of the next wave. And that would be a cycle.

And you have that expressed in radio, you see? Radio, all discussions of wavelengths. You have it in discussions of color, and so on. And that's really what they're talking about; they're talking about a sweep.

Now, there is an old, old, old, old definition on this, which by the way, we are indebted to in Scientology, because there's a philosophic aspect to the word *cycle*. And they didn't directly call it cycle, but – and pardon me if I seem to be a bit lyrical on the subject, but it is in the "Hymn to the Dawn Child," in the unwritten Veda (which has been written and then, therefore, called a type of Veda). But it's in the oral tradition, you might say (to borrow a musical term), of India.

And it's the "Hymn to the Dawn Child." I've forgotten whether it's the fourth or the tenth Vedic hymn. But it expresses that there is a nothingness, and then there is a form gradually takes place, and then this grows and this ages and then this decays; and then this goes into a nebulosity and winds up in a new nothingness. Now, that is not a quote; it's just an effort to interpret that particular action for you. It's a very short hymn, by the way, and it's quite interesting. And it is really part of your technology in Scientology.

You see, there have been billions of statements by philosophers and many of them are – more of them are wrong than right, but in sorting out the field of philosophy – this is sometimes what confuses people. I remember explaining Krishnamurti to somebody or other, a very dear old friend, who said, "But – but Krishnamurti said many of the things that you're saying in Scientology."

I said, "Give me a book by Krishnamurti."

So she handed me a book by Krishnamurti and I went down the line and there, there was one about time, it was a direct statement, that same statement that we use in Scientology. See, it was right there, and she showed me that, and she says, "Look it there; Krishnamurti said that."

I said, "Well, where is the boldface?"

And she said, "What?"

"The – the bold, the italics, the underscore."

And she said, "Well, there isn't any."

And I said, "All right. Let's count the number of statements on this page, also about time, which aren't true – none of which have any emphasis, any different emphasis than this one." And we counted them up, and there were 132 incorrect statements about time and one correct statement about time. So I don't think Krishnamurti said anything we said.
See? And I taught her the lesson of the evaluation of importance: Importance assigned to a datum is as important as the datum. And you'll find that in our Logics. In other words, there can be many truths.

Not comparing poor old Krishnamurti... Krishnamurti is mad at us, by the way, because one of our boys went out to India one time or another and next confounded thing you know, he had all of Krishnamurti's group out in India studying Scientology, and I don't think Krishnamurti has ever forgiven us. But that's – happens to be the truth.

Anyway, you get the evaluation of importance here, see? The evaluation of importance of the datum can be as important as the datum, and sometimes more important.

You could have fifty thousand monkeys writing on fifty thousand typewriters for a long time, and sooner or later one of them is going to write E=mc², see? And then somebody could come along and point out, "Look, those monkeys are as smart as Einstein." No, they couldn't be as smart as Einstein, for the excellent reason that when this was written, it was not assigned a relative importance to anything, you see? So its value was not estimated, so therefore it wasn't peaked up.

And although there are a great many truths in Scientology, some of these are peaked, you see? They're in boldface, you know, and they've got big underscores underneath them. Cycle of action is one of them. It goes back to the early Vedic hymns.

Now, out of this we get a great deal of workable, or applied, or applicable wisdom. In other words, we can get very, very full application out of this thing. This thing will work all day and all night. And the cycle of action is, of course, a plot of incident against time – if you wanted to get a definition here – the way we are using it, you see? It's a plot of consecutive incident against time, a plot against time.

Now, of course we're in the advantageous position of knowing the source of time, and knowing what time is. Since we got R6, we have known a lot more things than we knew before. And we know that time is a commonly held consideration which is a great, big, cracking, enormous, GPM which has got a lot of root words with an end word connected to it called time.

Therefore, it's an agreed-upon progress and we're all making this time and moving it forward. And as a result, from person to person, although the incidents plot against time, you see, at – I better say, plot against time: at zero seconds, the door is opened, see; at zero plus two seconds, the door stands open; at zero plus three seconds, somebody enters the door; at zero plus five seconds, somebody is walking; at zero plus six seconds, somebody sees a chair; at zero plus seven seconds, a motion is made toward the chair; at zero plus eight seconds, the person sits down. Do you understand, now, when I say plotting incident against time? You see?

In view of the fact that we're all in a present time – see, of course, couldn't be anyplace else, because there isn't any. You see? Everybody wonders "How do we move along forward in time?" Puzzled me for a long time. Well, of course, it's very simple to move along forward in time, because nobody is going anyplace, you see? That's the whole trick back of time, see.
But the incident, don't you see, which is plotted forward appears to be a plot against

time. And it's the incident, or consideration of the incident, which plots the time.

And you'll find that old people (that is, old humanoids) very often have their days go
by whzzt, whzzt, whzzt, you know? They just no more than get up in the morning and they go
to bed at night, you know? And it's just bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz, bzz!

This is a commonly held consideration. You go around and talk to some of them and
they will tell you, "Well, you know, there used to be a lot of time in a day, but there isn't
anymore, you know?" In other words, the incident, or interest, or future, you see, is gone – to
lead them forward in time – so therefore, you see, they have no consideration of time. The
incident plots very bang! You see? Well, there's only a couple of things happen in the day,
you know?

All right. Now, we take a little kid, maybe five, six years old, and the day to him is ab-
solutely interminable! Like little Arthur, the other day, was telling me he didn't have anything
to do and that he wasn't doing anything. And this was just for fun (I think it was the other
evening), I rattled off to him what he was doing, and what had happened in the last five min-
utes in his life. And he didn't consider this very much. You see, his tolerance of incident was
very high. But he sort of laughed about it, and then he still complained that he just didn't have
anything to do; I didn't make much of an impression on him.

But he had run in and out of the room three times, the dog had taken off one of his
shoes and he'd put it back on again, he'd stolen the dog's bone, the dog had gotten the bone
back, he had found one of his toys and thrown it down, and then he'd gone in the other room
and inspected his rocks, and – in other words, it was all this incident. My lord, man, the inci-
dent which had taken place, you see, in those last few minutes. And he still didn't think he
was doing anything; he was doing nothing, you see?

What he meant to say was he was doing nothing in which he was interested in doing.
So therefore time was passing interminably to him, you see, under a very heavy incident im-
pact.

You could be more philosophic about it and reduce it down to tolerance of incident –
not tolerance of motion but just tolerance of incident. How much incident does somebody
want?

You find out after the war – World War II, amongst my friends and so forth – I found
out that life was suddenly moving very slowly for all of them. Life was very dull, see? They
couldn't pick themselves up at all, and so forth. Change of pace was so fantastic, you see?
From hurry-scurry, hurry-scurry, bang, thud, crash, bing, zop, bow, dzz, zrrp, woo, bee, theer,
tha, bul, bung, bang, incident, rur, row, boom, bow, crash, all of a sudden, why, they settled
down to what had been, just before the war, a normal existence to them, you see? And this
normal existence of just this short span of years, regardless of their own considerations,
seemed awfully slow. See, it just seemed like nothing was happening at all.

And therefore, what had happened? Well, their tolerance of incident had increased.
Even though it was bad for them in numerous cases, they still had gotten up to confronting r-
r-r-r-r-r-r type of incident, don't you see? And then all of a sudden, they don't have that much
incident. So time, oddly enough, started to do funny things for them. It either went terribly slowly or it went by very rapidly. You see, because if you'd learned to plot your incident and time together – in other words, if you measured your time by the amount of incident occurring, and then you didn't have any incident – see, figure it out – why, you obviously wouldn't have any time. You follow that?

That's really what happens to old people. They had the house full of people, and they're this and that, and their responsibility to so-and-so; and there was Jackie coming back from school, and there was this and that and then the other thing; and all of a sudden, everybody goes off and gets married or does something, and there isn't enough incident, you see? So therefore the day is going \textit{whsht, whsht, whsht, whsht}. You got the idea? Amount of incident.

You can't say, you see, that the more incident there is – you see, it doesn't come down to an engineering proposition of the more incident there is, the more time there is, or the less incident there is, the less time there is; nor can you say in reverse, you see, that the more incident there is, the less time there is. You see, these things don't add up.

Well, why don't they just exactly add up and equate? Well, you're dealing with a false commodity in the first place, see, so it's never going to add up. But it's the consideration of it; it's a consideration.

Now, we did a lot of this with randomness and that sort of thing, but that is not as full an explanation as I'm giving you here today. But it's the consideration: Does a lot of incident make a lot of time or does a lot of incident make no time?

Now, you're going to have somebody around with a lot of incident happening in his vicinity, and he just suddenly starts saying – like I do occasionally, you know – "There isn't enough time for this incident to happen in," see?

I start getting an emergency on five or six fronts simultaneously while I am doing my research, while somebody is calling on me for a new bulletin, don't you see? And this is too much incident. So I say, "Well, there isn't enough time." You got the idea?

So I grab myself by the scruff of the neck, you see, and – you could get the consideration you are manufacturing the time. All you have to do is "Well, I could confront being that busy." That's all you actually have to do. My consideration for this: "Well, all right. I can do something about it," See? And instantly, you've suddenly got enough time! If you say, "No, I can't do anything about these incidents because of the time," of course you haven't got enough time. You got the idea?

And you can actually practically monitor the amount of time you had by simply changing any consideration you have about how busy you want to be, or how much you can handle. You sometimes – you can play tricks on yourself this way, see? You can say, "Well, I wanted to be busy, busier than I was, and I sure got my wish!" And the next thing you know, why, you've got enough time, you see?

So it's the consideration of how much incident makes how much time that gives or subtracts time from one's existence. And that's pretty deep and pretty profound, and I'm afraid that nobody has ever said it before in the field of philosophy, but it's quite shaking if you
really take a look at it. It's how much you decide you can tolerate, see? How much you decide you can confront, or whether or not you are deciding the other way to.

Now, this is all compounded by the – also, the very difficult situation that you can simply, you can get up to a point of where you can consider time long or short without measuring it against incident. Then, you see, by gradient, higher tone, you could get up to a point and you say, "Well, this is going to be a long day," and it'll be a long day, see? "Well, night will be here in no time," and it'll be there in no time. You practically just turn around and blink and somebody is calling you to supper. But we're now talking of – in a fairly high-toned action.

Normally, you're in a position where incident is, to a marked degree, monitoring your consideration of time. But actually, it's quite the reverse; as you get up, it's your consideration of incident which is monitoring time. And then as you get up above that, it's simply a consideration of how much time there is or isn't.

I don't know, I think you could get high enough toned as a thetan to consider that a million years was no time, and find yourself a million years up the line. You follow this, see? Or consider that evening was a couple of years away and just sort of almost live a couple of years before evening. You get the idea, see?

So there are three points here that we could consider, three different attitudes: Where the person is the total effect of time and he's habituated to the incident monitoring his time. But it's a certain speed of incident monitoring his time, don't you see, that he's just gotten used to – his habit, you know? He's always led a busy life and therefore his time is – he's the effect of that much time. He's always led an easy and rather wasteful life, so that's his consideration of time, don't you see? And when that pace changes, and so forth, he'll get a reverse consideration of the situation, see? But that's all in the field of being the effect of time, you see? One is just total effect: one never does anything about the incidents, one never lessens or increases the amount of incident, one never changes his opinion about the incident, one doesn't even know that incident has anything to do with time, don't you see? You got Homo sap; there he is.

All right. Now, let's go upstairs a little bit, and let's get into a level of Release, or something like this, and one recognizes in some way or another that – well, if two different considerations take place: One, "If I get busy, time will go by faster." And the other, reverse consideration can also be held, "Well, if I don't do anything, why, time will go by faster." You can also hold that reverse consideration just as easily as the other, but the first one I mentioned is the commonest. And you sort of get the idea that you could monitor the amount of doingness, and you can get into a point of how much incident you can confront. And you can monitor your time by willingness to confront incident, willingness to confront the amount of action in your vicinity.

You've been living in south Peoria amongst the growing sycamores, or whatever they have in Peoria, and life has been drifting by at an 1890 horse-and-carriage pace, and you all of a sudden get on a train or a plane; you go to New York City. The taxicab drivers alone are sufficient to change your ideas of time, you see? Well, you see, that's a change of pace.
Now, Homo sap would regard that, you see, as simply shocking. You know, he'd just probably voice the fact that he had been affected. That would be his total handling of the situation, you see?

Somebody who's upscale a bit higher could make the consideration, you see, well, he's willing to confront New York. And when he goes back to Peoria, well, he's willing to confront Peoria, see? (South Peoria. I won't malign Peoria itself.) You see? He's willing to confront that amount of incident. "Well, I'm back home again here, and this is the space in which I live," and so forth. And he'd find his time would stay in much better balance.

Now let's take him upstairs above -- the state I just mentioned would be someplace between Release and Clear. Now, let's take him up someplace to where he's moving into R6 or something like that, and he'll start getting the spooky notion that he doesn't have to depend upon the exterior incident to measure his consideration of time, see? So he's simply up into a point where he's saying, "There's lots of time," see, or "There isn't any time," see? He's waiting for a train: no time, see? No time is elapsing, so of course the train arrives almost at once, you see? And -- as far as his consideration is concerned, you see?

And he's at a big party and everybody is having a marvelous time and he's having a marvelous time, and so forth, so he just changes his consideration to the fact that it's a long party. And it is. Do you see?

So there are actually these three stages of reaction. Of course, there is a reaction below that I should mention, which is just unconscious. But of course, unconsciousness is not a reaction; it's an isn't.

Now we could probably go above that and we get up into OT and so forth, and we probably could get a pan-determined attitude toward time, which would monitor the time of others. Now we're talking pretty -- we're talking pretty, pretty swami. See, I mean, this is a little bit out of the range of reality, so forth. But it would be by -- instead of self-determinism, we're moving over into pan-determinism, and moving over to separately other-determining, see? Doing an other-determinism, see? And you get up into that zone, why, no telling what you could do, see?

You have an example of it in fairy tales, of the bloke that comes along and waves the magic wand over the sleeping princess, and everybody sleeps for a hundred years. No little child ever thinks to ask, "What happened to the armor and the -- so forth of the guards and the other people around in the castle?" Don't you see? That one, Sleeping Beauty, is almost a perfect example of pan-determined time, see?

He said, "There's going to be no incident in this joint for a hundred years," see? There wasn't. When you get up that high, you don't even have to give your postulates in correct English, you know? [laughter]

So then there is a zone above that, but of course that's done on the basis of communication. And I don't care whether the communication has much distance in it or not; you're now speaking in the realms of telepathy. And you're speaking in the realms of a telepathy powerful enough so that your consideration is able to induce a reality in the other person, and that's pretty high-voltage telepathy.
You can see this, however; you can see this in lower experimental phenomena in the field of hypnotism, in the field of mesmerism, early stuff back there when they were still experimenting with it. Hundred years or more ago. They knew more about it than they do now; they've forgotten most of that technology.

But you could tell somebody, you see, you can tell an hypnotized subject that this has been the span of time, don't you see, or not been the span of time. Although I don't know that these blokes ever thought of doing that, particularly. But they'll get a lot of incident, and they will think a lot of incident has happened and a lot of things have gone by, and that they've been out a lot – a long time, and their considerations with regard to this would be entirely shifted, don't you see?

But that, of course, is making somebody the total effect of a direct communication; it isn't pan-determined up on the upper stages. I'm just showing you that it can be represented experimentally down in the very, very low gutters of the scale.

You can cause incident to occur on a projected basis, in ways that the modern hypnotist has entirely forgotten. I was quite appalled to find out how little is known in the West, really, about hypnotism. I think Charcot must have studied in India, and Mesmer and so forth.

But this experiment, this experiment is a fascinating experiment: You put another being into a rapport, which is a total bing-bang, you see, with regard to it. And it isn't just a physical rapport, because that other being feels and thinks the thought and feeling of the body of the person who has him mesmerized.

Mesmerism is quite different than hypnotism. Later boys have mixed these two terms, you see? You can do this fantastic thing. Somebody can be put into a mesmerized state, and then put your hand behind your back (when you really get out the bottom, why, people will say, "Well, do you believe in hypnotism?" you know? It isn't anything you believe in – I mean, it's just an experimental activity) and you can pinch yourself in the back, and the person who's mesmerized, even though their eyes are closed and so forth, will leap convulsively. And if their back is examined, your fingernail marks will appear on their back. Quite interesting.

In other words, you can produce a physical pan-determinism, you see? See, you've determined their determinism. And that is also in an experimental zone.

This, of course, is quite unethical to play around with amongst the poor bloke Homo sap, walking already up to his neck in muck and trouble, don't you see? And somebody mesmerizes him or hypnotizes him and upsets what little sense of value he has left, because the only thing the poor bloke has got is his own self-determinism, don't you see? The only thing he's got left is that tiny, tiny spark of power of choice, don't you see? Well, when you overcome that, you just throw him into a total effect; then that mud just goes down right up over his head, see? But I'm just giving you an example, just to communicate the idea that that is a low harmonic on an upper state with regard to the telepathy of time and incident, see?

So at a very, very high level – at a very, very high level, not making anybody pushed into the mud or something like this, you get somebody thinking it's a long day, and everybody in the city begins to agree that it's a long day, you see? You get the idea? You could also have
this sort of thing going on; it doesn't even have to do totally with time. It'd be "the actions we're engaged in are happiness-producing actions," see? That consideration could be added to the cycle of action, you see; it's a happiness-producing action. And everybody working around there, they'd think they were doing fine, you see?

Well, you could produce the opposite effect of "the actions in which we are engaged are misery-producing actions," you see, and everybody would feel miserable and feel like they were forming overts by doing any action at all. And we've got a lot of that in this society in which we live, which is changing people's attitude toward time.

And the prime criminal in this is the newspaper – the press of Fleet Street. It's all scandal and it's all bad and all the employers are bad, and everybody is bad, and there's nobody good, and nothing happy has happened at all, and your actions are not producing any happiness, and the worker is totally walked on and stepped on and ought to be shot in his – ought to shoot everybody in his tracks, don't you see, because he's being made to work, you see? You get the idea?

You're spreading, then, on a pan-determinism basis – but on very finite, low-grade communication lines, you see – the idea of a worthless series of incidents. So therefore, this will do something to people's time. And the amount of doingness of a society is tremendously dependent on whether or not they are being told that their cycle of action – or whether they believe or agree that their cycle of action should proceed or shouldn't proceed.

And so we move over into the field of the word action, now. Action. We've got cycle of action. All right. Let's take up – we got cycle; you know what that is – all right, let's take up action.

So an action is simply a motion through space having a certain speed. Its speed could be fast or it could be slow, it could move across a lot of space, it could move across a sixteen-millionth of a millimeter, see? But it would be an action.

Now, there's a lot of bad connotation to the word action in the field of literature. Action stories are supposed to be bad stories, you see? This word in the field of psychology has gotten to be a nasty, spit-in-the-spittoon sort of word.

All these civil-defense blokes in the United States are carefully trained that if anybody gets active during an atomic bombing, they should instantly be incarcerated. I know that sounds psychotic; and it is.

And the psychological (ha!) assistance of civil defense (ha!) which has been organized in the United States at this particular time has been carefully trained to take any individual who is in action and put him out of action fast, with a cop or a straitjacket or something, see? And that's what he's trained to do.

I asked the embarrassing question, "Well, what if the fellow was engaged in trying to put out a fire?"

"Well," they say, "that would all be done by the local authorities, so that doesn't come into the problem."
And I found out that a local authority, a local authority (you'll have to cut that off the tape) – a local authority is not a being which was quite interesting to me. But a being is anybody who isn't a local authority. [laughter] And if a person isn't a local authority and he is active, or in action or is proposing action, or any of these other things, then the job of the psychological assistant – of which they're breeding lots of them – and the psychiatrist and anybody else (and the cop on the beat is supposed to turn over this person, also) – he's supposed to be instantly gotten out of the way and strapped down and bang! See, there must be no action.

It's sort of interesting to me that this word action, which is primarily and purely simply something which denotes motion and could be said to be, perhaps, volitional motion or intended motion, could become a bad thing, you see? So there's all sorts of conflict going on about this. Of course, if a fellow, you know, on a soccer team, or something like that, who is supposed to stop the ball from going in some particular direction, just stood there and didn't move over in front of the ball, why, he'd be terribly booed, don't you see? But in some other part of the society, you see – that's inaction; inaction there is bad, you see? But in some other part of the society, action is bad, you know?

And psychiatry has this so bad that they think a person is cured when they become inactive, and that's one thing which you, as a Scientologist, have never been able to understand about psychiatry. You think I'm kidding you, or something like that, you know? But that's merely a misalignment of their intention; there's something wrong there, see?

If this fellow is active and he's got something wrong with him – he's had a label hung on his chest or something like that, and he's active – then he is unwell and must be restrained, and that is the real action behind an electric shock and a prefrontal lobotomy. It's the action in which the person is engaged which is the criteria of what treatment he gets.

So a well person is then a catatonic schizophrenic (a very fancy word which means somebody just lies still, stiff and never moves).

So in the field – in the mental field, this word action is a very bad word – very, very bad word. It fits along with agitated, frenzied, disturbed, see? These are all the same – same thing. See?

So, we've gotten this word pulled down here amongst a bunch of brothers it doesn't go with. And this has thrown the whole field of mental healing, so called, in the Western world at this particular time, for a loop. It's whether or not – you get the idea? It's not whether or not he went back to his job and did his job. It's whether or not he was active. And you, talking to a psychiatrist, wouldn't make any sense at all, because he'd say "active," meaning crazy, and you'd say "active," meaning constructive. See, so you wouldn't be talking the same vocabulary, because of their abuse of this word action, see?

So, you must realize – you must realize – that the prevention of motion is fairly prevalent, particularly in mental-healing circles. The prevention of motion. And therefore, there is something marvelous about the state of inaction.

Now, we are not the only people to comment on the subject of action or inaction, but certainly – although we follow far more traditional areas, such as "man is a spirit, he's not a
dog," that sort of thing – realize that in the field of mysticism, one of your main complaints about mysticism and one of the bad bugs that there is in mysticism is the image of the wise or totally elevated individual or the finely refined individual as a totally inactive one. See? That's your little point of argument. You say, "Hey, wait a minute."

You see, a fireman putting out a fire could be totally calm and collected. He could go about it with a completely apparent effortless efficiency, you see? Well, that's very high-toned. But a fireman who would sit and regard his navel would be crazy! You see the difference?

So, you as Scientologists have seen this for a long time. Now, you've even coined a word; I didn't coin this word. You've coined quite a lot of words, you know? Amongst you, I hear you say them, I see them in auditors' reports; they become prevalent, and so forth. So very often, I start to use them. And you've got one called a mystic mystic, you know? A mystical mystic. I've heard this word bang around inside organizations and so forth, the mystical mystic. And it's a case; it's a case type. It's a commonly Scientology agreed-upon case type. "This person is a mystical mystic."

And they'll process that person in accordance. And by that they mean that the person will be totally reasonable about anything that happens in their vicinity, but not do anything about it; and see nothing but good in anything, including murdering babies. You see? It's this unreasonableness which you're protesting – the mystical mystic.

But that's borne out of the fact that running alongside of a great deal of wise wisdom, some awfully bad wisdom has been carrying forward on the basis that all you would do, if you were really elevated, is you would sit on a mountaintop and regard your navel and not look at the world, or not look at anything, engage in nothing, participate nowhere, be effective nowhere at all, engage in no action of any kind, be totally detached, nothing to do with you, be completely aloof, and so forth. And you ask a lot of people what an OT is and they'll describe that. See? An OT is much more likely to be a ball of fire.

But, of course, this is a self-protective mechanism. People would like to believe this. We have somebody in England who is absolutely frantic every time you mention the idea of OT, and has even come up to me and said, "Please, Ron, don't release these techniques. Please, please, please don't go in that direction. My God, it'd be worse than the invention of the atom bomb. You realize what is liable to happen if you set these people loose!" and so forth. And he's really worried! Or he was; maybe somebody got to him, because it's been a few months ago and there have been a lot of Scientologists around. You can't ever tell what will happen to somebody's character in that case. But they probably got him talked out of it.

But there, his fear is that somebody would become powerful or strong, which is fear of somebody causing a lot of action, or somebody getting very active, see, which almost fits back against the psychiatrist's definition. His fear of action.

"Well, what's somebody liable to do? Uhh-uhh-uhh!" Of course, your best answer to that was "Well, the best solution to that is for you to become OT, too." There's no reasoning with such a person; just give them – "If everybody's gonna become wolves, you better not remain a rabbit!" [laughter, laughs] It's a very good sales campaign.
But it has very little to do with the facts of the case, because the level of responsibility rises and rises and rises, don't you see, along with it. They lose sight of this sort of thing.

Now, the idea of action, then, gets – is all sullied up and messed up: whether or not things should go forward or not go forward, you see; whether or not time should advance or not advance; whether or not incidents should take place or not take place – just as a general principle, not "should some incidents take place and some incidents not take place?" Well, that's a sane consideration. But you get this insane attitude toward it which is simply "no incidents should take place" or "all kinds of incidents should take place."

And then a person eventually pulls out of that into a lower grade of "Well, it's all going on and it has nothing to do with me." And I'm afraid Homo sap is walking into that particular category right now at a very, very fast rate of speed. "It's all going on and it has nothing to do with me. I can do nothing about it," and so forth. You see a declining society normally holds this. And a society which has a bit of zip left in it, a society which is still rising and so forth, well, everything has to do with everybody. You know, they'll say, "Ho, ho, ho," and they take a lot of responsibility for that sort of thing.

Well, you take early nineteenth-century America. I imagine somebody would have walked miles to convince Joe down in Dog Hollow that he was dead wrong to vote for President Fillmore. You know, you just really work at it, you know? It had to do with him and it had to do with them. Well, the modern think "Well, what can I do about it?" Don't you see? "It's life, can't do very much about it."

You get a hot, roaring campaign issue whereby a people really does feel challenged or attacked and so forth, they'll get up and start saying, "Well, it does have something to do with me." They have to be pushed pretty far back before they begin to say that. Something like that is occurring right at the present moment in the United States.

And a lot of people are just going to go along with the tide; a lot of people are starting to fight. The end product of that, Lord knows what that will be. It might not be in 1964, but certainly you will see the end product of it by 1968. Driven too far, see? So even the fellow who says, "It has nothing to do with me" at last has to admit that it has something to do with him.

I remember, I was trying to convince somebody that the atomic bomb had something to do with him. I think I've told you this joke before, but I finally moved it on down, I got on down to his wallet and his social security card. And all of a sudden, realized that that would be affected if a bomb went off in his vicinity, and he became very concerned about atomic fission, see? I just kept cutting the gradients down, getting closer and closer to him, until he finally got associated with it.

But even killing his children didn't have anything to do with him. "Well, your children are liable to be killed off, don't you see?"

"Oh, I don't..." Nothing to do with him!

So, you can approach a person closely enough with action, and he'll retreat, retreat, retreat; and when he can't retreat any further, you get the cornered-rat effect, you know? He'll turn around and go the other way.
Politicians are always making this mistake; they always misestimate the moment. And they'll see this supine population that is taking everything that is shoveled out to it. It's being charged 110 percent of all of its income; it's being made to stand and bow every time a policeman goes by, you see? All this. And they see this totally docile population, and they say, "Well, we can do anything we please," you see? And they do the "anything you please." And all of a sudden they do one too many "anythings," you see, and all of a sudden they get the cornered-rat effect, see?

All of a sudden it does have something to do with the population, and then there's no controlling it at all, because these people are rather irresponsible, and their control of action is so foreign to them – they've forgotten how to control action, don't you see? – that their actions just go brow! It's like a barroom brawl. You really, in a barroom brawl, you never really can identify who started the fight or who's against you or who's for you, don't you see? Just everybody starts slugging everybody.

It's very interesting to be in the middle of a barroom brawl. I have been, in some of the less seemly places of the world, and emerged with a whole skin. But it's very interesting to see one blow up. Well, this is amidst a bunch of drunks, and they're all happy and cheerful, "Who'd care less" and "Have another drink, Bill," you see?

And all of a sudden one says, "There's two heads on a dime," or something.

And the other one says, "There ain't two heads on a dime."

And, "Yes, there is two heads on a dime; I'll show you, you see?"

"Well, you can't show me" and all of a sudden, wham! See?

All these people that have been sitting there supine, and so forth – bottles are flying through the air. These two fellows start to fight, these two, these, these, these fellows fight those – you'd never know who's friends of whose, or anything of the sort.

You'd say the best thing to do in a case like that is to back up into a corner and barricade yourself with a table, but let me assure you that that is very unsafe tactics, because somebody else will have the same idea, and he'll fight with you for the table. [laughter, laughs]

So action also gets the bad connotation, and a thoroughly bad connotation it can get, because it can produce pain! It can produce destructiveness, pain and so forth. So when somebody is overly concerned about being hurt, they're pretty nuts, you know; they think you only live once and they think they've got to preserve the body to the ultimate degree. They think pain is something that nobody can confront, and they certainly can't confront it because they got so many overts on it, something like that.

When people cannot confront pain of any kind, and so forth, you will find that they also are refusing to confront action. And when they cease to confront action they cease to confront incident and they won't advance a cycle of action, and their sense of time goes completely bad.

I didn't say that psychiatry and psychology and so forth had backed themselves – and medicine – had backed themselves into this exact position, because I didn't have to. I think
you could understand that clearly. The only thing a doctor can ever tell you is, "Be quiet," you know, "Take it easy." Don't you see? It's rather bad advice! He's given the patient a longer time of illness; whether the patient is in bed more weeks or not, illness is now going to move along longer for the patient, don't you see?

What if he said, "Well, you can lie there in bed if you want to, but let's get some things that interest you and let's get some of this and that, and so forth, and you better have some people come in to see you," and so forth and so on. The guy would have an idea that time is passing very quickly, and this has a remarkable effect upon healing. See? It takes so long to heal, and if you've got a lot of time passed, then you'd heal quickly, wouldn't you? You get the various considerations, how they entangle here.

So there's these various upsets, then, on the subject of action, the avoidance of action, and then there is, of course, a pugnacity will set in where it's all got to be action, or it's all got to be destructive action. For instance, Hitler should have had some processing. He had it all won up to the point where he had to have more action. We're not quite sure why he had to have more action, but of course he went into a faster level of action than he could confront or anybody else could confront, and that was destruction.

So when you get more action than you can confront, you normally get destruction. And this also gives the cycle of action a bad name, because people think that a cycle of action inevitably ends in decay and death. And it's at that point that we depart from the Vedic "Hymn of the Dawn Child," you see. They assumed that it was all going to decay and die. Do you see how that doesn't necessarily represent a cycle of action at all – that it's all going to go on newly, newly, newly and then peel off and then die, don't you see?

But we're taught this on every hand. Every flower apparently is designed this way; buildings are designed this way, and so forth. And you have so many examples of a cycle of action ending in disaster and the completeness of disaster being the total end of the cycle of action, that it makes people quite unwilling to complete a cycle of action.

They say, "Well, if I completed a cycle..." I'll show – give you a very direct application of this: "If I completed a cycle of action on the preclear, why, he'd be an old, decayed corpse." Do you see what he's cross-associated here? See?

So a cycle of action, philosophically, and in the physical universe, is very often looked on as something which goes from birth through growth to a momentary stability, through decay to death. And that is so built into the physical universe that it is a barrier to people completing a cycle of action.

And somebody is worried about this sort of thing when they never seem to be able to complete a cycle of action on a pc. Never flatten a process, never really go through the auditing cycle and so forth. They are up against something there which prevents their arrival; they mustn't arrive; they mustn't get to that final point. They're afraid to get to that final point, so they will go bzoodle!

So something could be wrong with their concept of the idea of a cycle and something could be wrong with their concept of the idea of action. But certainly, the cycle of action is not being completed with regard to what they are trying to do. And you, in supervising the
case or in trying to handle this situation and so forth, can actually beat your brain to a fine feathered froth, trying desperately to figure out "How do I get this guy to complete this cycle of action?"

You call in Joe and you say, "Now, look. On auditing this pc – auditing this pc – get your auditing question answered! Your auditing question answered! I mean, you got that now? Now, what have I just said to you?"

"Auditing question answered. Oh, yes, of course. I know that. Yes, yes. Whuh-uh." Of course he also is saying back there, "It has nothing to do with me," see?

Oh, yes. So you see this session the next time and you see, "Well, Pete, how have you been today?"

"Uh… the trees are pretty, aren't they?"

"Thank you very much."

You say, "Look, look, even on two-way comm, for God's sakes, get the pc to answer something that has some relation…"

"No, ha – oh, of course. Yes, I know that. Yes, I know that."

But you see this cycle of action: cycle out maybe, action out maybe, destruction and death being the end of all cycles of action, we mustn't arrive. So the best way not to arrive is never follow a cycle of action. See? Always just follow a random action that has nothing to do with completing any cycle of action.

And when you run into that too much, those are the things which you will find wrong with the auditor: something wrong with cycle, something wrong with action, and the other thing which I mentioned earlier, that the individual – confrontation of incident.

Well, for instance, you know, you know an easy-running pc can very often upset some auditors because they change so rapidly, and the auditor, he no more than gets grooved down into auditing whatever the command was, and the process goes and gets flat, and here's a new incident, see? You've got two conditions, then: either the tone arm action has been run out of a process and it is continued, see, because one can't confront the incident, see, of a change in the pc to this degree; or on the other hand, one stops running the process when there is still a lot of tone arm action going on, because "We know what'll happen if we complete the cycle of action: we'll kill the pc. Obviously, so we better not kill any pcs. Ron says not to kill pcs, so…" [laughter, laughs]

Anyway, you see that very often you are trying, in trying to get auditing accomplished, and so forth, you very often are trying to get it accomplished against this thing called a cycle of action; and we mustn't have a cycle of action on the part of the person, and yet auditing depends on the cycle of action.

So it's all this rather long series of considerations which I have been giving you which complicate the auditing cycle. And it can be avoided by not getting the auditing question answered; it can be avoided by not acknowledging the pc, see? It can be avoided by, well, not asking any question at all – that's also a solution, you see? It can be avoided by never really getting the pc in session so that you start auditing the pc, don't you see?
One could go to the extreme and decide that it's all over anyway, so that it doesn't matter what one does now. You see? A whole bunch of considerations can occur around it using these various elements of which I've been talking to you: considerations of cycle, considerations of action and considerations of the whole cycle of action, which is the fact that it's liable to end up in death and destruction. So, all of these things will compound and will show up in an auditing session.

Now, where you've got somebody with these points very astray and adrift, and who either has got to have too much motion from the pc, or has got to have too little motion for the pc, because his confrontation of the amount of incident, see, is off – when these things are awry, then you have trouble with this thing called the auditing cycle. And the auditing cycle is simply nothing but the broad auditing cycle of a session: we sit down and we start a session and you get the pc in session, and we run the session, and then we run it on through and we end the session. And we continue a series of sessions unto we finally have the process that we're running flat, don't you see?

Or this pc has come to us to be audited for his lumbosis and we cure his lumbosis, and that's the end of the situation. See, that's the broad – the big one.

But that really isn't an auditing cycle, technically; that's a session cycle, or an intensive cycle, don't you see? That's the cycle of the case, and so forth.

What we mean, very precisely, when we say auditing cycle, is simply your TR 0 to 4. That is very severely, precisely, an auditing cycle, in the finest, purest meaning of the word. It is simply the Pete – Bill, "Hello," "Okay," you know? I mean, he says, "Do birds fly?"

"No."

"Thank you." See?

And the auditing cycle which goes on the bigger perimeter of "Do birds fly?"

"Uh… hm! You know, I used to watch flying birds when I was a boy. Tsk! Yeah, I used to have a lot of fun watching flying birds… a boy."

"Oh, yeah? All right, all right. Now, do birds fly?"

"Uh… yeah. Yeah, they sure do."

"Thank you."

See? See, that's really all there is to it. But when you get to throw in the number of cognitions a pc can get, the number of changes a pc can experience, the complexities of various processes right up to R6 – what you've got to do in order to do this – this auditing cycle is still very dominant. But it is so overwhelmed and surrounded by the tremendous complications of the auditor's action that if he hasn't got it down right he can't audit. Do you see that? He's just going to be all thumbs! What's missing is the auditing cycle. And if he hasn't gotten an auditing cycle in by the time he's studied up the line pretty fair, well, there's just something wrong with these points I've taken up with you today in this lecture. He's got some wild considerations with regard to this. He can't confront incidents, or he's got to confront too much incident, or, you know, his concept of time is out, or his cycle is out, or his concept of the death and destruction of the situation is out; he's got the wrong idea of action, you see? It'll lie
somewhere in that direction. And if you then cleaned that up with the individual, you'd find all of a sudden that he found these other processes very easy.

He's always having trouble, let us say, with a complicated process: he's saying he has trouble with a complicated process, whereas he's not having trouble with a complicated process at all. I've seen you use the most complicated processes anybody ever dreamed of, don't you see? And the only thing I've ever seen you have any trouble with is the cycle of action. See, that is the cornerstone on which all such actions take place. It'll be those various elements, and it'll be those various things.

Now, I haven't answered one question in this lecture – is, although cycle means various things in various departments and so forth, what does it mean in Scientology? And I haven't said what it meant in Scientology. And it just means the – "From the beginning to the conclusion of an intentional action"; that's what cycle means, in Scientology. As far as we're concerned, it's the beginning to the conclusion of an intended action. Intended, see?

Has to be a higher-toned definition than your other definitions. And you can consider it in these other departments, too, at the same time. See, it's perfectly all right. But it has something to do with the tone of the person who is using the definition.

"A cycle of action is the moment when my mother looks at me to the moment she whips me." See? That's an other-determined definition, see? As we move the definition on up, it's from the beginning to the end of the intended action. That's a very loose, wide definition, but it could be that.

The only other thing I'd leave up in the air is how could possibly one go about straightening up these various things with somebody? Well, I'll give you a very complicated process, and so forth, that I would thoroughly recommend, to take care of this, and that's just itsa on these subjects. And you'll find out that, within the limits of all levels, would be the most embracive of these.

Okay?

_Audience: Mm-mm._

Thank you very much.
A lecture given on 20 October 1964

What's the day today?

*Audience: October 20th.*

Twentieth? Twentieth of October, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

We're, as you know, just as an announcement here, we're dividing the course into Central Org and field personnel. Several reasons for this – is one, the course is very large at this particular time and it's one way to divide it. And Central Org personnel are always used to working very, very hard, so we thought they could stand about three or four more hours of a study day and it wasn't a matter of punishment, it's just a matter of expediency. We have to get them in here and straightened up and taught and out of here.

Central Org personnel are a bit different to this degree, is in organizations they do keep right up with their technology and they don't drop far behind, so to put them through the same set of checksheets is actually a bit abusive and as a result, why, Central Org personnel have been divided off and if you see somebody around looking very, very haggard and looking very driven and a face is always missing at a party or something like this, well you know that's a Central Org personnel.

That doesn't mean the program is softened up for the field auditor. Now, we have other curves on the line for the field auditor. The way the course is being rigged at the present moment is that somebody comes in here and we check him out with great rapidity up the line to where he has reached on the levels and where he is expert on the levels and then we give him that set of checksheets to proceed therefrom, you see. In other words, we hand him a set of checksheets proceeding from the point to which he has progressed in his actual auditing application, not his certificate, and take him on from there. So of course, he is on, relatively speaking, a different set of checksheets than Central Org personnel would be on, even though we'll still do this with Central Org personnel. The program is quite different with a Central Org personnel.

He comes in here and the first thing we'll do with him is look him over and find out why he's dragging that way, and find out why he misfiled that despatch and let's get those withholds off, you know, and let's get him straightened out, let's get any bug in the case that somebody hadn't been able to crack straightened out; let's straighten out any subject similar to Scientology that he ever got wrapped up with, don't you see. This is right off the bat – *bang!*
you see. Then get his definitions real straight, and get him on to clearing with a dead crash and just with a – I think it's 7½ hour auditing day – bring him right straight on up to Clear – bang! don't you see. And then hand him a set of checksheets on R6 and kick him out of here. In other words, yeah, let him go through his checksheets, get him provisional classification; he has to take his examination before he ever gets that but that's the idea, don't you see?

And we won't be bothering too much. Why? Well, there's good reason for that. When he gets home he'll still be getting checked out on bulletins, he'll still be getting technology, he'll still be getting this, he'll still be getting that, don't you see? And actually Central Orgs so miss their personnel that they send here that they have a very, very hard time and they've had an awful hard time in the last year and a half. And one of the reasons – one of the main reasons for that has been it's their key personnel very often is missing and we mustn't keep doing that. So it's – be a shorter course for them and a much rougher course.

And the field auditor, why, the course goes on more or less the way it's been going on, straight on down the line, making a different, slightly different basis. They come up to the point where they have achieved their level. Give them the checksheets from that point; make sure that they go through there and then put them through the auditing steps up from that point; mostly it's a training basis, don't you see? And get them well trained up in that particular direction and when their cases are in good shape and that sort of thing, throw them over into R6.

So case is going to become a requisite for a provisional VI classification. And there's a very excellent technical reason for that. You cannot take somebody who has been head-on into R6, I mean, actually running R6 – real R6, now, I'm not talking now about running some items, or what we were calling GPMs a year or two ago, or you know, 2-12 or stuff like that – no, no. I'm talking about real honest-to-goodness R6. You can't take somebody who is at that state of training and processing and return him into clearing.

You start clearing up definitions on a person at that particular stage of the game and you're going to be in trouble. You're going to be in trouble. Why? The boy is right that instant sitting in an item "to glopher gofs," you see, and this item "to glopher gofs," is all you're going to get and you can take a lot of locks off "to glopher gofs" but if you unfortunately reach too far and got him into the next GPM with your definitions and all that sort of thing – I don't mean, just checking out definitions or words in general, I mean for blood auditing, you see, and if you were auditing him on this and you got him into Clay Table Clearing and he unfortunately picked up a term that was in the bank, a series or three serieses or ten serieses on down the line or even six items down the line, he's going to get a cracking big somatic and that somatic is just going to get worse and worse and worse. Well, why? Because you haven't got the item necessary to resolve the case which is, of course, the whole item. So he can't say, "Well, I want to improve my golf" "What of you – haven't you understood about golf?"

And he says, "Well, the effort – uh – the effort necessary to hit the ball."

You say, "All right, put effort together in clay."

It's an end word. It's way down the line. He isn't there, don't you see. He's up here. Well, you won't run into this difficulty with somebody at the lower levels because all the words and all the GPMs are there. They haven't got straightened or selected out. Do you see?
They aren't selected out. He's not running on down the track. It's just a globular glutinous bunch of glue and any place that you pick anything off of it, you're lucky, don't you see.

But when you've got this straightened out and you get somebody going on down the line, *pocketa-pocketa-pocketa*, in real R6 auditing, then you start clearing them; well, you're just going to find the item in which the person is now sitting that was the next item to come up and it's just going to get goofier and goofier, don't you see? And it's going to be very poor – very poor show.

Now, this means, then, that there are technical reasons why cases progress up the levels and should progress up the levels and they're very solid sound technical reasons for these things. That's what this lecture is about.

Levels are not particularly popular because peoples got it mixed up with class consciousness and everybody wants to be equal. Well, I'll tell you… [laughter] I'll tell you what – what equality to achieve. Let's say yes, let's all be equal but the equality to achieve is OT. You have to work a long time to be equal. That's what it comes down to.

So, the reason for levels – the reason for levels originally was to stretch out auditors into what they were capable of getting results with, see? The first attention was on auditors. It quickly passed from there over into the realization that we were looking at why pcs didn't make good progress because they hadn't come up through an orderly progress on the line. We tried to enforce this on pcs and it didn't go down very well. They wanted to be run on R6 when they had to be run on Level 0, and all that sort of thing and they didn't like this particularly so we took the classification off the pc and told the auditor to retain the classification on the pc, see. We didn't force the classification down the pc's throat but we say, "If you haven't got a Class so-and-so you mustn't run processes above that class on the pc." Well, that's good sense. Well, it goes further than that. Also, if you've got good sense you won't run a process which is above the level where you find the pc.

Now, I'm not trying to give you at this moment an accurate progress that I don't have the bulletin in front of me in which it was laid out – and it is to some slight degree in a state of flux at this moment. I'm just trying to appeal to your reason along this particular line.

Let's take an ordinary bit of raw meat that's drifting up and down the street out here – raw meat, derivation of word: the guy thinks he's a brain. You see, so he doesn't know he's a thetan. He isn't up there and he thinks he's deteriorated into a bit of matter; he thinks he's a body and so forth, hence this derogatory – jocular term rather – raw meat. And of course, he hasn't been done up any particular way or another so it has a side joke that goes along with it, you know.

But it also carries the fact that man is sinking down into – and this is a new thought on the line – into just a food animal. He's long thought of himself as a spiritual being and – with great pride and dignity and that sort of thing, and there's a bunch of revolutionary mutts all of a sudden jumped up on the track in the late part of the 19th century and said, "We have made a new discovery: you're meat," you know. "You're nothing but a brain. The way you perceive is – the way you perceive is there's a bunch of cells that click against a bunch of cells and this shows against some kind of a screen and this analyzes the new thought and then this gives..."
you a reaction and then the man thinks he thinks, don't you see, and then he somehow or an-
other acts in some stimulus-response fashion."

And they've made man into a stimulus-response animal and they're trying to handle
him that way governmentally and they're trying to handle him that way with advertising and
they're going to have an awful lot of failures because there's a big lie on the line. He is not a
stimulus-response animal. There is always, no matter to what tiny degree, there's power of
choice. And this is the one thing that overwhelms the planners: is the fellow who doesn't like
soup, you know? And that plate of soup will stay on that endless belt because he didn't take it
off, you know, and it goes in and busts up all the machinery in the whole empire eventually,
by concatenation.

Now, if they could just solve this bird who didn't like soup, then they've got it made,
from there on, don't you see? Because everybody would pick up their soup off of this endless
belt and there wouldn't be any dissonance here of any kind whatsoever and all would be har-
mony. But what kind of harmony – for whom, for what? The end product of this would be a
bunch of machines running to maintain a bunch of machines, which I think is terribly interest-
ing game if you look at it – a bunch of machines running around.

And I remember old Johnny Campbell, one time or another, he used to hold forth at
this at great length and so forth. And the reason he parted company with us on the subject of
this mind and the spirit and so forth, is because of his dedication to the machine. He wrote
one of – a marvelous story by the way; he could really string these things out – and it was a
civilization, you see, where man had been dispensed with and it'd become an ideal civilization
in there were just machines left there which were repairing machines and that was the ideal
civilization. Only he didn't put it out as a satire. He meant it. Now, the end product of this sort
of thing is the super stimulus response.

So, when an individual shows this item called power of choice, they conceive it to be
an irregularity. They think that this individual is now going to conduct himself irregularly.
Well, this is against the hidden standard that the plans he's given were right. You see, if all the
plans for the universe were absolutely infallible, why, then there would be some reason not to
have any power of choice over anything. If all the plans laid down by social states – if all of
the – of the great designs of Utopia were all of them utterly flawless and would lead to noth-
ing but paradise on Earth, why, then of course, quite obviously a power of choice would be
quite destructive. So those who pretend that the ideal has been achieved and laid down and
must be followed – those who pretend that and carefully delete from it the totality of power of
choice, are going to get in a mess and the way they're going to get in a mess, is simply, that
they have told a big lie as the ideal has not been laid down on the political front.

That there are this many ideologies at war with this many ideologies would tell you
that there was something in error here. None of these are winning above another one really.
Capitalism's still hanging around. I think the Congo now is sliding back toward capitalism. I
noticed that Russia – and I had a very funny, a very funny cognition this morning – I shall
have to tell you what it is – I realized what this Khrushchev overthrow is.* I just suddenly realized the whole significance. Russia tried to have an election. That's it. She looked at the United States having an election and she looked at England having an election, don't you see, and she went into an obsessive duplication. [laughter] The only thing that's been holding her up at all is the personality of Khrushchev. Now, what happens, we don't know, don't you see? But they did; that's what they tried to do. I think it's very amusing.

So anyhow – anyhow, the ideal state has never been laid down and get this – never will be! Absolutes are unobtainable. And that absolute perfection is unobtainable. You can get awfully close – you can get close but you can't arrive and never will be able to arrive at a total perfection. And the reason for that is this same thing. The reason why we can't attain this absolute is just this same item. It is that you're not dealing – you're not dealing, now, with a total carbon copy, being to being, to being, to being, you see? So, who would be to judge when the absolute had been attained? You see.

Oh, we always had some tiny disagreement on that if we were trying to apply – we were trying to apply absolute to the arts. All right, what is the perfect piano piece? You see. Pft. Ah. Who is the perfect performer? Now, we could go a long way toward analyzing what a perfect piano piece might be, and what a perfect performer might be but then this would get modified at once by the consideration of who was hearing it or seeing it. And once more we would have dissonance on the basis of whether or not a perfection had been attained and therefore the absolute is not achievable, don't you see?

And it's this one thing that man is capable of his own judgment that – now that sounds very odd to you, but man is capable of his own judgment – that keeps the absolute from being attained. Now, that's a very peculiar, a very peculiar fact. So, therefore it could be read as a very evil thing. But who wants to attain an absolute? That's no game at all. See, that's the other question you have to ask.

So, this individual – this individual never, all the way down the line, totally loses his individuality. It doesn't matter how many – how many lead boots you subject him to, how many rats you have in the warm brass jar running around on his stomach trying to get out; it doesn't matter how much economic duress you put him under. This random factor of somebody all of a sudden stands up and bears his chest to the bullets, "There, go ahead and torture me; go ahead and shoot me. Yeah, all right. The hell with you!" See.

And they say, "Well, now, Joe, that's not a reasonable attitude. Do you realize you can be tortured for eight thousand seven hundred and sixty-four days and you can be incarcerated and imprisoned; all your wives and children can be executed out of hand and the whole society will be destroyed?" And you lay up all these consequences and so forth.

And he says, "My answer to that, bud, is shoot me. Go ahead, torture me. Go ahead, put me in jail. But I won't say yes."

* Editor's note: In October 1964, Nikita Khrushchev was removed from his posts as head of the Communist Party and of the government of the Soviet Union by the Central Committee of the Communist Party.
And the hell of it is, is everybody admires him because they recognize this as the last resort of the thetan which is integrity – integrity to himself.

Even the Russian, in propagandizing his own revolution, could only make motion pictures of great heroes of the people. And it is so interesting to watch some of these things. You might not even be able to understand the Russian but what is going on in this thing is quite terrific – is Dimitri Novgorod leaps forward and says, "You are oppressing the people!" See.

And they say, "Dimitri, were going to fix your clock, bud, but good – but good. We're gonna fix your clock."

And he says, "To hell with you."

And the plot then proceeds. I'm sorry to give you such a short synopsis of it, [laughter] but I mean it's rather obvious. And one of these, at the final end, shows Novgorod, who is about to be executed by having a hook hooked in underneath his breast bones – I mean, typical Russian taste – and hoisted high in the air, and so forth; he brushes the guards off and does a ballet leap into the air and collapses down on the hook. The total theme is, "You could not and will never succeed in breaking down my individual integrity." And even in the midst of the Russian Revolution – making motion pictures which were supposed to superpropagandize how you should all bow down to the communist state – all they could do – all they could do, you see, was deify individualism and integrity. They deified the revolutionary because they wanted these people, of course, to revolt against the other state and ever since they've had this problem of counterrevolution.

Now, the individual can only be pushed so far. You want to watch one of these situations where, well, the ship's company is given a terrific beating by their Commanding Officer. They're just chopped around madly and according to the Bligh school of thought, don't you see, this is the perfect way to handle the crew. Well, I knew such a ship commander at one time – his name Richmond Kelly Turner because I wouldn't want to be exposed for libel on the thing, and he was in command of the USS Astoria cruiser and he did this kind of thing and it was all pretty doggone confounded grim and it was strictly a Bligh sort of government of the ship, don't you see.

Well, now, you'd say, under normal circumstances isn't this perfect – this best of all form of worlds and this best of all form of – of management? All right, naturally, you would have had a perfect running ship. Oh, no, quite the contrary. There wasn't anything on the Astoria worked. Nothing worked, nothing! You turn on a water tap and no water came out, you know. All right, well, then the ship fitter that was responsible for that would be put up on the carpet you see, and "Why had his people been so remiss as not to fix up that pipeline?" Crash-crash – don't you see – thud-thud. Oh, he's going to get a general court or something like that if it isn't fixed up there at once and so on.

Yeah, well, they go down and they take apart the pipes that had to do with this one pipe, see? They take apart those pipes very carefully and they see that there's seven of them that need replacing but they only have orders to replace one. So they carefully take apart the whole bulkhead where these pipes run, you see; they take off these huge sheets of armor plates you see, at enormous expense and labor; they take off all this equipment; they disconnect all the electrical connections that go in there. This is a fabulous operation.
You see, a modern man-o'-war is built like— it's built like a lot of watches enlarged
into a much greater complication, you know. And you probably could touch them anyplace
and they become vulnerable because the complexities. And then they will fix that one pipe.
But there are seven pipes in there that needed fixing but they haven't got order to fix the six,
so they fix the one. Now, having fixed that one pipe they then put together all the electrical
wiring at great expense; they put back on all the armor plate at great expense, you see; they
put everything back together again— you can't get at those six pipes now. And now they turn
on the water faucet and it runs and the ship fitter says, "Well, sir, the water faucet now runs."
"Very good, very good." The next day in the next cabin the water faucet there doesn't run. It's
called a white mutiny, it is the technical naval term for that. Do exactly what you're told and
don't do anything else.

And all the way from the top to the bottom a thetan will do this. He never gives up—
ever, never really gives up. No matter what state you eventually find him in at the bottom of
the barrel, he really has not given up. And he could look like he's given up. He could be down
on skid row, filled full of booze and that sort of thing, and what do you suppose this is? That's
a way of getting even, too, isn't it? Being no good; being a burden to the society, a liability,
setting a rotten example to everybody, and so forth. No, he hadn't given up. Not at all.

So, what— what accounts for production and that sort of thing? Well, the Russian state
right now, in its overthrow, only had one real liability in it, in that its people didn't have any-
thing. They had to buy enormous quantities of wheat just to feed people something, and they
had a lot of difficulty in keeping their economy going. And one of the reasons why they had
trouble in keeping their economy going is their collective farms didn't produce well. They had
a little law in there that they really couldn't quite get rid of, that every peasant or comrade or
whatever they call them these days, now had a little plot of land of his own, and he could raise
things on this little plot of land of his own and he could sell those. See, Russia even got back
the income tax not too long ago— they could sell all the produce on this little tiny plot of land,
you see. But he was mainly supposed to work on the collective farm. Well, Russia's food sup-
ply, and I don't know the exact figure and I don't think anybody else does, but is 60 or 70 per-
cent from these little tiny food plots. The bulk of their produce is coming from this privately
produced materials of life. Still running on private ownerships, you see, right there in the
middle of the communist state. And over at the collective farm, yeah, they sit on that tractor—
of course, it won't run— but they sit on there from 9 o'clock in the morning or whenever
they're supposed to work on through till about 5:30 and somebody comes around and says,
"Why isn't the tractor running?".

And they say, "Well, we don't have any parts."

And, "Well, why haven't you got any parts?"

"Well the gearshift went out the other day."

"Well, what happened to the gearshift?"

"Well, I don't know. It was just being worked. It was Ivan over there who was operating
it at the time and the gearshift went out. We need a new gearbox."
So, the head of the collective farm, of course, he is actually an elected character. They got democracy amongst them, too. So this bird, instead of being the commissar which he was once upon a time and so forth, is more or less an elected representative of those workers of the collectivism, you see. So, this bird, of course, has – is in the danger all the time of not being reelected to head of the collective farm by his own workers. I don't know how the Russian managed this because over his head is a commissar who has the right to shoot him dead. So, he's left at a point where the authority breaks down. He's in a pitiable position. He feels that he can't shoot anybody dead but he'll be shot dead unless things produce. So anyway, he passes on up the line and finds out that the same condition exists all the way up the line to the tractor factory. And the tractor factory, of course, exists right on out into the mines. This whole situation is awry all the way down the line. They can't get the spare part for the tractor.

Well, if this were an American farm or something, they'd go out and clip some pieces of baling wire off or something like that, and hold back one of these confounded gears that kept slipping into the other gears that were stripped and they'd wire it down in the gearbox, so that it couldn't mesh, don't you see. And they'd get a couple of gears that would mesh and they'd run the tractor in second gear from that time thereon with a frozen shift, don't you see? And I've seen them do this. You had to leap quick on this tractor because when you started it, it started to run. Clutch gone, you see so they just wired the drive shaft straight into the crankshaft.

You won't find that in Russia. Why? See, it's a sort of a white mutiny goes on all the time. They don't approve of this and they don't approve of that and so they're in revolt against the perfect state. This isn't a lecture against communism, it's just a statement of that. Be very nice if someone could invent a perfect society, you see.

But there are societies which are more perfect than others and I know perfection is not supposed to be – have grades or degrees. You know, "best" is not supposed to have a degree and "worst" is not supposed to have a degree and that sort of thing, whereas, as a matter of fact, life is full of these little shades of gray. And to attain an absolute then, in terms of conduct, by making everybody conform to Rule A and to attain this absolute by denying him – now, this is what's wrong, you see, it isn't actually, "Let's conform to Rule A," that's just an agreement, don't you see? But now, denying him by duress and continuously, any judgment or initiative with regard to Rule A.

Now, there's two things that makes managers or supervisors or something like that fight this. One is the person, before he knows Rule A, is very prone to violate it because he doesn't even know what he's violating. And he isn't going to get any result or get anything done or make a factory run or anything else because he doesn't even know there could be a Rule A, don't you see? So, he's just extrapolating off of nothing. He's just trying to figure out something from nowhere, don't you see, not being aware of the fact that there is an agreement on this point. Well, maybe he could figure out something better but it's his disagreement with everybody else who is running at that particular moment on Rule A that gets him in trouble. Well, he doesn't know of its existence.

Now, now – now, look at this difference. Now, he knows Rule A and becomes very good at this Rule A. He knows what Rule A is; he knows why it's there and he knows how to
exercise it; and he does something else and he gets away with it and it works. Do you see this? Well, that's not a mutiny; it's an improvement. He knows very well what Rule A is and he knows how to use Rule A and that sort of thing and he can still keep the agreement in with Rule A and he can still exercise his freedom of choice with regard to other factors with relationship to Rule A. It takes a – it takes a very well-trained, very skilled fellow to do that.

In auditing, if you took somebody in your HAS class and you said, "Well, you really don't have to follow a comm cycle, you know. That's just a..." We'll take a comm cycle as Rule A, you see, out of an auditing cycle. "And you don't – really don't have to follow this, you know."

And he says to himself, "I really don't have to follow this." So, he just sits there, and he doesn't say anything to the pc and he acknowledges in the middle of the pc's sentences and that sort of thing. You're going to have gobbledygook. And you aren't going to get any auditing done at all because this item does exist called an auditing cycle.

All right. Now, let's take the middle – the middle area of auditor training – the middle area, Level II, III and so on. You have to be, at that level, pretty awful careful that that auditing cycle is followed, man; that's really followed. This guy could follow it in his sleep. He knows what it is. Bang! Now, the reason he's following it is because he knows what it is. He knows why he has to follow it and he knows what results it gets when he does follow it and so forth. He's getting more experience on it and he is following it. And the auditing cycle at the other end of the line, why, he's very expert with his auditing cycle. He doesn't even think about using the auditing cycle while he's using the auditing cycle. He thinks about the pc and so forth.

Now, you take him on upstairs into very, very, very skilled, very experienced auditing – a very odd thing about it is, is occasionally one violates the auditing cycle, but you've got to be an awful skilled auditor to do that. The pc is saying, "Yappity-yappity-yap," and your sensitivity to the pc, you know exactly where the acknowledgment should be and you modify the acknowledgment by a little bit of nod, you know. And pc goes on, and so forth and so forth, and you find out the pc is answering this question now, one right after the other. He's giving you answer after answer or something like that. You know if he's – you can see this just blow. You've just hit some kind of a line charge on the thing. And if you said, "Yes!" and "Thank you!" every time he gave you one of these answers, you'd stop him cold in his tracks and you can see this thing blowing so you just sit there and let it blow, you know. And you give him a little wink of the eye and a nod and you still got that and so forth, "Mm-hm-mm," you know. There's no acknowledgments going on. The auditing cycle has gotten into too blurred a blow, don't you see? It's blowing too quick for anybody to do anything about it and he sits there and when the pc finally runs down, why, he now knows all about auditing cycles and that sort of thing – he sees the pc's run down. The pc hasn't got anything to say on that subject. He says, "All right." He said, "Thank you." See? He puts the intonation of voice. He's got different things now in his auditing cycle. He uses his auditing cycle.

Now, you can teach a fellow all about a violin and you say, "If you saw on the violin while holding your finger down at this particular point you get A," and I remind you that that doesn't make a Jascha Heifetz. It's very possible that Heifetz possibly, occasionally, doesn't
even touch a string at a particular place to make a particular note. Did you ever think about that? He possibly doesn't close the string at that particular place to make that note. He may very well find out he can just as easily make it on a harmonic on another string, or he can make two notes sound together – they sound just like the other note which you heard so it doesn't matter whether he hit the string at that point or not. In other words, this is... Don't you see? He can – he can render the effect with such ease and such virtuosity, and so forth, that if you were observing it, you – if you observed it very, very – if you were just listening to it, you'd think he was following all the rules but if you looked at it very, very closely, you'd find out he wasn't really following all the rules. Now, if he was following them, he'd be following them with variations.

Well, how well did he have to know the rules in order to follow them with variations? See, that's what gets interesting about all of this, and there is where the person comes a cropper who is trying to learn some subject or trying to follow out some industrial plan or something like that.

There are two conditions, which are a variation from the "must do it" – two conditions. And one is the condition of just total ignorance and rebellion which is based on aberration. You know, the manager is a blond. This guy was in the war and he killed a lot of German blonds, you see. He didn't like blonds, of course, so therefore, anything the manager says is wrong, you know. That's, "What wall?" So he doesn't even bother to find out what the plant's manufacturing. And yet he's supposed to be getting his coffee and cakes from this plant. He hasn't bought himself a job, he's bought himself a point from which he can revolt, don't you see? Management sees this! Management sees this and they say, "Shoot that guy from guns."

Well, that's a variation, don't you see? And the other end of it is, is – this happened one time down in south China when they were trying to industrialize – trying to industrialize China is one of the more amusing activities because, of course, industry puts people out of work and the Chinese have only one ambition and that is to get everybody – get everybody a job. Between these two things you get quite a clash. But they themselves have terrific production potentials. So, here's the Chinaman and he's got a – he makes tin cans. He's sawing out the tin for tin cans for Standard Oil down there in some southern China plant and this is before China went boom. And there's a guard on this band saw that he's sawing metal with, you see, that is a safety guard that keeps people from cutting their hands off, you know. So a new American manager took over this area, and he went through the plant and he saw this old Chinese standing there at this band saw and this fellow was sawing out pieces of tin that were to make tin cans, and he was going at it with great rate, and he saw no guard on the table so he said, "Yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, and where is that guard?" through the interpreter, and so forth.

Why, the old Chinese workman there, he said, "Oh, yes, yes, yes, there's a guard. There it is, it's down underneath the table there."

"Just make sure it's on the machine."

They picked it up and put it on the machine, and so on. "Is that where it belongs?"

"Oh, yes, yes. Well, that's it."
"Oh, you make sure you leave it there."

And he came through the next day and the guard was back underneath the table. So, he got ahold of the interpreter and he got ahold of the couple of foremen around there and he said, "I want that guard on that table of that band saw because somebody's going to cut their hand off on the band saw, you see, and that guard prevents them from cutting their hand off, and it's an automatic control so that nothing can go into it but the piece of tin." And he explained it all to them with terrific rationale and reason and all this sort of thing and they put the guard back on the table and everybody said, "Yes," and went away very happily, and he came through on his inspection the next day and the guard was underneath the table. So, he explained to everybody where this guard belonged and he himself put the guard on the table that time. He was thinking very seriously about this – about the revolutionary spirit which must exist in this particular plant and it was all centering around this old workman. Well, he was making a fool out of himself. Of course, the end of the story is that after the seventh or eighth day of the same performance and so forth, he just walked on by the band saw table without even mentioning the absence of the guard on it that particular day, you see. The old Chinese had won.

The sense of the thing is, is he had a – he had a highly skilled workman there and this guy could have probably sawed tin into scallops and scrolls and done anything else he wanted to do with this band saw, and of course, this guard was from – for some knuckleheaded – knuckleheaded kid that might be doing his job, but let's notice that the knuckleheaded kid wasn't doing the job; it was being done by a skilled workman, and the necessity of this guard was absolutely nonexistent because if we looked carefully at the old Chinese workman we would have found he had all of his fingers, hands and arms. He'd been working it for five or six years and he still had all of his fingers, hands and arms, and he hadn't had any guard on the band saw either, so you would have thought somebody would have used some sense.

So, it requires sense from the person who is handing out or enforcing the rules and it requires skill and observation and judgment on the other side, to make anything work, simply because there are no perfect solutions.

Now, I don't care whether you're making a great – biggest piece of machinery in the world work, or whether or not you're just teaching somebody to swab off windows on a skyscraper, or something like this, with a piece of cloth. You can lay down all the rules in the world and all these rules are very sensible, but after a guy's understood these rules and after he's understood what the job is, and that sort of thing, to keep going around asking him if he has had his safety belt tested for its stress analysis, and so forth, at the local plant testing office in the last sixteen days – it's supposed to be tested every sixteen days or something like this, and so on. Well, at that point we have to decide – it must – somebody must believe they're dealing with a fool. This guy's not going to be on the 45th-floor window, with a weak safety belt. And he doesn't test it at the plant test room. When he hooks it on – when he hooks it on and starts to do his job, before he even he goes out on a window ledge, he usually puts his foot against the wall and goes crunch! you know, back against the belt. "Oh, that's – that's good today. That's good, you know." He comes down, he said – one day he said, "I gotta have a new belt." Well, the plant testing room tested the new belt. They're liable to get something like this: "Well, I don't care what the hell it has to do with the plant testing room but it so
happens that this belt has a weak point on it. I don't care what they think, it's what I say and so forth. If you don't believe me, you don't have to like it." Anybody in charge of the job who was very clever – an experienced workman says, "I need a new belt," they'd just say, "All right. Here's a new belt."

Young kid comes up, has no experience at all. Everything's been passed, tested and standard and he had no experience. He hasn't anything with this and he says, "Oooooooh, I-I-I-I-I got an old belt here. It's got a grease stain on it, see. I-I got an old b-belt here and I-I-I-I-I th-th-think it's awful unsafe and I'd better have a new – n-new belt." Don't you see?

You say, "What's a belt for?"

"Well, it's to keep you from falling."

"Oh, yeah. Well, what else is it for?"

"Well, I don't know."

Of course, it's leaned back against so you can get yourself some pressure against the window in order to put a polish on the window, you know. Why, he doesn't even know what a belt's for. How does he know whether he needs a new belt or not? He can't use the one he's got.

This is quite normally what happens to amateurs in photography. They can't use the camera they got so they always got to have a new camera which is their fixation on buying 50,000 new cameras every fifteen minutes. It's quite a different operation from somebody who's trying to get a camera that grooves in easily and it goes snap, pop and doesn't give him any trouble. Because he knows he's trying to get a certain result and the certain result which he's trying to get, he cannot squeeze out of the exact equipment which he's got. Well, all right.

Now we've got some reason for shifting, but we're shifting from the viewpoint of virtuosity. The fellow can already do this. Do you follow that? He knows, in other words, what he's trying to lay his hands on and, of course, he's also knowledgeable enough that if he gets hold of equipment that doesn't particularly service him or pick out this result or he can't hang back together again… You'd laugh, I got a new camera the other day, and putting it together, and so forth, and it didn't function at all, so I put it full of gaskets – oh yes, I have a piece of news – I graduated in earnest. [applause] Thank you.

But I put a – I put a piece – a couple pieces of cardboard underneath the lens mount to hold it out another thousandth of an inch or something like that so it focuses properly and it's a piece of ordinary cardboard. If anybody were to buy that camera they'd probably be horrified because they'd open up the lens mount and they'd see there was an old piece of cardboard stuck in there and they'd wonder what this old piece of cardboard was and they'd say that doesn't belong there so they'd pull it out and then their camera wouldn't work.

I was just taking some pictures a few minutes ago. I didn't have any parallax corrector for it. I knew about what the parallax must have been on the camera so I put my thumb underneath the finder and tipped the finder up about what the parallax would be which I, you know, which I thought was about an eighth of an inch above where the thing should have been. But taking pictures holding a loose, flopping finder would have given you fits. You understand
what I mean? When I say parallax I mean the lens takes one picture and the finder sees another picture. So you got to make the finder see what the lens is going to take. Well when they don't -- when they don't true up one for the other and so forth, the normal course of human events is to just grit your teeth and bear it and wonder why your pictures have all the people's heads cut off in them, don't you see? Well, this finder's loose so what you do instead of putting the finder down where it belongs you know, the viewfinder, because it doesn't agree with the lens, why, just sort of hold it there in your fingers and look through it, you see, balanced at an angle which you guess might possibly be the proper angle with the lens so it's looking at the same thing the lens is looking at and therefore you're not cutting somebody's head off. When you get a finder that's extreme this way, it's much more accurate just to -- just to sort of hold the finder in your hand. You could get down to a point where it would be actually more accurate to dispose -- dispense with the finder entirely, don't you see? And you say, "Well, there -- this edge of this camera lines up with the upper right-hand corner of the picture so we'll just squint along the edge of the camera and say -- well that'll be the upper right-hand corner of the picture," snap! See?

Well, how could you do that? Well, you'd have to know the theory of what you were trying to do, you see. And you know -- have to know what you -- why it was happening and you'd have to know what was going on and what was liable to go on particularly, what was liable to happen if you didn't do something about it, you see. You'd have to know the whole game all the way around the line. Not a rule you could quote about parallax. "Parallax is the logarithm of the wizirods as they go into the wuclabugs." It's actually, of course, different for every distance. You go another inch, the parallax between the finder -- this works on box camera, too, you see your finder's up here, your lens is down here. So of course, the picture you take is looked at up here, the lens is taking the picture that is looked at down here. They're two different pictures. Cut people's heads off so therefore, you're really -- in lots of cases as you get up close to things -- much better off never to look through the finder. Going give you a false picture.

But you'd have to know that, see? You'd have to know that existed; you'd have to know well enough that it did exist, that you didn't suddenly find out you had forgotten to remember it just afterwards, do you understand? And then all of this stuff about parallax becomes very -- very uncomplicated. Why, it doesn't amount to -- to lots, see.

But when you were studying it, my God, how you sweated over this -- "What was this thing, what was the formula, how did the coincidence, what's the difference between the axis of the lens and the axis of the finder and what is the formula that you apply and work on -- on your slide rule, you see, brrrrr, and what are the various rules that relate to this thing, huh-huhuhuhuh," you know? He's having an awful time with it, you know? And then you'd get up so you'd be very, very careful about this, "Does this camera have parallax and this camera doesn't have parallax. This corrects its parallax and that doesn't correct its parallax ooohooohooo, good." And you get up through your total confusions about that sort of thing.

After a while you take a big view camera, hold it up in the air, squint over the corner edge of the thing and shoot it simply because you know that the lens is going to view what appears on the film. You know that -- you know that very well now and you also know there's
lots of ways by which this is not likely to happen. So when in doubt, you just short cut all these ways.

So the amateur, busily trying to make his achievement or attainment or something like this, is trying to get something else to do it or get the perfect instrument to do it. He's trying to get the perfect instrument to do it. I was looking over cameras the other night, it was very interesting to me to find out that I already had a camera that was doing better than any of the cameras I was looking for in spite of the fact that it was very far from a perfect camera. These other cameras were much more expensive. But it was very far from a perfect camera – the camera that was better than those other cameras, by sorting out all of the angles, all of the little liabilities.

For instance, when you vary the speed at which you take a picture you don't know where you are, if that's always variable because you have to take a picture very quickly in order not to get any motion in it and most of the blurs which you get in your pictures are from motion. They're not from anything else. They're not the grain of the film or any complicated reason whatsoever. It's just because you're waving it around like a red banner on high, don't you see, at the time you were taking the picture. So, the way to get over this is take a picture very fast. Well, if your picture's going to be very fast one moment and very slow the next moment and you're not going to know about it then you could never take a picture without blur. And you know the most expensive cameras made today are fixed up so the shutter speed varies. In other words, so they don't know whether you're taking a picture fast; you don't know whether you're taking it slow. And that's true of most of these automatic cameras. So, that's why a pro really wants nothing to do with an automatic camera he can't control. That's one of the reasons. There are a dozen more, too.

But look at – I'm just giving you this as a progress of rules. At first you run into this thing called parallax and it's as puzzling as the first time you heard me use the word, see. And then you find out that's just a parallelism between the lens and the finder and you find out finally that the lens is looking at one picture and you, through the viewfinder, are looking at another picture and that these are not the same picture. So there's a thing called parallax correction which the closer the object gets to you, the more the finder has to be tipped over to see the same relative view, you see? And you get this through your head. Now, you've got the formulas involved with this thing; now you get how this happens; now, you've got all the methods of correcting it; now you've got this and now you've got that and now you've got these other things. Now you're getting into a very complex subject. Well, by the time you've mastered this whole subject, why, you now, finally, come out the other end of the line and you don't correct parallax or figure out parallax anymore, you know about what the thing would be, you squint over the top of the box and you find out there's one line of the camera that is always parallel to the lens – film line and that more or less occurs up in the top right-hand corner of your picture and that you can squint along that. You wouldn't even need a finder. But look – look, you'd have to come through all of that to come up to a point of virtuosity.

So you see there are two breeds of variation. There are two things that are variable and one of those things is sheer ignorance, just crash! Unbelievable ignorance and unfamiliarity. There's no familiarity with it – they haven't got a clue, you see. All right. And there's the other
kind which is a variation which stems from familiarity and knowledge. There's hardly a good
cook in the world makes it up according to the recipes, you see, anymore. They take a couple
of eggs – they may be very precise, but they take these eggs and they throw them in one di-
rection, another direction, and so forth, and they say, "Cookbook, cookbook? Oh dear, haven't
cooked out of a cookbook for years," you know. Beautiful cake.

When you try to shoot that one down, you're in trouble because that's got experience,
familiarity, judgment; the individual has earned the right to vary it. I told Graflex Camera
Company that – one of the oldest camera companies in America the other day in a letter, very
insouciant – I was writing the letter and I said, "I see that you have invented a new camera
term. But having been in business as many years as you have, you have a perfect right." This
really got a laugh out of them. They recognize they have a perfect right to invent a new term
for a camera. Perfectly valid. You'll find the term's going to be used every place very shortly.
They have a perfect right to. They're familiar enough with them. But some Johnny-come-
lately company that wouldn't really know cameras and wasn't making a good camera anyhow,
they put a new term out on the market – I wouldn't pay any attention to it, see? That's your
difference.

Now, when a management makes no differentiation between these two things, whether
in a company or a political area, or a training area or anything of this sort; when nobody
makes a differentiation between these two things, these two reasons for variation, then judg-
ment is denied the individual and from that point on you really get in trouble. You can handle
that first one – the first kind, the sheer stupidity, with duress because you're being helped by
all of life. The person does the action wrong through stupidity, they're in trouble. They don't
get the result. Everything goes to hell anyhow – if you can pardon my French. Life is assisting
you in punishing them, see. It's a sort of a Q and A. Well, they're going to get their heads
blown off. All right, blow their heads off. You know. Well, all right.

Now, you could use then a certain amount of coercion, a certain amount of persuasion
and so forth, to get people through that point, make them see that there is something there.
And very often this is very hard to do. An Instructor very often finds this in teaching that it is
quite rough getting across that early point, see. Well, right here, pc's getting no better but the
auditor hasn't observed the fact that he isn't following an auditing comm cycle. Auditor some-
times sits there for five, ten minutes, you know, and never says, "Yes." Pc's also not talking.
Nothing is happening so auditing isn't working. Well, a certain amount of coercion is neces-
sary at this point, or persuasion or something of this sort, to trace the source and cause of this
no action in the auditing session. Do you follow? All right, that's training.

Now, the Instructor who, carrying through somebody all the way and passing him suc-
cessfully all the way and their understanding is up all the way – to let us say Class VI – and
then calling to the attention of a Class VI Auditor, whose pc was running like a startled ga-
zelle, that he was not following the auditing cycle, would be pure idiocy. This fellow was
following as much of the auditing cycle as is necessary to resolve the case. He's using it with
judgment.

So you'd have an entirely different viewpoint. Your viewpoint of what was going on
would be different because of your knowledge of the person's experience. You'd say, "We're
dealing here with virtuosity. We're not dealing here with stupidity and ignorance." Now, almost everybody confuses these things, and what messes it all up is the fellow who is ignorant very often considers himself very virtuous. "Oh yes, I'm – I can drive cars beautifully," he says, as he goes over the embankment and into the gully.

And also what gets it fouled up is no matter how great your virtuosity on some subject is, you every once in a while have a catastrophe. This is, after all, this universe. People are, after all, people. And you also once in a while will run into some unexpected turn in the road that – such – nobody could have done anything about it at all. It was absolutely beyond any power known to man to have averted what happened.

Well, now, virtuosity simply is measured by how quick is the recovery. We simply measure that. So we find somebody has made a colossal, screaming blunder in the first half-hour of his session, horrible blunder in the first half-hour of his session and it's still a blunder, still in full force two-and-a-half hours deep in the session. Oh well, there must not have been very much virtuosity involved here because the recovery wasn't quick, don't you see. Guy who knows his business, recovers quick. A guy who knows his business doesn't always never make mistakes – to give you a double negative. But that also confuses the situation.

So, does a person know his business or doesn't he, is what has got to be decided. And this is decided on the basis of result. Is the person obtaining his results or isn't he? And you can assume then that a person who is protesting against the rules – and this is a very easy measure – protesting the duress with which he's being made to follow the rules, who is himself getting results, duress or no duress, don't you see, we can assume that we must be dealing with a considerable virtuosity here. But a person who is protesting against all the rules and isn't getting any results, we must assume that he should have had more rules, not less. Because what we're dealing with here – we must be dealing with ignorance. You see, his departure from the rules does not result in a – in a – in a better gain – a better end product. His departure from the rules always winds up in catastrophe and when he makes one of these catastrophes and so forth, his recovery is absolutely zero. See? He not only goes over the cliff, but he never gets back up the cliff either. Now, that person protesting against the rules is the only fellow who gives management, instruction, running states and so forth the bad, duressful character that these things develop. It isn't the state that develops it. It's this bird. He doesn't know what he's doing. He doesn't know where he's going. He doesn't know why he's going there. He hasn't a clue and yet he's agin it. And to get anything done you go across his dead body. And the only difficulty is he never dies.

There's only one way that you could ever pick him up or ever get the show on the road or anything like that and that is to pick him up and that is the one thing which a very stupid management, state or instructor would never try to do. They would never try to pick this boy up. They want this guy in concentration camps; they want this bird starving; they want this bird way downhill, don't you see. So, it's actually their combat with ignorance that's giving them trouble. Their combat with ignorance is what gives them the trouble and which gives them the broadest excuse to use force and duress and so forth. Now, when we move this back over onto the other side and they are foolish enough to go into combat with virtuosity, now they put leadership to the revolution and we have a new Khrushchev tomorrow.
There are only two types of people who were ever exported to this planet. There were distinctly two types – the very stupid criminal, destructive personality and the genius. These two personalities without any gradient between them of any kind whatsoever is the total export to this planet and comprises the population of this particular planet. There's no in between. Anybody who says there is an average human being, an average which end of the scale human being would be what you would have to ask. I could tell you long stories concerning that particular line, but it's both those people, you see, give an unthinking stupid state (which believes that it has the perfect political answer) the only trouble – one is reactive and the other, however, happens to be intelligent self-determined trouble.

When you run into intelligent self-determined trouble and try to handle it with force, this of course, is handling thought with mass and it just doesn't handle very well and everything starts going up in small plumes of smoke, because the biggest power the individual has is his own power of choice – his own self-determinism. And this expresses itself in the very stupid, the very ignorant as well as the very brilliant. Only when it expresses itself in the very stupid, it expresses itself in total destruction and when it expresses itself in the very bright it expresses itself in the terms of a total volte-vis for all the forces involved in the situation. In other words, you just stay and change the whole lousy lot – volte-vis, about face – French military command. So, do you see?

So, somebody has decided, on careful consideration, that we are not running in a perfect condition and we're – that condition has become sufficiently imperfect to merit a change. This is on due consideration, not on a reactive consideration and then follows the thing on through with a well-ordered program and that changes the whole ruddy lot. Nothing much to that. And generally this individual will accumulate to himself a lot of other individuals who are on the upper strata of being able to shift things around and change the whole bloody lot.

Yeah, but this would be a revolution which would normally come about on an evolutionary basis. It would come about rather easily. It would come about rather inevitably. There wouldn't be anybody being able to stand up to it very good and all the other people who just revolt would probably revolt then, too, at the same time unless it were alleviated and things worked a little bit better in their particular direction in which time they wouldn't be likely to do so. But why did they have to stay stupid and that is our question in Scientology. Why do they have to remain in that particular debased condition? A lot of other such questions as that.

Therefore, this gives you some kind of a view of what you're handling when you're handling pcs and moving them on up the scale. When they move up through levels with great unfamiliarity, they say, "I want to have a shot in the gluteus maximus with a number 22 needle on a plastic syringe with the spot anaesthetized first, you see, and that will make me an OT," and here we go into the wild blue yonder. And you run into this bird and you run into lots of them, see, and he's going to be an OT in the next three minutes because you're going to wave a magic wand. In the first place, the factor which he neglects utterly is becoming an OT has to do with his own power of self-determinism, power of choice, power of observation. That's him that's going to become an OT, you see. That's not you. And if you waved a magic
wand that caused this sort of thing to happen it would just result in a further effect on him – an effect to such a degree he wouldn't be likely to get over it.

In Asia, poor old Buddha tried to pick up man and waved a few too many magic wands and turned the Asians into utter complete debase slaves for about 2,500 years. I think it's rather – the most – most horrible example of a guy's postulates going wrong way to that I ever heard of. He would be utterly shocked and probably is every time he takes a look at a bunch of these brass images sitting around, you know. "How…" he'd say, "No, I wasn't talking about that, ooooooooow!" you know. It's probably a matter of total outrage, you know. And a fella down here in Asia Minor, where they're always having trouble, sent a bunch of swine over a cliff and turned some fish to leaves, and so forth – into loaves of bread or did something remarkable and everybody went, "Gosh," you know. And 1,964 years later, see, everybody is still overwhumped. And you know I don't think that bloke was trying to do that at all?

[laughter] Well, so much for the twenty-two gauge needle into the gluteus maximus and you're OT tomorrow, see. Just result in further overwhelm.

Now, the unreality and unfamiliarity of the situation; the fellow doesn't realize he's got a road to walk and he hasn't got a clue of what he's walking into and he therefore says to you as an auditor, he says, "Well, all I want you to do is to put me on the pad and light the fuse and here I go," you know.

Well, man, you can put him on the pad and you could light the fuse but after it burned out he'd be just a little more carbonized. [laughter, laughs]

Therefore, we get really the unpopularity of levels because there's an unfamiliarity with the road that's to be walked so therefore we don't say much about it to pcs and I think the less we say about it to pcs the better off we're going to be. I'm talking about pcs here, there and every place, don't you see. I don't think this is a profitable line of progress at all because their unfamiliarity doesn't teach them that they have to go anyplace.

Here's this guy sitting here – here's this guy sitting here saying, "Well, are you having any trouble?"

"Well, I really don't have a great deal of trouble except with breakfast food and so forth. I always have a lot of trouble with breakfast food. It makes me throw up," and so on.

"Well, do you have any more trouble?"

"Well, yes, I have about two or three different jobs a year. I keep getting sacked."

You say, "Well, isn't that a lot of trouble?"

"Well, no, the state, you know, kind of takes care of it between times and so it's really no real trouble to me."

"Ah well, what about your marital situation?"

"Well, um – oh that. Well, I try not to think about that."

"Well, all right. Now, at the beginning of this session here, do you have any present time problems? Is there anything worrying you here in present time?"

"No, no, not really. Nothing really worrying me."
Well, you happen to know that he's about to be thrown in jail tomorrow, you see, for something of the sort. You say, "How about that?"

"Well," he says, "that's just fate." [laughter] Then he says, "Well, what I want you to do is make me into an OT so that I can totally escape out the bottom."

His comprehension of the situation, you see, hasn't anything to do with the fact that he has anything to do with these problems, that he has anything to do with his environment, that it's necessary for him to become slightly causative in his environment and even in the auditing session – at least able to talk to the auditor. Goodness heavens, we've got to – yeah, he's got to be able to project himself at least those three feet to a sympathetic listener, before he projects himself from here to Arcturus. [laughter]

So, you have levels. I told you I wasn't going to describe the levels today. I'm going to try to tell you the sense behind them. Well, that's the sense behind them. And that's really much – all there is to it. You've got to get the guy up to a point where he can talk to an auditor enough and tolerate control enough and be keyed-out enough of the glutinous mass he's sitting in so he's under sufficient discipline – as far as an auditor is concerned – to go through the motions necessary to confront the very real objects of the bank necessary to run out to resolve his case. And that may take quite a while. That may take quite a while.

Technically, the easiest thing to do on something like this is to unburden the case by getting locks off and you do this by first unburdening the session environment – you know, you got to educate him a little bit, tell him what he's supposed to do, get him used to be able to talk to the auditor. Well, I started to audit somebody just a few months ago and was very shocked to realize that I was – was startled that I had not estimated the situation because this person is apparently very glib all the time and this person was not willing to talk to me as an auditor at all. I had no session. I had no session. I was actually trying to do something for this person and I had no session and I had overestimated the ability of that case to project, you know, to talk, communicate and so forth. So, it was startling to have made the mistake, don't you see? Don't often make a mistake like this, you see. Person was perfectly willing to talk about all the social subjects under the sun, moon and stars but not willing to talk to an auditor. Not about anything, you see, just not willing to talk to an auditor. And you thought I was going to say about personal subjects – no, no. Was willing to talk about all the social subjects under the sun, moon and stars but not willing to talk to an auditor. Not about anything, you see, just not willing to talk to an auditor. And you'd have to ask, "What would you be willing to talk to me about?"

"I guess I don't know."

Probably you'd keep that up for – for hours. And all of a sudden the person's considerations with regard to this would have come into view and we would have had to straighten up the subject of auditing and we would have found some unhappy experience with regard to some such associated thing. We would have gotten this by itsa; we probably would have found a little bit of difficulties they had had and worries they had had which hadn't been straightened out by some similar subject to Scientology. We'd gradually get them to talk to the auditor, see. We don't care what they're talking about. We'd find these other things were there and we'd gradually get them so they're talking to the auditor. Huhuhuh.
All right, now, we've got the thing of what are they supposed to do now – this was just itsa, see – now what are they supposed to do. Well, the auditor says something and they're supposed to do something so you pick out something very simple that you say and they say and then you okay.

Now, you could even teach them what an auditing cycle was and so forth and this is a rudiment. When you tell them to touch the chair you want them to touch the chair. You have to explain this to them, and so forth. Don't just leave it all on automatic and so on, and so forth. And you finally get it – you finally get this thing up so that they can be audited. Got the idea? They're sessionable, or something. Invent a new word as though we don't have enough.

And they're quite auditable and they haven't been audited on anything really. You think, "Well, we must have made quite a bit of progress on the case because the case did mention that they had been in the Holy Rollers and they hadn't done anything for him so that must have cleaned that..." Oh brother, no, they probably won't hit that again until they're up there about Level IV. Leave it alone. You haven't got any clue to this case yet. So, case is just able to be audited that's all. We've achieved this now.

Now, can we audit the case so he isn't so disturbed with the immediate present time problems he has at this moment all the time in his environment? Let's handle that environmental situation. What PTPs is he running into? And we're not going to do anything very deep about these PTPs. We're just going to get them counted. Let's get him to look over these things. Let's get him to look over problems and so forth. Now, let's get the session – now, to go over the steps again – let's get the sessions, so it can run. Get the pc so the pc can be in a session and respond in a session and not be upset about the auditor or the – or some kind of a room in a session, straighten this up, see, so get that step.

Now, let's get the environment so the pc can be audited on the immediate present time environment. Do you realize that's a little bit different than auditing him on the environment. No, no, he's not auditable yet on his environment. He hasn't got his environment sufficiently disentangled to know what to look at in the environment. He'd be in a total confusion all the time. You said, "All right, now this big problem, you're talking all the time about your wife and so forth."

He said, "Aoooh, aooohahh, I-I-I-I don't kn-n-n-ow that we'd better go into that. Heh, heh, heh, heh-h-h, ooooh."

You say, "What's the matter? What's the matter?"

"Oh, it wouldn't do any good."

So, in other words, without making – without straightening out his orientation on his environment, we start to audit him on his environment. We picked out one thing in the environment. It overwhelmed him at once because all these things were in the matter of stuff. In other words, we didn't straighten this boy's environment out so it could be audited.

We could do this as simply as, "All right, now, give me the parts of your environment." We do a case assessment on the environment, you see. But it's not real case assessment because it's not going to be done with a meter or anything else. We're just going to sit there
and say, "All right, what's your life all about? Now, what are the various parts of this environment," you know, "that you live in?"

"Well, you're a part of it." That'll come off pretty quick. "And then there's my job. You know sometimes I have the feeling my job is a good place to escape to."

Of course, at this moment if you've said, "All right, now what problems do you have about your job?" you'd just be doing a Q and A because we're trying to straighten out the environment, don't you see? I mean — well, all right, he's got a job, all right, see. He comes to that. He doesn't — it's a good place to escape to. All right, that's fine. "All right, now, what are the other parts of your environment?" and so forth.

And way down at the end of the line someplace he, all of a sudden, mentions his parents. They live with him. But we've heard about this guy and we've heard about this guy and we've heard about him, we've listened to this guy and so forth, and so forth and he just never mentioned the fact that his parents live with him. And that his wife and five children and his parents live in this two-room house. [laughter] He just never seems to — he neglects to have told us all this, don't you see? Well, he himself by the way has never confronted it, you know. And while he's telling you, if you've straightened out his environment anything up to that point — as I say this is down toward the tail end of getting his — parts of his environment named and straightened out, put in their proper — you don't realize it, you see, but his job sits over there within a foot outside that door. I ain't talking about a crazy person now; I'm talking about a pretty good guy off the street. And his — his entertainment, you see, his entertainment is over here just back of that wall don't you see — the theater he normally goes to and he's sort of sitting in his own office while he's sitting in the auditing room, you see. His environment's confused. Well, you get this — just get these things spotted. Just where are they and what is all this about and where do you live and what do you do and that sort of thing. Well, you're getting his environment auditable.

Now — now, that you've got that all straightened out and you've found out these various things, you'll find out that he's making good case progress along this line if you aren't pushing him too hard. Now, you maybe can start auditing the environment. "Now, what problems do you have in this environment?"

"Oh, well, yeah, I do have problems in this environment, I..." and so forth and he starts to ease in and he starts listing this problem and that problem. You finally find that he's named a problem that he can't seem to get his mind off of — *vooh, boom, chug*, you know. He's stuck with that one, you know.

Well, you could be so feather light as to say, "All right. Well, what communications didn't you complete with that?"

"Oh, gee. Well, you see I never wanted to communicate with it at all, you see, so..." And he gives you a long list of communications with regard to that problem that he himself has never completed and you don't even bother to get the overts off. See. That's rather accusative after all. Too light, you got to handle it too light.
"Oh, are there a lot of communications you didn't complete about that problem?" That problem doesn't bother him now. All right. There's a lot of other of these things and you get all those things straightened out with similar feather-touch processes.

Now, now, we've got the period from this auditing session to the next auditing session somewhat cared for so that it isn't always going to be coming up in the next auditing session, don't you see. Now, we've straightened that out. Even though it took us several sessions, we got that straight, don't you see. What are we doing? We're expanding the perimeter. Comes from the auditing, what is auditing; expands out into the environment, what is the environment – just that, you know – to the problems of the environment, you see and we're now involving the case. Now, the case is getting involved. That is to say we're coming up against the outer perimeters really of the reactive bank now.

Now, after we've done all that, we want to know something about the person's past and future. Ah, but we're going out into two different spheres now – isn't it? Well, you know you could, you – if you're going to audit a person on his past, ARC Straightwire is so wonderful, simply because it orients the past. It's just the person, you know, there it is, you know, there it was. If you say, "Give me a date out of your past," you'd be doing almost the same thing, by the way. "Give me a date out of your past and where was that?" "Yeah, what – what date can you remember something happening on – out of the past – where?" It wouldn't matter what you were doing, you're carrying this same area and zone of familiarity, you see, into the past. Do you follow that?

Well, when you had him up to that line, why, then maybe you start him at Class II – pardon me, what's now Class I materials which is repetitive commands and auditing cycle, and so forth. Now you didn't think he got anyplace – you thought he got a long way didn't you? He hasn't gotten anyplace at all but he's just now in a state – I said II, I because actually II has just been downgraded to I and I was talking out of force of habit. Your HQS is Level I now. You have some new of them – one of these. The reason why is, is we needed room at the top.

HQS – repetitive processes – is Level I. It's not Level II now. I know, you say, it's changed. Well, let me call it to your attention it was never broadly released because of that. See, I'm – and I told you – been telling you for quite a while this is in a state of flux and study. I keep telling you exactly where do we fit in these various points in order to bring off these various points. In other words, where do we fit in these various levels? Where has the guy got to go in order to get into these various levels? And it's a pretty hard thing to figure out. So the finalized result is all we're talking about.

The guy can now stand a repetitive process. The guy can now sit there and run on automatic, is all I'm talking to you about, you see. He can have the auditing question asked him again and again and again and he can answer this and he can involve his mind with this, he can blow locks, he can get rid of a lot of things, don't you see, and so forth and he's flying – he's auditable. And I will say that it is to our shame that some 80 or 90 percent of our pcs have never been brought up to a point of where their environment was sufficiently straightened out. They had been brought up to the point where they were sufficiently straightened out to be audited in the room but they – always picking up PTPs between sessions because their
environment has never been even oriented enough to address, so their problems have never been handled enough, so we're always faced at the beginning of sessions with PTPs and where auditing becomes very involved, very complicated and very upsetting and you can't really get on with the process and what you're all doing is – what you're doing there is getting tangled up with the pc's disorientation in his own environment. He doesn't know what problems he does have. Now, they keep coming up and smashing him in the face and so forth, between sessions and you try to carry on in sessions, and so forth. In other words, we haven't lifted the auditability of a person very high.

Now, if you run this person on up into, let us say, healing – Clay Table Healing now and you're going to heal up some of their body conditions and that sort of thing – their environment is so confused and from session to session it's going to – first their auditing could itself as a session – and the conditions for being audited are so confused they couldn't be audited at all. Well, *bluh*. That goes without saying, you see. Their environment's so confused that from session to session we can't make them make any real progress. They keep going back downhill again. That's because their environment has never been straightened out.

Now, you're straightening out something that they have been worried about – their body, Clay Table Healing – health, that sort of thing. We're getting them so that they can live and not be so worried about pains and somatics in their body that every time they get a little somatic from their upper level auditing they don't all of a sudden start going into a screaming fit of terror because their body might be destroyed right on the spot. And you, of course, get rid of their hidden standards and that sort of thing as a result.

You move on up then into healing and then you're handling the locks of the reactive bank – the GPMs, you're just handling locks, locks, locks, locks, locks, locks, locks and you just handle them by the ton and the person isn't into the actual bank and hasn't been sent down the line – then the bank itself straightens out sufficiently so that it could be audited. You might find the person going onto whole track at that particular point, and so forth so you're really including a bit of Level V in.

When you get up into your R6 however, you want to make sure that that person's reactive bank is sufficiently unburdened, the GPMs are lying out there like a doggone long parade all ready to go *bzu-bzu-bzu*. You haven't got the fifteenth tangled with the first and that sort of thing. The only reason they're tangled up is he's so disoriented himself he can't put his attention on it.

You try to run somebody on R6 when he hasn't been brought up the levels, you're going to be in trouble all the way. Because he isn't auditable. And a great deal can go wrong at R6 and he's insufficiently under control for you to put it right. So that's a very difficult situation that you walk yourself into.

Those are the levels. Those are the reasons for the levels. And the individual revolt that I was talking to you about, he revolts against what you're trying to do. He doesn't understand what you're trying to do. Well, give him some chance to find out what you're trying to do and give him some… Let him – let him get his feet wet before you throw him into the icy drink, you know. Let's get him – get some familiarity on it and if any variations occur as you
go on up the level, let them be from the level of intelligence and self-determinism merely than from reactive revolt.

I have spoken – Thank you.
THE FAILED CASE

A lecture given on 27 October 1964

Thank you.

Now, this is what date?

_Audience_: October 27.

August, you were saying?

_Audience_: October.

October 27th.

Now, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. You're going to have a good lecture today for a change! (Joke.) I have to get these jokes in, you see, because... And the name of the lecture is "The Failed Case."

You're about to have put in your paws, _The Book of Remedies_, which takes all of these failed cases and all you have to do is look up and find out what your pc is doing and what's gone wrong, and it tells you what to do. And if you follow the directions intelligently, why, you'll find out the case ceases to be a failed case in almost all instances.

This lecture that I am giving you has some bits and pieces of that in it but is mostly devoted to the – or in part – devoted to the real failed case that will fail in any event. There is such a case and I have begun to understand this of recent times: that we cannot totally, 100 percent... Now, there's always going to be a failed case. You can just make up your mind to that and you can get just as starry-eyed as you want to in saving the whole of the human race and so forth, but you're still going to collide with the totally failed case. And the reason for this, I must make very clear right at the outset, does not lie with the auditor and does not lie with Scientology, does not lie with technology.

Let's begin at the beginning on this. Along about 1954 I went into a spate of research on the subject of people who had turned against Dianetics and Scientology. And I tried to find a common denominator amongst these people by which they could be understood. So I looked them over very carefully and I listed their names and so forth. And I finally was able to collect irrefutable evidence – something you couldn't contest – that about twenty-one different people had been in Dianetics and Scientology but had been, during that entire period, very active against Dianetics and Scientology and it's caused a great deal of trouble for us.

And so then I made it my business to run down these blokes. And I got up to seventeen names. You've heard of this little project before. I've never laid it out to this degree, because frankly I never really understood it until the other day – not in its total entirety. Its first
echelon is very easy to understand. Seventeen of that twenty-one had criminal records. I thought that that was very, very significant. I thought that was very, very interesting. Because these people had all had auditing. And the other common denominator is they had had no case change – no slightest, faintest case change.

The reason why I haven't got twenty-one criminal records is because I got tired of looking them up at number seventeen. Because they had so far, all the way up the line, been one for one. This was a totally failed case.

Well, I started thinking the other day – no, not the other day, a few months ago – on the subject of case remedies and put together this *Book of Case Remedies*. And I have to add to it this little addendum – this is not in *The Book of Case Remedies*; it is mentioned in passing, but it is a very highly specialized type of case. And the other day I realized what the other factor was – the other factor with this totally failed case. Now, he doesn't have to be a totally failed case; that is to say, you *could* do something to make it not a totally failed case, do you understand, if you understood the mechanics of what would otherwise be a totally failed case. Do you und… do you follow me?

But this is as far south – as far south as you can get is no communication possible of any kind whatsoever. That, by the way, just goes south of the English language and actually goes south of what you normally call unconsciousness. It goes into a – almost a total absence. Because you can take a puppy dog, you know, and you can process that puppy dog up tone the like of which you never heard of, you know? Well, that doesn't require any language. See? So you could – processing exceeds language. And right now, knowing that people get hung up on definitions in study and that sort of thing, well, hurrah! We've now exceeded language, don't you see? So what does this case do that is the failed case?

Now, you in the kindness of your heart are always thinking about his past and you're always willing to give somebody a break and not hold his past against him. But you're not dealing with the man's past and that's what's fooled you. In the totally failed case, you're dealing with his present. He commits more overts between sessions than can be picked up in a session. Do you see that ratio at once? He commits more overts between sessions than can be picked up in a session.

Now, in view of the fact that it takes you quite a little while to dig for and get up an overt, don't you see… He doesn't as-is things well; life is on a big, beautiful alter-is-ness of it all, you know? He's going to ch... he's changing everything around. It's all sort of dub. It's all sort of justified. He's pretty detached.

This was Freud's failed case, too, by the way, only he never realized it and I've never spoken of it in these terms before. The person had no responsibility for any place he was or anything he was doing. Freud called him a detached case. I don't know why he'd be detached. I think he'd be dead in his head to end all dead-in-your-heads, see – undetached case. It'd take you quite a while to get in communication with this bloke and his responsibility level would be down around zero. See? The responsibility level would be very bad.

Well, it takes some degree of responsibility to put one's self into the scene. Do you see? You know, "My hand – my hand stole the pocketbook." Well, that's an irresponsibility to end all irresponsibilities, don't you see? And it wouldn't as-is because he hasn't said the rest of
the communication, you see, which is "I saw the pocketbook and I picked it up with my hand." He doesn't say that, so you don't get, really, an as-is-ness of the action. Do you follow? The action then doesn't vanish or key out or deintensify.

He's putting an alter-is on the line. You say, "What have you done?" He said, "Well, I've picked up a pocketbook." But he says this because it's social, don't you see, just to use "I." But if you question him very closely, you would find out that actually his hand had picked up the pocketbook; he hadn't had anything to do with it at all. He's quoting you something it said off the police blotter.

These people are not all criminals, by the way. They're not un… they're not this; they're not that. But you understand here that he isn't really giving you a factual answer, so therefore isn't answering the auditing question. You say, "What have you done?" And he says, "Well, I'll be sociable about it and I've done this, and I've done that." And sometimes the auditor is completely spun in by the fact that this guy is getting off fantastic overt, see, fantastic crimes of some kind or another. Guy just sits there and gives them to you by the bucketload, don't you see? And you say, "Well, good heavens, anybody getting off that much would undoubtedly experience a case change," and you find out that his case sits just exactly where it was.

That's because he never answers the auditing question. You're saying to him, "What have you done," or something like that or "What overt have you committed?" or something like that. And he never answers this. He answers something like "The society has forced me to commit..." or "My hand picked up the pocketbook," you see. "And it was purely an accident that the money was found in my pocket." But, you're saying, "What have you done?" but he's not answering "What have you done?" because he'd be incapable of assuming that much social responsibility. So what he's doing is answering some put-off as far as you're concerned. Yes, he'll say the things which occurred in his lifetime, but in his own mind he isn't answering any auditing question. It doesn't really matter to him. It didn't matter if he did these things.

And then there's the fellow who turns around and tries to make himself look good all the time, don't you see? And his concentration is totally on how he looks to the auditor, you see? He's got to look good. He's got to put up a social presence so he never gets off a harmful act, don't you see?

Well, that's peculiar to this failed case. Any – either one: He's either giving you tons of things he didn't do... In his own mind he never did these things. He says, "Well, that's a social response. I'm in a sort of a police court; that's where I am. It's not an auditing session. All right. Well, I'll tell them all these crimes; doesn't matter and..." Or he's saying – he's done some wild things, don't you see, some crazy things and he's withholding these things like crazy. "Oh, I've always been a good boy."

The one that sticks in mind was a pc who was the sweetest, dearest old lady you ever laid your eyes on who had led an exemplary life but had had a lot of bad things happen to her. And it wasn't until we used one of the remedies in The Book of Remedies, which you'll find there today, of after finding out completely that she had never done anything in her whole life – you know, never even stubbed her toe. Life was just one beautiful song, you see. A lot of things had happened to her, though. Why, we got the happy idea of asking her, had she
murdered anybody? Questions of that character, total exaggeration, you see? Had she ever raped any small children, don't you see? This dear sweet old lady. It was quite obvious that if she'd had this many motivators in her lifetime, that she herself must have been very, very busy, see? But according to the record that she was putting up, she was just looking nice and sweet and social to the auditor. And the trick that was worked there, you see, is by presenting "Well, have you ever murdered anybody?" you know?

"Oh, that's so terrible! Well, no, I've never murdered anybody, but of course I made somebody awfully sick once." [laughter] And it's the trick – it's the trick of, "Oh, you can look much sadder than that," don't you see? It's the trick of giving them a much worse overt than they had committed as a yes-or-no type of question. And they start unloading real overts, you see?

But I'm just showing you, then, the normal run of cases, and this I would consider the normal run of cases. You have problems and you have to apply special remedies very often to get off overts. Sometimes auditors blunder in getting off overts because they don't get the pc in communication with the auditor. You know very well that there are people you'd say "Good morning" to but they are not people that you would tell your family troubles to. Well, similarly the pc is willing to sit there and say "Good morning" to the auditor, you know, but not go any deeper into his life than that. You see? It's a standoff sort of an attitude toward the auditor. Well, the auditor would have to work on that.

The pc is in this condition of perfectly willing to say "Good morning" to the auditor and say, "Yes, all right to be audited," but that's about the end of the intercourse, don't you see? That's as far and as personal as this must go. And then the auditor says at once, "All right, now tell me a harmful act you have committed." Well, good heavens, the person really wouldn't even describe breakfast with the auditor, see?

You know, you'd have to build up this communication gradient. "What are you willing to talk to me about?" which is a far more effective process than you ever realize until some day you run it on some pc you're having trouble with. You find out, well, hell's bells, you've been auditing him for twenty hours and they've not been willing to talk to you about a blessed thing. And you get these long comm lags on "What are you willing to talk to me about?" "Well..." Finally they get an answer that's real to them, you know, "Well, I'm willing to talk to you about... this room." You've been trying to get overts off this guy, see? Oh, poo! You've been trying to run ten thousand volts on no wire and it just wouldn't go, you see? Or too thin a wire – too little communication line. And that's so tiny a wire that if ten thousand volts ever started over it, it'd blow up the wire, and you'd have an ARC break, of course, see?

So that – there're all these – all those little nuances. This is, by the way, where an auditor lays the most eggs, is in the field of overts. That's where they chicken the most. That's where they buy the wrong things and so forth. So it is a difficult zone of auditing. I won't say that it's unsurmountable because it's pretty confounded easy.

I've gotten to be an old war horse on this now. And the pc says, "Well, I have a withhold. I thought the other day that you were..."

I say, "Oh, yes. That's very interesting. I'm very glad you can think. Now, I want something that you're withholding from me."
"Well, I was withholding that."

"No, I'm afraid you weren't even bothering to withhold that. You were simply being critical. Now, I want the withhold that's back of this." See, I just don't ever let a pc get in there and chop me to ribbons, and I sit there, you know, and say, "Well, that's the lot of an auditor," you know? You think this will produce an ARC break. No, no. The other way is the way you produce an ARC break. Because you've just got missed withholdings by the ton on the case by – after a while.

No, what you do is the guy starts to get off "withholds" about you and starts to get off "withholds" that's somebody else's withholdings, you know, "I was – well, I have an awful withhold here. I was auditing Betsy Ann the other day and she told me – yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap-yap." [laughter] When I run into that in a pc, I go pheew! Chop!

"Now, look, we're auditing. We're interested in you; we're not interested in other people's withholdings. We're not interested in what you're withholding of critical thoughts. Nothing of that sort, and so forth. I want to know what you're really withholding." And the needle goes mmmm. [laughter]

"I spilled all – a whole ashtray full of ashes over your new rug the other day. Oh-ho-ho-ho. And you can still see 'em." [laughter]

"All right. Thank you. Any other withholdings?" Now they give them to you very cheerfully. You don't get these circuitous critical thoughts of the auditor and other people's withholdings and all this kind of nonsense, don't you see?

But as I started to say before and complete saying, pulling overt is dependent upon the degree of communication with the pc, the degree of responsibility of the pc, the – it's also in the ability of the auditor to really know what one is and pull the right one. In other words, we're dealing here with stuff that can't be done crudely. We're dealing stuff that has to be done rather slippily and very well. An auditor has to be right on his toes.

Well, even if you were right on your toes, the case that's the failed case still couldn't have his overt pulled fast enough in a session to keep up with PT. And that's why he's a failed case. So it's his present that you're in collision with, not his past.

He leaves your session; he cuts you to bits with his friends; walks up on the front porch, sees the dog lying there happily asleep in the sun, gives him a good, solid, swift kick in the ribs; goes inside, finds out that his sister hasn't got dinner on time, breaks a couple of plates; finds somebody else's piece of mail, steams it open and reads it. [laughter] Rather incredible!

I want to interject a note here which seems not apropos of anything else, just as an aside here at this particular point. But did you know that you could audit all sex and so forth you want to on a pc – it isn't going to do very much – but you can audit any God's quantity of it – because it doesn't happen to be an end word. You very often find GPMs and that sort of thing what – they are things that it can lock on in root words and end words, but it itself is a humanoid action and the GPMs aren't, don't you see? So you could pull all the sexual overt that you want to. Don't think that it's going to make all that difference to the case, however, because you aren't on down to the roots of the reactive bank; you're just taking the very sur-
face locks off. I think why Freud did this is because that's about as far as people could go, you know?

But he probably has some – a lot of second dynamic overts on the subject, you see? He has probably all kinds of tangles and withholds, but his life is just one long, harmful action. See? Active, man, active! Not the crimes of omission, even. Good and active, and you never spot these. So, therefore the case remains undetected because you can't even get off his shallow overts, don't you see, from his past. So you're not about to get off these overts in his present. Now, you wouldn't even have to classify this fellow as a criminal personality. Maybe this fellow is simply a foreman of the works, or something like this, and he's always figuring out how to get somebody sacked. And he's doing this and he's doing that and he's just chopping them up left, right and center, don't you see? And taking the stuff out of the company till in the bargain.

The guy – the guy is really heavy at it, you know? He's working – he's working at it, you know? He's dedicated. And you get him in session and you just can't pull those overts fast enough to keep the case in balance to return any degree of responsibility. And you wouldn't really know what you were looking at. You just wouldn't really know what you were looking at until you got right down to brass tacks and put a shadow on his trail throughout the entire day, which is outside the province of auditing. Because, you see, he's so irresponsible that those things don't react on an E-Meter.

An E-Meter reaction takes a certain degree of reality, a certain degree of responsibility, and the reason you take – always take your biggest action, is you've got that thing the pc feels the most responsibility for. The E-Meter works, then, at the level where the pc has reality and responsibility at any given time. And therefore if you run things that you know the pc has done, but which don't react on the E-Meter, you are then either running something that's already been run out or you are running into a zone on which he has no responsibility or reality. And in either case, you will practically do him in, see? Asking a guy to run out something that's been run out is pretty grim. But trying to run out something for which he has no responsibility of any kind whatsoever is almost fatal.

You can take a list and the key word – this is Auditing by List – you can take the key word on the list – isn't reacting, but you through some insight or observation of the pc determine that this is the key word – you take that thing and you audit it. And you'll have an awful sick pc on your hands. Didn't react on the meter, see, but you knew it must be, so you audited it. Therefore, the thing that falls best is the thing that's nearest and realest to the pc.

In R6 if you skip a GPM you of course haven't got the thing which is nearest and realest to the pc so you don't get much reads. That's practically the total source of small reads on R6. You're just running him where he ain't. So if you're running him where he isn't, why, you've bypassed something where he is and on – if you had him where he was and so forth...

Another little remedy that goes along with this: You go over ARC break lists – you know, in Auditing by Lists you go over your L6 and – or L4 at lower levels – and you don't get any reads on this. Well, that doesn't mean anything, except that the pc has got lists suppressed. That's all that means. The lists are all perfectly accurate. So what you do there is a very simple remedy. If the pc is getting small reads and you can't find out where he is because
he doesn't respond on any of the lists, then you must assume there's something wrong with the lists.

Now, there's two things can be wrong with the lists: He's never learned the parts of the GPM or the bank. If you're auditing some green pc (as some auditor undoubtedly, stupid-headedly will do sooner or later), uneducated, totally uninformed pc… One recently, by a name that I won't mention – but I will send a bill to for not mentioning – sent a student to the Academy in Washington the other day with orders that they must not audit her because she had been run on R6. And the understanding was that if anybody had been run on R6, they couldn't be run on anything else. That's just about as wild and crazy a datum as you ever heard.

No, they can't be run on processes which involve words; that's all they can't be audited on. A process whereby you're trying to get them, you see, to define whole track-type words, like Clay Table Clearing or definitions of earlier subjects or something like this – something involving words – you're going to lay an egg because this person is already into the slot of the GPMs and of course the only thing that's going to read is the nearest GPM. And you're just going to key them in. So eventually if you were stupid enough to force them into some word that they considered was wrong, which was way down the bank someplace, you'd bypass all that, they'd turn on a tremendous somatic and they'd feel like the devil. But it's just those things which – those processes which – would use words.

Now, you actually could get them to define Scientology terms except some of those terms are also in the bank. That's a liability; but you could get them to do that if you watched it. And if your meter started to go high or something like that, you'd say, "What's the matter?" And you'd better jolly well find out what's the matter, don't you see? You'd have to take it very delicately even to do Scientology definitions. But you definitely could not do definitions of Clay Table Clearing. And you definitely couldn't do definitions of earlier subjects. And you definitely couldn't list words to assess. Those things would practically wreck your pc.

But good God! as far as I know, that leaves some hundred thousand processes! And, you know, there isn't a single process in The Book of Remedies that violates it, except the earlier subject, definitions of. That's all. All the rest of those processes in The Book of Remedies, whether they came from 1950 right straight on up the line; all these tons of processes that are on tapes and everything else – could be audited on somebody who's running R6 out of his ears.

And the other thing is, who ran R6 well, well, well. That's the clue.

So somebody is running R6 and they're not running R6 well – well, you possibly don't even have the liability of Clay Table. They're not in the slot; they're not going down the bank. Lord knows where they are! You might even be able to run Clay Table Clearing on them or run any stupid kind of definitions or run anything that comes into your head or anything in The Book of Remedies on them. You're not going to do anything to them. And you could prepcheck them. Perfectly valid to prepcheck them on various things, providing you prepcheck. Very often people go completely astray by taking a Prepcheck and think a Prepcheck is very harmful or upsetting because of end words that might occur in the Prepcheck, when as a matter of sober fact they don't know how to run a Prepcheck.
Well, if you overrun the Suppress button on a Prepcheck, you of course got all the other answers he would have thought of on the other buttons coming up and hitting him in the face, and then you make some recommendation, "I think I will have to have this pc itsa." (This happened right here the other day. I won't have any withholds.) And having overrun Suppress madly, you see – audited the process wrong – why of course the pc now had all kinds of additional answers. So the auditor's solution to it was to go off Prepchecking and go on to itsa because the pc had so much to say. No, the only thing that had happened the pc had all of his answers to Invalidate and Change and every other darn button in the Prepcheck. You see, he'd been run – the tone arm action had been run out of the Suppress button, see? You don't – you don't flatten a Prepcheck button to a point where a steamroller appears to have run over it, you know? The pc says, "Well, I really haven't got any more answers."

"Well, you'd better get me another answer. I'm still getting tone arm action on it." No, the tone arm action is on the process; it's not on the button. If you don't think it's flat, go through the buttons again in rotation, and so forth, and see if you get anything. But that's actually the mechanics of it.

You'd have to prepcheck properly, you have to audit properly to get proper auditing results. And one of the things is, is when the pc hasn't got any more answers and he really hasn't got any more answers you don't ask any more questions.

I mean, it sounds elementary. I know of no auditing situation where the pc who has been getting proper tone arm action – proper tone arm action in the session – who says, "I don't have any further answers to it," has ever had any further answers to it. I know of no such situation.

But occasionally you'll get a pc who is getting wonderful tone arm action on something like O/W, who runs into mea culpa. (Latin morals of the Catholic church: "I am ashamed" or "It's my blame" or "It's my fault" – mea culpa). I mean, that's – they practically never got off mea culpa as a therapy. The Catholic church could be very pleased with this boy because he really now knows shame, blame and regret, see? And he doesn't bother to give you the withhold. He just simply says, "Well, I don't have any more answers."

Well, actually, if you – if you took a pair of magnifying glasses and looked across the table at your pc and cut the smog out of it and so forth, even in Los Angeles you could tell [laughter] that this pc has not answered all of his answers. Because he's sitting there – there's various symptoms that you could notice, you know, like chewing his fingernails, looking cringing like this, you know; he's backed up in his chair; he's turned bright red; he's sweating; the palms of his hands running rivers of moisture. I mean, there are some small indicators that says he's simply hit something he don't want to talk to you about no more, brother. He's not going to say any more about it – hah-uh! Oh, no! Well, at this point, of course, in O/W, you press it home; but it's only in O/W that you press it home.

If he says "I haven't got any more present time problems," you say cheerily, cheerily, "Good." He can withhold all the present time problems he wants, really, without getting him in – or anybody else into very serious trouble. He'll only withhold them if they've got overts connected with them that he's ashamed of and you'll get that on the overt line, don't you see?
Not to push it home, but you could actually run a – run a Prepcheck so that it looked like you were restimulating end words and messing up the pc. Don't you see? You could run it in such a way that it looked like catastrophe that was occurring. The only thing that was occurring is you just happened to have flattened the button and you aren't listening to the pc in the session. He says, "Well, that's all the answers I got. There aren't any more answers."

And you say, "Well, I think you'd better answer this two or three more times or five or six more times." And – hm-mm-mm-mm-mm – about that time he starts imagining answers and dreaming up answers. You now have a condition where he isn't answering the auditing question, and because Prepchecks are Prepchecks, you now start getting answers to the other buttons on the same subject. So he now doesn't answer the auditing question at all. So now he looks like he's got – a floodgates of Niagara would open at any minute, see? Because he's thought of this to tell you but that doesn't answer the question and there's no way he can. Well, what fouled it up in the first place, you see? Somebody forcing him to answer a question he had no more answers for.

Now, some pcs change faster than others and on this particular course, you can get very, very used to a case going at a certain pace or rate of change and all of a sudden be totally thrown for a loop. The case will start to change at a faster rate. And it's the auditor that worries in this particular case.

Case is changing at a faster rate than is believable according to auditing experience and so processes are madly overrun, particularly at the lower levels, you see? And we sin on the direction now, because of the – of the supervision and other factors involved in the course, don't you see – it's very tight auditing – you'll find the rate of change of the pc is increasing. It's faster.

He's changing faster and very often, why, we run into the sin of overflattening, don't you see? The case will suddenly come up with a cognition. Now, we try to audit this process again and it's blown.

That won't happen with GPMs. You'll find out the GPM was just suppressed at the time and you'll go back a couple of days later after you've run something else and all of a sudden, why, it's got all of its reads, too.

But rate of change of the case increases in ratio to the auditing. The slowest change period of the case is at the start of the case. So if you've actually started a case, then rate of change increases. Do you understand?

Your very failed case – coming back more solidly to that – doesn't experience any rate of change at all. There is no rate of change but one. See? And that will change more slowly as you go on because the case is a failed case. Do you follow this? The length and rate of change, you say... well, this actually has very definite indexes. You can measure how long it takes for a pc to get a cognition on something. How many hours of auditing does it take a pc to come up to a cognition on something fundamental about himself?

Let's say it starts out early on when he's being audited at the HAS levels or something like this and it's about twenty-five hours or something like that and he comes up to some recognition about himself, you see – some bigger recognition. And you'll find out as he goes on
up the levels, why, it would take him maybe an hour to come to some conclusion of similar magnitude, don't you see, about some facet of his life at a higher level. You get what I mean – rate of change. And you sometimes can get somebody who has been audited well and whose case is moving very well who almost audits by inspection and this gets pretty weird. And sometimes then the auditor will overestimate the power of the engram or something that the pc has collided with and think he can get rid of that because he got rid of all of the others, you see, and audits him too short on it and comes a bit of a cropper. Don't you see? It's a variable thing. It doesn't stay constant, but it goes also along with comm lag: How long does it take the pc to answer the question?

And one of your indexes of rate of change is the posture of the pc in auditing. Pc always assumes the same physical posture while being audited. Never assumes an additional or changed posture really. Always comes back to one posture, if they do change to another posture.

It isn't any particular posture; you'll just have to understand it like that. The pc is always dropping into Rodel's [Rodin's] (or whoever it was) Thinker. Don't you know? You'll see that the pc is – very frequently in session the pc has his head cocked, way over here – something like that – some posture. He keeps returning to this posture. He keeps returning and returning and returning to the posture, don't you see? Always auditing like that – being audited like that.

Has a habit of doing a certain type of fiddle with the can. Always has this mannerism in auditing. To the degree that the pc's mannerisms in auditing remain constant, he is not experiencing a rate of change of progress. Do you follow that? You can do that by inspection. You see some pc: He's – always sits down – he always slumps in some position or he always sits in a certain way or he always looks in a certain way in a session. Always seems to return to this mechanism in some way or another – I mean this posture, this pose, this diddle-fiddle. That thing keeps recurring. You want to watch for that as an auditor, because that case is parked. That case is definitely parked. Quite important for you to recognize that.

When you see that, you know that you're looking at a case which needs remediying. And if you start – that means that you've got to look this case up in The Book of Remedies and do something about it. You understand? No rate of change. Now, the rate of change hasn't changed at all. I mean the case has still got the same posture, same reactions, you know, very often the same overts. But you don't have to go off into that direction to find out that they're stuck. They're not progressing and you can tell that actually from the consistent physical posture in a session. As simple as that.

And tone arm action on such a case is minimal – very little tone arm action. Their other symptoms are all there. They just go on down. Your bad indicators are all there. I mean, everything that you'd shake a stick at is present.

But as an Auditing Supervisor, as an Auditing Supervisor you actually can go through a room on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and if your memory is very good, by the time you've gone through Wednesday (and it's this – it's this fast a rate of change is what is expected) you notice that you still got a pc – by George, you still have a pc – who is sitting there with his cans like this. He always holds his – he's – on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday he
held his cans flopped down at his sides with his back bowed and his head hanging and that's the way he's being – he's responding in auditing. Well, you wouldn't have to look at his auditor's report or anything else, you wouldn't have to look at his auditing, you wouldn't have to study anything particularly and so forth to know the case wasn't changing. Follow that?

Now that you know the case isn't experiencing a rate of change, now let's look at the case, now let's look at the – at the auditing reports. We're trying to find something wrong and you're trying to find that and match that up against The Book of Remedies. And when you get those two things matched – well, you give those directions, and if you did it Wednesday night, by the end of session on Thursday you would find the pc sitting with his cans in his lap. He's no longer sitting like this; he's sitting like this. You get the idea? I mean, it's that superficial an observation. You follow that? There's nothing very – nothing very fantastic is required in the way of instinct to know somebody isn't changing. They've always had a green complexion; they've still got a green complexion. Well, you know their rate of change must be lousy. A non-optimum condition persists is another way that you spot this.

Well, when a person starts in, in auditing, in spite of everything you do, in spite of anything anybody else does, in spite of all the think and everything else and the sweat and so forth, you've got one thing left that isn't in The Book of Remedies, because that's a book of remedies. But it could very easily include this one, of course, but it wouldn't necessarily emphasize it. You've got this present time condition of a concatenation of overts which is too rapid to be picked up. And that's your boy; that's your boy.

If after a hundred hours of auditing and all the sweat and change – particularly with The Book of Remedies in your paws – you didn't see any change in this pc, there is no reason for you as the D of T or the auditing supervisor or something like that – or the auditor – to go – considering that you have failed in some particular line. I mean, you haven't failed in any line. You did your best.

You'd better start looking at this pc's PT. You'd better look at that PT environment. What's he do when he leaves this auditing session? That's giving him a fair trial, don't you see? That's a long look, you know? Well, what's he doing? You don't know of any big flubs that weren't corrected. Nothing been done to victimize this character one way or the other. Yet there he is – no change. Well, there's the other zone which you yourself would not find it very easy to inspect but which you'd better jolly well find some way to inspect if you're going to do anything with this case at all.

You're going to be horrified at the conduct of some parts of the human race. You're going to stand your hair on end on some of these characters, you know? And it's so pathetic, because they've done so many overts, they get so many motivators. You see, it's not a one-for-one, even. I don't suppose it's that neat a ratio. But it's a type of overt for a type of motivator, so you could actually run it down in auditing; you could search this thing out. You must realize it's not something the person has done but it's something the person is doing.

Now, it's pretty hard to spot that this is what you're handling because of course you never get any communication about this from the pc. But there is one method of spotting it and that is what the pc complains about in the conduct of others. And you could just get him busily complaining about what he complains about in the conduct of others and go over this
right on down the line and you'll finally find out that one of them is very, very consistent. Well, that is what the pc does between sessions.

Now you see, you wouldn't go to an heroic measure, like this – pc has merely got some motivators and they're talking about this and that and their PT is – their present time is all upside-down or something like this. But you're auditing him and you're getting a change of case, see? Well, you don't take any such measure.

I'm talking about the fellow who was audited and everything is done for him that can be and he still comes around – he says, "What are you going to do – what are you going to do about my lumbosis?" They drive the medical doctor mad. "What are you going to do about it? You've done nothing for it," you know. "You've done me in," and so forth. Now, you're probably part of the – part of the overt-motivator package. He's got enough ovens against you out of session, you know, to make a – make a book like Fanny Hill.

Anyway, we got a whole bunch of stuff going on here that is outside the observation zone of the auditor. So the auditor is looking at his mind, he's looking at his past and he's looking at his own auditing of this pc, don't you see? Well, those are legitimate areas of inspection. But there is another area and that's what I'm calling to your attention, and that is the failed case – that other area. It's the present time series of ovens, and I could add the word involvements but this is rather false because it's not really – he's involved because of ovens and don't kid yourself otherwise, you see?

Now, that's the PT of this pc who keeps coming back after 150 hours, saying, "You haven't done anything for his lumbosis." There's your boy. Overts! – comes down to, straight dead on the line. And this case could be so bad and his environment could be so enturbulated that you just did not have a prayer of being able to pull any part of the ovens which he commits. You audit him for five hours in a day; that leaves nineteen.

You can audit him on a ratio of five to nineteen. Of that nineteen, let's say he sleeps eight. Let's give him credit, then, for not committing ovens during one of those hours. That leaves ten hours of the day for five hours of your auditing, and it's already two for one. Now, if it takes three times as long in auditing to pull the overt as it did to commit it, you're just straight up against nothing but pure, honest-to-God arithmetic. That's what you're up against.

And I don't care, these people are the first to tell you how innocent they are and how inactive they are. They're the first. They -- you give them a stack of Bibles a mile high and they'd do something about it. Now, that person is a failed case where it comes to general practice for this one reason: is you can't monitor his environment strongly enough. He's walking into your zone of influence which extends maybe the size of the organization, maybe the size of your house or your auditing room, don't you see? Maybe even to your front sidewalk. That's your zone of immediate influence as far as this case is concerned, see? Your zone of influence may be much wider than that, but as far as that case is concerned that's your zone of influence.

Now, the second he steps one foot beyond that zone of influence, he's away. And the way you handle this case, if you could handle the case, would be to establish your zone of influence as far as the case is likely to go between sessions for long enough to pull the case out of it.
Now, it would mean a shift of environment. This isn't the normal thing whereby the
guy is simply in an enturbulated environment and so you change his environment during the
period of auditing, see? That's a common remedy. And that is not – enters into the failed case.
This other fellow would take a lot more, he'd take a lot more than just that. If you changed his
environment, don't you see, he'd go on committing the same overts over a long-distance tele-
phone or something. He'd do some way, you know? He's getting even with all of existence.

Now, where you have such a case and where you do not have control of the environ-
ment, you can be absolutely certain that this will become a failed case. The only possible
remedy that you could have is to project the fear of the auditor or something like that to such
a degree that perhaps you keep him under. But then you're defeating yourself, of course, be-
cause you're spoiling your ARC, and you're doing an overwhelm of the pc and you're more
likely to get a religious reaction. The fellow kisses the hem of your tablecloth before he
leaves, you know? Keeps facing your front door as he goes back up the walk, don't you see?
You haven't got anybody in a very healthy frame of mind, so that's self-defeating, too.

But you can do some of it. You can do some of it. And it's worth – it's worth trying.
Recognize what you're looking at, you see? You don't have control of the society in which
this fellow lives or his family or something like this. Well, recognize what you're looking at
here. You can say to him, "Now look, the reason your case isn't progressing is because you
are doing things which you suppose I have no inkling of, between sessions. And you're think-
ing things and you're saying things and you're acting in certain ways between sessions which
is highly diffi… – highly detrimental to your case. Now, if you change these habits and ac-
tions and cease to frequent the same places that you've been frequenting and so forth, why,
maybe we can go on, and even then I would have to be very, very convinced before I would
pick up the meter on you again," see? It's this kind of thing.

Now, you actually, at this point, have simply to some degree located and indicated the
bypassed charge; because this would be true. You've audited the bird for a hundred hours and
he's had no rate of change. And you've applied the whole Book of Remedies and you've done
everything under the sun, moon and stars, and this guy isn't changing in any way, shape or
form and he isn't getting any better. Ah well, you've only got one left. And that one left is his
environment is being so reacted upon by him that he is laying in more overts than you can get
up. And that's all there is to that. You could try a lot of things, but that one I don't think you
will ever totally catch up with until you've totally controlled the environment in which the
person exists.

Now, you could say, "Well, now, if you'll go to the Bide-a-Wee Hotel and let me put a
couple of guards on your door – if you're willing to go through this for a couple of months
and pay the price of the We-Spy-for-You Detective Company to relay – put a relay of watch
and shadow on you during this particular period, why, I'll go on auditing you, but not other-
wise." See? You might – you might – you might, you see, just on the occasional one, crack
through and so on. But you wouldn't – you wouldn't do 100 percent, because these people are
dedicated.

Environment – the environment looks so dangerous to them or so provocative or so
hostile or so something – we don't care just that; we're not just talking about a particular type
of reaction to the environment – but it looks so something, that the only way you can exert your livingness at all or even breathe is to do a certain line of actions which even though they are socially unacceptable nevertheless are vitally necessary. And the person's conviction along these lines are to the degree that if you told them to stop them, you have practically told him to stop eating or stop breathing, see. It just totally violates his reality.

Now, therefore you sometimes look for the fast one – the fast, fast process. What'll get in and undercut this case, you know – zoommm! Well, there isn't anything to get in and undercut that case because in the first place you've got to be able to have the case in communication with you. The guy's got to be able to be in communication with you before you can do anything for the case. And it's going to take more than one session to get him in communication with you, because after you've gone to the second session, you now have a bunch of overts in which you're included in the perimeter of overts and this will just go on going in that particular direction.

So there is the social liability. Now that gives us an avenue for an activity known as – doesn't give us one – but that gives a justification to the psychiatrist: One, he didn't have any processes – well, one, he didn't have any understanding of the situation. Two, he didn't have any processes to handle the situation. But those cases, then, which can't normally respond just by talking to somebody about their troubles – and you know that wouldn't be very many cases – you know, I mean the case that wouldn't get well just because he said, "Well, I been sick lately." That'd be a pretty – a pretty high-toned case that can do that, see. All the rest of these cases look crazy to the psychiatrist and look unsolvable to the psychiatrist.

Now, because we've gone so far in an understanding of the subject in which we are dealing, because we've gone so far in having processes, because we've now gone so far in having remedies for these particular odd difficulties which the people come up with, we of course could get very, very cocky and say, "Well, we can go the whole way."

And I call to your attention the Axiom "Absolutes are unobtainable." You're always going to have this case. Unless you can exert – unless you could exert what amounts to political control of the activities of the environment, don't you see – almost to that degree – you wouldn't be able to sweep them all in and even then I imagine he'd still find ways to commit overts in a locked room. Do you see this?

Now, about the furthest-south process that operates on such a case – you, I'm sure, would be very interested in and that is – you already got it – it's justifications. But I'd like to – I'd like to – I'd like to put in a word here. If you can get the person to talk to you, why, you've already won your first round with overts. This is true of all overt running. The first round you've got to win is to get the person to talk to you about things, see, without being reticent as he would be with a stranger, see, that degree, he's got to be able to talk to you. And then you can get off some of his lighter overts and then you can get off some of his heavier overts, you see. And that's about the gradient that it will go on, don't you see?

Now, you actually, oddly enough, can audit the case who isn't obsessively committing overts but he's been so busy in the past that he's got them stacked up to the roof. Now, that case is actually not today very hard to audit. As long as you remember to get the case in communication with you as the first requisite of all overt pulling and as long as you don't ask
for the whole basketload with the first auditing question, why, you can – you can do this, don't you see?

But this bird you will run into, and he's commoner, fortunately, than the bird who is committing the overt during the auditing session to – committing overts to such a degree that he can't possibly catch up with it, don't you see?

So you would handle this – they look quite alike, by the way. They – one is – they're both very detached; they're both very irresponsible. They very often will give you fantastic things they have done in life and expect you to be shocked over them or something of this sort but they aren't. There's all kinds of odd manifestations which make these cases look similar so you can – you can make a mistake.

So on either type of case you would try this one. You'd try to get them into communication with you. It wouldn't matter what case it was – you would do that, don't you see? – or what you were trying to do. And then on a gradient you'd get more and more, heavier and heavier – more voltage on the line – and you could go deeper and deeper on the subject.

And remember this one: that for that long-gone case who can take no responsibility whatsoever for his overts or for the recurrent overt – the guy keeps giving you the same overt; you know, he really can't get off of having done this terrible thing. The secret of what holds it in: that overt has become a problem, hasn't it?

Well, the anatomy of a problem is postulate-counter-postulate, isn't it? You got that as the anatomy of a problem. It's exactly balanced so therefore floats in time, you see. It – there's just as much force against it as it's pushing, see? And you've got this thing exactly poised in time here and it's floating along with present time. Well, he can't get this overt off and he can't get rid of this overt: You must recognize that you are dealing in actual fact with a problem as far as the overt is concerned, don't you see? Well, you don't bother to address it as a problem. I'm just showing you that having – he's got this overt and he tells you about it but that doesn't get it off. This is true of any of these whether it's from total irresponsibility, you see, or the guy just feels so guilty about it, you know. Whatever it is, the answer is the same at both ends of the scale: It wasn't an overt in his view. It was justified.

Now, I want to give you a note on running this process, because you've run off the rails on it occas… – wherever I've heard it being run and when I was wrestling with it I tried to straighten it out here in the class, and I may have succeeded and may not have succeeded. But if I had to fight that hard to get it back on the rails, I'm sure it's gone a little bit off the rails again. So just let me make a few notes, particularly for those who weren't here when I was fighting to get it on the rails.

Let me make this – few notes here about this, and that is: There is a process of justifications which is really not a repetitive process, which is a wide-open invitation to run as a repetitive process, "What have you done? How wasn't that an overt?" You could say this, see. You could – you could sit there as an auditor with a silly smile on your face going, "Yeah," being – he's totally irresponsible as an auditor – and run a repetitive process called, "What have you done? And how did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it? What have you done? How did you justify it?"
Well, that's the essence of the process, but it is not a repetitive process. Let me clar... – call that to your attention. It is not a repetitive process. It requires handling.

You can say, "Well, what harm – ." Well, they don't care what words you use – "What harmful act have you committed? What harmful act have you really, really committed now? Let me see it." Well, the fellow – now, this is not a repetitive process, you see, and it's not itsa. This is taking up the case, see – crash!

And he says, "Well, I did this."

And I say, "All right," and you don't challenge it or anything.

"And I did that. And I did something else." And he's giving you a lot of balderdash as far as you're concerned, because you and the society at large don't consider these things very harmful acts. Fine. Let him get them off. He's just trying to run some variety of O/W. Okay, but that isn't what you ask him. And so you just go on getting your auditing question answered and you – doesn't take you – if you – doesn't matter if it took you twenty-five hours to get this auditing question answered. You get something that he really did that he thinks was an overt act – it was a harmful action.

That's what you're looking for and it's a sort of a chitter-chat, don't you see? It's not "What have you done? How have you justified...?" That's not the process. Let me put this other form of action across here. It's "Let's sort it out." And he finally says, "Well, I threw my little brother in the river one time." And that was one hell of an overt act. You've got a – it's fine with you that he says something like this. Now you've got your meat. Now let's cook it. I don't care if it took you one minute or twenty-five hours to get an answer that both you and he would consider an overt act. We're not dodging around now about social mores and some people's considerations are different. So the both of you consider this thing as an overt act. All right. That's fine. Now, that's the one you start to put on the front burner.

And this is the way you put it on the front burner: And you say, "All right. Now, let's just start out and count them up. Now, how wasn't that an overt?" And that's not a repetitive question because he'll just go on answering that and he'll get lost after a while and go off mandering someplace and you say, "The auditing question was 'How wasn't that an overt?'" – because you haven't got that one answered yet either. Do you understand? These are two auditing questions you're getting answered.

And it's going to take you, sometimes, one awful long time to get each one of them answered. And it's not a toss-off process, the way those repetitive processes are, don't you see? It's not a process by which you could say, "Recall a time you communicated with somebody. Good. Recall a time you communicated with somebody. Good. Recall a time..." – you see. It's not a process, "What would you confront? What would you rather not confront?" and so forth. Because he's got certainty on these questions. No, you've asked him right into the guts of ab- erration. You've asked him this question, "What have you done that was a harmful act?" you see.

Now, that actually – actually he has to clip that thing in his mind; he's got to get ahold of something that answered that question. See, you're not going up on it on some gradient and hoping some accident will occur. You're driving right down the center of the road now and
you're driving all the way as an auditor and you want to know just that: "What have you done that was a harmful act or action," and so forth. That's what you want to know. It doesn't matter much how you phrase it and so forth. And he'll give you something that, yes, he – even he at the moment considers it harmful and it's something that you recognize as harmful as the auditor. And we finally got this one shaken out. And we can even get into arguments with the pc about what's harmful and what isn't. That's all part of the game, don't you see?

We got this one. Now he's clipped one side of it. Now, let's take the other side out with "How wasn't it an overt act? How wasn't it harmful? Why was it justified?" I don't care how you phrased it. He really, in his first sputterings, is not really answering that question. He isn't telling you what he really justified, what he really thought was unharmful about it, why he really had to do it. So he hasn't really answered the question, don't you see?

And it's going to take an awful lot of answers before you really get the answer to the question. When you finally get the answer to the question, it goes something like this, you see: "Holy suffering Godfrey, I hated his guts! I'd been trying to get rid of him for years."

"Oh, is that so?"

"Yeah, I guess that's why I thought…" And you'll suddenly notice a change to past tense. "I guess that's why I thought it wasn't a harmful act to throw my little brother in the river. Now, what do you know about that? Well, well, well, well, well."

"And you see, you get a "What do you know?"

It was one overt and it was one reason. Do you see? In the getting of it you got fifty overt to choose from. You got twenty-hours worth of reasons but there was one reason which kept the violence of the action pinned into this thing of postulate-counter-postulate, see. He and society really considered this an overt and there was an awful good reason for it. And there it is – hung. And it's accumulated locks and it's influenced his whole life, don't you see? And if you've got patience and skill as an auditor to go through that drill, you've got what I first released as justifications and which easily degenerates into some lousy, relatively un-workable process in which nobody is answering the auditing question, don't you see?

You can ask, "What have you done? What have you done? What have you done? What have you done? What have you done? What have you?" Well, you're not asking for anything. "What have you done?" "Well, I ate breakfast." "All right, that's fine." That's a perfectly valid answer. He knows he's done that. But I shudder to think of how many answers you could get to that before you would get… The gradient is so long that it's very worthwhile to go at it on this other basis, you see, and cut it down to size because this other basis can be reached, because he's been sitting in that ever since the day he threw his little brother in the river.

Now, the unchanging condition comes from a postulate-counter-postulate. So an overt which created an obsessive problem or which sought to solve one hangs in time and becomes both an overt act and a present time problem. Even though it's not in present time according to time span and calendars it's in present time according to the mind.
And you'll find out that most overts are committed as solutions. So you have another little in\(^1\) whereby you could trip this case into a change and you could trigger off a chain reaction in this case that's committing overts all the time. It's just accidental that you would – you would hit it because he's not much in communication, you see. He's – almost every session he's further out of communication than before, you see. He's really sending himself over Niagara Falls without even a barrel and a publicity agent. And nothing could be drearier, could it?

You've got this other one, is you handle the overt as a PTP that he is trying to solve and you cut in – try to cut in back of it. You understand you're trying to do this with this guy who's the failed case – who's committing these overts. You're trying to do this with somebody who isn't in communication with you anyhow but is just pretending to be, see. So don't pat yourself on the back and say, "Well, we can always trigger it," because you won't. It's worth – it's very worth trying and it's very valuable on other cases, see. It's very valuable on cases who aren't, who are just normally going along trying to get better. A very valuable process is just find out what present time problem they're trying to solve with their overts.

It's very amusing. It's very amusing that you'll all of a sudden have a stream of overts pour into view that the person doesn't even remember having done. This is very amusing. I mean, if you want to suddenly expose to the pc's view over here a whole chain of actions that he never suspected that he himself had done or would never have considered an overt and has now totally got occluded, just start approaching overts as solutions to some problem. Go in through the back door, don't you see?

There's a thousand ways you could dream up to do this even on a repet… I'm not trying to run down repetitive processes. The repetitive processes are – can be repetitive processes only when they can be answered. See, when they can be answered with good reality on the part of the pc and he knows he's answered the question, why, you can ask repetitive. But you can't ask him on something that is far-fetched as "What have you – what harmful act have you committed, you know, that you consider harmful?" And he says, "Well, I did so-and-so," and he doesn't think so and it's not a harmful act and he's got it totally justified and so – it doesn't answer the auditing question, so the guy is even further out of session afterwards.

But approaching this other one now – approaching that as an overt – a harmful act is an effort to resolve a problem. Ninety-nine percent of the cases you collide with – oh, a higher percentage than that – this just works like a bomb. A terrific process, all the time, but it even works on the guy who is categorized at some tiny percentage of the time, see. You find out, well, all men are Martians or something wild, see. That's the problem he's trying to solve. How to get rid of the Martians or… It'll be probably some crazy problem that hasn't got anything to do with reality, see. This is fact. It'll be some problem that existed a long time ago that doesn't exist any longer or something. But the obsessive commission of overts means that their – the pc must have some oddball problem that's got a tremendous lie connected with it somehow or another. And all things that persist have lies connected with them. And you could try it from that door. You could try to open that door.

\(^1\) Editor's note: "in" here: access (Ref.: World Book Dictionary)
The only reason that it'd fail is you don't get problems, you get a whole bunch of motivators out of such a case. A normal case you say, "Well, what problem are you trying to solve with overts?" You said something like that and he'd say something like this. Well, he'd say, "Well, a continuation of my business. I have to commit one God-awful number of overts to keep afloat."

"Well, how do you have to commit these overts?"

"Well, actually I commit them against the customer by cheapening the product. And I commit them against the staff by demanding more work at less pay. And, uh – actually, you know, it's the goddamned government. If they weren't taking…" And then he'd say something like this to you, you see – "If they weren't taking the additional profit that I might be making, you see, then I might not have to commit that many overts. Hey, you don't suppose I'm trying to make the government guilty, do you? My God, I am! Hmmmm!" See, one of these brassy, ten thousand-volt cognitions, don't you see.

You've all of a sudden done something very tricky with a case that looks absolutely magical, see. What you did is, you recognized that overts are an effort to solve some problem. Not all overts are efforts to solve some problem – some are accidental, some are habitual, see. I mean, some are just ignorance. There are different kinds of overts that are harmful acts a guy can commit, see. He didn't intend to commit an overt. Well, an overt and a harmful act normally requires some intention, don't you see. Even the law – accidental death, you know, is manslaughter and homicide is premeditated – even the law makes a difference between what was intended to happen and what happened, don't you see?

Well, all of these various wild considerations, they – you needn't tangle yourself up and get too involved with them. I'm just trying to say that it isn't true to say that every overt that was ever committed was an effort to solve a problem, don't you see? That's one of these data like "jewelers never go anywhere," see. It's completely non sequitur to anything type of data, you see. It's a total generality. It doesn't work. Not all harm in the – in the world stems from the existence of problems, see. You could run this down. You'd probably make a pretty good case for it, don't you see, but it's going to – its logic is going to fail some place or other along the line.

But where a fellow is absolutely a dedicated hombre – where this bird gets up in the morning and crosses his heart and takes the hilt of his tie pin and presents it to his forehead and before the mirror, on how he's going to get even today – he's solving a problem. And this person is going around saying, "Well, I really don't want to commit the overt, but I've got to." This also gives us a strange view to it all.

See, he's withholding committing the overt but he's got to commit the overt and so forth. Well, now look at that. Get an insight on this. He's obviously trying to solve some problem, isn't he? No other avenue of solution, so he commits the overt as the last resort. Usually an intentionally committed harmful act – this is ordinary in life – an intentionally committed harmful act is committed in an effort to resolve a problem. And so, when you get some horrible thing that the person has done in life – as threw his little brother in the river – he agreed it was an overt. He knows it's an overt now. It wasn't just an accident. He didn't drop him in the river. He picked him up and he threw him in the river, see. And we've got this thing now and
he knows it's a bad thing and you know that's a bad thing, too – it's not – it's not done. And now he's answered the question, don't you see?

Well, when you ask him on the reverse current, you see, why that wasn't an overt, you're unlocking the door to an ancient problem of some kind or another, see, and you're taking locks off of it. So you let him chatter on and on and on and give you more and more and more on this one question until all of a sudden the real reason – the real reason it wasn't an overt – shows up and you've unlocked it. He will say, quite incidentally, and pass it off shortly after his cognition, that that was a hell of a thing to do. He'll say, "Well, I just didn't figure – I just didn't figure I'd ever have anything, if he was that young. He always used to tear up my things. Parents would buy everything for him." You've already heard all these things, why it wasn't an overt, don't you see, but he explains it to you. He'll sum it up. It was a problem. It was a problem actually in havingness. So why he threw his brother in the river was a problem in havingness. Don't you see?

And you can sometimes be completely magical with this and very lucky. If your pc is very bad off, you're very lucky if you make this work, don't you see, because his recognition of responsibility is out the bottom. He's not about to be responsible for any quarter of anything he's doing or has done. And he – therefore, he's not even responsible for sitting and being a pc in your auditing session, you see. So trying to reach this gone character, this totally failed case, is – bdahh. But this may even occasionally work with him, don't you see? Treat his overts as an effort to solve a problem.

I don't care how you treat it. You say, "What problem are you trying to solve? Now, you know, let's see, what have you done..." This is a good gambit on such a thing, "Let's see, what have you done in the last twenty-four hours that was pretty antisocial?" Ahhh, but he – before he starts to even say, "Ohoh-oh-oh. Well, nothing, you know," well, you already got this guy taped, you know. Just brush it off, don't even acknowledge it. It's a lie anyhow. "Let's see, now. What would it be in the vicinity of? Would it be something to your family or somebody around that's close and near and dear to you, or would it be me, or the organization? Well, the needle just fell on me. Now, what have you done to me?"

Actually, the last time he left the session, he – you couldn't find your overshoes. Well, he took them and threw them in the garbage can or something like that, see. You run it down. You say, "All right. Now, let's take this – let's take this – let's take this action now, and what problem were you trying to solve with that?" See? Let's go at it on a kind of head-on proposition so he really doesn't get the motivator off. Sometimes by lucky chance, you'll come through. You could ask him, "Well, why wasn't it an overt act?" He could give you a lot of justifications, don't you see. He could give you a lot of other things and so on.

But you could also undercut the thing and have some chance of getting through just with a blunt, "Well, what – by being mean to my possessions, what problem are you trying to solve?" And he'll some way or another start coming up with, "Well, I'm trying to solve the problem of how the hell I'm going to stay sick."

Of course, your immediate response, "Well, why do you want to stay sick?" see. You probably would ask him that, really before you could check yourself. You'd be too startled,
something like that. An auditor should never be startled, but they occasionally are, me amongst them. "Ah," he'd say, "Well, I'd cease to draw a pension."

"Well, what problem are you trying to solve by getting auditing?"

"To show them how sick I am."

But I'm afraid this really failed case would not have that much insight or that much directness to approach it. You can try, you understand. With other cases that are having trouble and so forth, oh yes, this will work. They've got some responsibility for life. They're going to do something in life. They're of some use and benefit to somebody in existence and so forth. Yes, these processes are terrific. I probably err in putting such processes at this lowest, unworkable level, don't you see.

I'm showing you – just trying to show you these processes are terrific processes, work on almost any case. On this case they sometimes nudge it, sometimes budge it, sometimes get it off of the kick, sometimes straighten it out and get it along the line.

But you must know what you're dealing with when you're dealing with this failed case. You must know what you're dealing with. You are not dealing with a person who has committed overt acts in the past. You are not handling a problem that has to do with the past. You are handling a problem that has to do with today. You're handling a problem that has to do with the session yesterday to the session today time period. You're handling that consistently and continuously.

You handle that with every case that you have anything to do with, one way or the other, to some degree, don't you see? Well, with this case it's all totally hidden. It's all gone. You're never going to find out about it and he's not enough in communication to tell you and you probably can't hire enough detectives to find out about it, don't you see? So you are actually not failing in any quarter except failing to restrain an individual from committing so many overt acts that he can't be audited. And that case is the failed case and that's the only one there is.

You can say, all right, well, there's another failed case: the fellow who died. No, I don't know that he's a failed case. We'll pick him up later on. You keep Scientology going and workable, you pick them all up, see, no matter what happened to them. So that doesn't classify, see. And of course somebody who's unconscious and can't be talked to and that sort of thing, you can get them into communication with their pillow and wake them up. I mean, that's quite interesting.

And we got a dog up to the point now where all she does is try to talk. It's probably – it's having an awful time trying to get along without vocal cords – trying to make up for vocal cords: Yummm wumm gumm yummm yummm. Through a little bit of processing from day to day, or from every couple of days to every couple of days and that sort of thing – just Touch Assists sort of thing, you know – why, she's coming up in tone. I notice her communication level is rising, rising, rising, rising, rising. And she's up to a point now where she – well, at first she would only moan and groan around about her chow, see, something very intimate. Now she moans and groans around because she's glad to see you. And now she's gotten up to a point
where she’s moaning and groaning around in other – using other voice intonations now, complaining about how cold it is outside.

So these things – these things are not terrific barriers, see. You can process almost anything or anybody up along the line, providing you haven't got this other condition. And what you've got to recognize in dealing with cases at large, is that when easy auditing isn't there with continuous case progress – when that isn't present – that you are facing a circumstance which has to be remedied before ordinary auditing works. There's something odd about the case or something peculiar. There's something that has to be handled about the case, and this is very, very general. This isn't isolated, but it is handleable. It's very easily handleable. It's only when you don't recognize that something is there which has to be handled, that you then have any trouble with the case, and that you would fail on a case, you see.

Now, there's a big difference between that, you see, and the failed case. Now, cases which have appeared to fail in your hands have only failed for technical reasons and for lack of remedies. And you have *The Book of Remedies* now; it is very easy to use and it'll be out in a few days. This you will see is going to make an immediate difference. Because I notice in doing auditing session reports on somebody who's busted down in the line of auditing and so forth, we don't give them anything new. We're giving them stuff that's very old and creaky and antique and so forth: "Look over the auditing report and find the first time the pc set a sour goal. Now go back to the session immediately ahead of that and sc... and investigate that session." It's almost perfect formula, see. Pc set a sour goal: He hadn't been running well since 1958. What? Well, it doesn't have to be that extreme. But you might run somebody down to an unflattened process, don't you see, or something of that sort. And you set that up and they all of a sudden flatten that process up and *zoommm* – they're away, don't you see? Something has happened, they've left a process unflat or a process has been messed up or something has occurred and so forth.

It's just sensible material of this particular kind and it takes that sort of thing. I recognized that I had not, in actual fact, released all of the technology of Scientology, through not having released the auditing remedies used by – in case supervision, which was done over the many, many years – and that was to a point when the student came to Saint Hill, why, of course, he got case supervision of one type or another. He got case supervision, see. And then in trying to relay this material on, the material was too complex to be relayed at a breath, don't you see? There are a lot of them; there are a lot of them. There're – well, it's around a hundred or less, but they look – they look bewildering at first glance.

You know, I mean, if you – if you didn't have any book and you had no guide and you had no map, no chart of anything of this sort and you try to teach somebody – sit down and teach him – he actually would have had to have had each one – one each almost – of all of these various case manifestations, which aren't very many. There are less than a hundred of them. Each one of them would have had a different manifestation, don't you see. He'd had to have handled the case each time. Well, they don't happen that frequently. And it's very hard to train on a practical experience basis. And I all of a sudden realized that section was missing and so got together and "writ it up." And then I corralled Mary Sue, who is old-time experienced Supervisor from way back when in HGCs, and so forth, and I went over all of those and
– that she could think of, and we got a bunch more and put them all together in a ready-reference type of form.

You'll have to learn how to use that book, but that takes care of the cases that you normally are considering cases that are hard to audit or cases that you're failing on and so forth. I wanted to make it very clear from this point on what a failed case was. And a case that is utterly an unauditable, God-help-us, catastrophic bust – with you, with The Book of Remedies, with some area of auditing, with somebody able to do something for the case, the case doesn't progress at all – you've still got this one case left, you see.

He's committing overts faster than you could ever get them off. And through that, why, you will occasionally spell yourself a disaster. So I'm pointing that one up as a great big – great big set of rocks that lie under the water up there someplace on some case. And if, after you've done your very, very best to handle the case and done everything possible that you could possibly think of, and you – so forth and so on – why, just hark back and recall this one.

There is such a case. Now, if you want to hire – have him hire a couple of private detectives to chase him around and lock him up in a hotel room and so forth, you could still solve his case, you understand. But under ordinary auditing conditions, his case is unsolvable and so therefore would be a failed case.

Okay?

Thank you.
A lecture given on 3 November 1964

Thank you.

Well, aside from the staff you all look pretty good. [laughter] Staff looks fine, too – that's just too good an opportunity for a gag. Except some of the new people. Ooh, this is serious. We better get to work here. All right.

What's the date?

*Audience: 3rd November.*

Three Nov. – 3 November AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and you came just in the nick of time. We're winding up the areas between 0 and IV and it's in the nick of time that you are because we'll probably very shortly never talk about them again. Probably all lectures in a very short while will be exclusively devoted to Joe's report to what really is on Alpha Centauri, you know, I mean... [laughs] What are the Martians planning now, you know? [laughs]

Anyway – anyway, we've been doing a roundup here of technology from 0 up to IV. I should tell you something about this. You're entitled to know what went on. Is I went on a flat-out – really flat-out-excursion on research and worked very, very hard on research beginning, I think, exactly on the 22nd of January – completely flat-out straight on through till about April of 64, that's 22nd of January 63 to April of 64. Well, this was a skull-buster to end them all and consisted of, oh, anywhere up to eighteen hours of grind at the meter, and so forth, a day. And finally rounded up by April the basic materials necessary for people to run Level VI. I didn't bother to polish these things off. I left them about the way they were because at that time it became obvious to me that somebody could pilot his way through this. And I didn't bother to give the perfect root-word lineup or finish off my end-words plot or anything of this sort, but I just gave enough of it so that it could be run. And I discovered all the rules of running the thing and so forth and pinned it up and that was it.

Well, then I saw something as far as I was concerned which was of considerable interest to me – is the fact that I was now, myself, beginning to pass out of any interest area of any kind whatsoever in 0 to IV areas. I just couldn't have cared less. And I suddenly looked this over and I says to myself, "Well now, all I've got to do now is go on down the track and wrap this bank up and keep going and put these materials together perfectly," you see, "and that's about all I got to go. And at the end of that time, I'm going to be so far out of touch personally that to get even vaguely interested in doing anything for anybody else along this line except at the level I'm working at..." You see, that started to get unreal to me – I'd begun to understand insanity in observation of people and why they were doing what they were doing to such a
degree, that I was simply as-ising it left, right and center, so I didn't have to do anything about it. And they began to look a little silly to me actually and somebody having a hard time with study – well, I knew he was just wrapped up with a certain end word that he had in restimulation, and so forth, you know. But, that was – so there he was in an end word, well, so what, don't you see?

I saw this attitude growing and I said, "Now, see here now, young man," I said, "You mustn't do this. This is a very bad thing you're doing. What you've got to do is get yourself by the scruff of the neck and hold it down and go back and start in at Level 0 and put the Bridge together smoothly, from Level 0 on up through to Level VI."

So, from April of 1964 until now in November, I have been very busy doing this and that project now is complete. The materials have not all been written down or issued but the project as far as that's concerned is complete. Most of the materials are on tape. In fact, I think they all are.

Now this culminated with the composition of a book of remedies which picked up cases that weren't running and put those together and so forth. Two new processes – two new routines were issued at this time and that was in a brand-new discovery – was clay table work and the two new routines were those which go in for Level III, which is Clay Table Healing and those which go in for Level IV, which is Clay Table Clearing. I saw that these were quite necessary in order to bring somebody up to a point where the bank was sufficiently unbur- dened that he wouldn't be stumbling around all the time, lost and wandering in the midst of Lord knows what and I saw that it was very feasible to clear somebody at this particular levels.

And I also saw just below that if somebody was very sick all the time, well he wasn't going to be able to clear himself up of anything mental. He was in too much physical duress, don't you see.

And moving back down just below that, if some fellow wasn't at all oriented in life – he didn't have any good command of what life was all about, he was in such a puzzle all the time concerning this sort of thing, that he wouldn't even be able to concentrate his attention up to a point of getting well, don't you see.

And moving it just back ahead of that, this fellow has got to get over the idea that he's always going to get worse. You'd be surprised how many people are around that don't think anything could ever get any better. They think they have nothing whatsoever to do with that. Nothing is going to get better and out of that we get the philosophy of "man is an animal." There isn't anything there to do anything about anything, don't you see. How can a cell heal a cell? Well, of course, it can't. They have, in other words, lost total – totally lost sight of the personality and beingness of the person. Well, that we call a level of release and actually a person at the level of release is simply expected to realize that he can get better.

And then just below that, we've got an area where the individual has an orientation of the philosophy or his thinkingness of life or what is life all about – another orientation area but mostly one of vocabulary, of philosophic straightening out, you know – the sort of thing that you find in, oh, various essays, various books of essays, stuff that's appeared in Certainty, you know – "Is it possible to be happy?" you know, that kind of thing. Bringing a person up
to this point and where he has some idea of what he is all about – what is man in his relation-
ship to the universe? Actually, this is quite a step, and we look at it very front on. We see that
it is quite a step because it's a wrap-up of a subject called ontology in the whole field of phi-
losophy on which men have been working for about fifty thousand years and that's all
wrapped up – but that's only Level 0. Do you see? That's how far we'd gone.

Now, if we look into this, we see then that some sort of a bridge has been formed and
actually quite an effective bridge, between the man in the street and we've even got the fellow
who won't be audited. We know what's wrong with him. If we pay any attention to it at all –
that's somebody screaming around about something or other and he's never going to be au-
dited and he's not interested in Scientology, or even somebody that just won't even talk about
it and isn't interested – we've still got them. We can resolve those. Moving it on up then, the
person can be graduated up through these levels and he finally collides with Level VI.

And then what happened during that period of wrap-up is I had a recognition of a ne-
cessity of first – first thing I realized was I had to get a good command of the whole subject
called "study." What was wrong with this subject? How wasn't it ever written up? How wasn't
it ever put together? Because if you're going to put out materials and it's put out into the
messy technology which is called education today, and if no more is known about that tech-
nology than is known, then the possibility of getting the material relayed over to somebody
becomes quite remote. So, it's necessary to finish up that communication bridge, you see, with
the various materials. So, one had to know something about that and basically from the view-
point of somebody who was going to put it together.

So, the truth is that I started putting study together in April from the viewpoint of how
am I going to write up the materials which I am now going to research and which I have re-
searched. That was the burning question. How am I going to write them up? What do I omit?
And actually, I've never particularly released that technology. It's still in a very secret place
on written longhand on pieces of paper and every once in a while I have heart failure because
I've taken hold of it and referred to it, don't you see – and I have forgotten to put it back, you
see, and it's already gone astray twice and it's the sole existing record of this material, you
know. But it's all of the things you must and mustn't do in relaying communication materials.

Well, as soon as I started going in this direction of putting it together – how do you
put it together – then I've got the reverse angle on it. What interrupts study and how does one
go about study and the rest of this technology started to fall out of it and then why people
blew Scientology and became upset also fell out of this hamper and then things just started to
avalanche out of the hamper and we had a science called education. And the way I did this is
rather unorthodox.

When one lives in an ivory tower of philosophy, it is never necessary, of course, as
everyone knows, to have anything to do with reality. Every once in a while somebody cracks
sideways at me, you know, of having lived here and there a rather wild life. Well, I assure you
that some contact with life is necessary to understand it and I also assure you that any contact
with life gets wild.

So, the upshot of this was that I started in on the basis of – I've got to go outside the
field of Scientology for a field to study because I'm – you know, if I kept studying inside the
field of Scientology, I'm studying an area where I understand everything. So, I took a subject in which I'd been mildly interested since I was a kid and had very often used and actually had been a professional in at one time or another, but which I really knew I didn't understand very well. And I took a course in this. Took a three-year course, crowded it into five months on top of all the other research materials and came crashing down the line with this thing. And every time I myself would hit a bug – the subject, of course was photography – and every time I would hit a bug, then knowing Scientology and knowing the combinations of things, I would simply back off from this – oh, I'd get ARC broke, man, I'd be swearing, you know, throw the book halfway across the room, and so forth. "What was the – wha-what they talking about," you know. And I kept watching these various phenomena, you see, and I'd go back and I'd trace them down very, very carefully and using Scientology trace those things down to their exact source.

At first I realized that it was merely noncomprehension on my part or a failure to communicate on the part of the teacher and that's all I attributed it to. And then I found out that this wasn't a total satisfactory answer because one remained ARC broke on the subject. So, I traced it back that little additional step and found out that one hadn't understood a word and then it wouldn't have mattered whether the teacher had been articulate or the student bright. The word gone – the mind goes. It's just one – two. And it's just like hitting a springboard that sails you through the air because the next few paragraphs after the missed word are blanks. And you can go back and study those paragraphs and go back and study those paragraphs and study those paragraphs and you can take somebody who is in this cycle – and you can plead with him, you can coax, you can howl, you can scream, you can beat the desk, you can examine him. You could do anything in the world you want to do, I mean, you would not be able to shake the thing because it's hanging on the prior word – just ahead of that misunderstood passage and very often having nothing to do with it.

Now, this is what drove Instructors mad – having nothing to do with that word, we get this skip. So, you had to go back and you had to locate that word. The second you located the word – the magic, you see, was that all the kerfuffle the person was in, all the mess he was in, all the mix-up – that's Texan Indian, I think. That's where we got okay, same state. Anyway, "kerfuffle" means an upset. The... as soon as we got into that, then the instructor or the teacher or the writer or whoever was trying to communicate it, see, he would just try harder and harder to bang around what wasn't understood and you know – and they just – on the subject matter of what wasn't understood. And actually they weren't discussing what wasn't understood at all. It was just a little bit earlier and it happened to be a word that was misdefined in the person's mind and that was really all there was to it. So, you get a word you don't know and can't define, then you get into a sequence of "don't understand anything."

Well, this was one of the most important facts because this told us why people blew Scientology. This told us how we lost people. And we've been busy here madly getting a dictionary together. This is a very important fact – very important fact. So, if somebody didn't understand the word Scientology, then thereupon skipped the whole subject. I think that's interesting isn't it? So that tells you why psychology doesn't have to be worried about by you or me. [laughter] Psychiatry – same root words. They obviously wouldn't believe them if
they'd go on treating the people the way they're treating them, you see. They have no definition for that.

Medicine has now broadened itself into "the act of healing." That's what the word medicine means. I think that's very fascinating. You'll find it in all the latest dictionaries the medical profession has been able to get next to. Medicine is the act of healing. Of course, to thee and me it means something you take in a spoon. So, they've had to redefine their words in order to include, they hoped, both psychiatry and surgery. Those were the embarrassing areas they had to include. And so now we don't know what medical doctor means and they try to push it down the throats of state legislatures. You very often will find yourself very puzzled, as why is medicine in that particular area. Well, that's because they've redefined their professional terminology, which I think is gorgeous. It's gorgeous, so we don't have to worry about them.

No but – this poor guy going into medical school, see, medical school, he's going to medical school – he's had it. He doesn't know what he's going to study in medical school, because he thinks it has to do with what we used to consider the word medical to mean, see. Well, what did it mean? I don't know – and they sure don't. But they're now trying to broaden it over to an imperialism of all healing, see. They're now trying to make this mean this other thing, only it doesn't mean this other thing, don't you see? It's a mess.

So, one of the first things you've got to do is recognize when you're relaying anything to anybody that you don't pour on their heads words which boggle them, see. Like the word boggle. What does the word boggle mean? [laughter] See. Right in the middle of that you'd derail. A colloquialism, means popeyed – become popeyed with puzzlement. Also derived from bog down, meaning get one's wheels in the mud. You clear from that point of the track? [laughter]

All right. Now the upshot of this is then that we have been on a very long and very arduous run in the field of technology and research and we've come out with our hands full of lilies and also violets and other things and life is much more pleasant and looks brighter. And as soon as I get some of these books and materials written and the dictionary out and as soon as I get the PE books written, why, then I can go back to my E-Meter and keep going.

Now every once in a while during this period of time, somebody has said, "Well now, why hasn't Ron gone totally OT and gone?" Well, that's why Ron hasn't gone totally OT and gone. And if anybody chides me with it, I'm going to get mad. [laughter]

All right. So much for all that. Now, that brings you up-to-date on what the immediate history is concerned. Now, as far as planning, all during these last many months I've been putting together the basic planning of Scientology from a standpoint of programing. What do Central Organizations do and what's the drill and how's it going to go in this way, and I went ahead and planned a boom and you'll see the recent policy letters of just this last week and if you understood them, read them very thoroughly, went over them with a fine-toothed dictionary, and got yourself in a high state of comprehension as to how it interlocked, why, you would become a little bit popeyed because this is the wildest thing that has ever been advanced around here.
This thing—this thing is a machine in which not too much can go wrong. If it does go wrong, it can't derail it very much, don't you see, because it's in from every place. And it has to do with books. And the reason Central Organizations haven't gotten along well and why you see them staggering and their staff getting low units and so forth, it's very difficult to trace: they just forgot to advertise books.

For instance, HASI London up here used to spend 127 pounds a month on book ads in magazines and they stopped doing that because they thought for a little while they didn't have enough money to do it. Well, then they made sure they didn't have enough money to do it by not advertising. So, by dropping out that one pin—just that one pin—why, they actually slowed the wheels of Scientology dissemination immeasurably. Now, by putting that pin back in and turning it into a gold spike, why, these wheels will start to roll. And then by making money available for that book advertising, then make the books available which are comprehensible, you see, behind that program, and then fixing it up so that if they don't advertise books, the tax collector will get all the money, which will make them frantic...

A Central Organization can't do anything with the money which is invested in membership and so forth except advertise books with it. It's in a sealed account. As soon as a membership is bought, then it goes into that local account and it can only be spent for book ads. And that account, I can see it now, it'll go up there to two-thousand pounds, three-thousand pounds. Then to fix it up so that people have to buy memberships, see, and then so that Central Organizations will insist on them buying memberships, in spite of the fact that they get tremendous discounts from the memberships, don't you see? Get 50 percent discount if you own both memberships, you see. Horrendous! Both memberships cost much less than the amount of money you save by buying them. So, that's wheeled around. The only place membership money can go into this book account, and the only place that book account can go is into dissemination.

I can see it now that—and with the emphasis on the book ad. So, I can see it now: the thing gets two-thousand pounds in it, see. Everybody is sitting there, see. And then they write a despatch off to Saint Hill and they say, "Dear Ron, we have about two-thousand pounds' worth of bills which we owe in the Cape Town area and it'd be awfully nice if we could take that book money there—I know we owe Saint Hill a little money—but if we could just pay our bills and we could borrow this money..." And I will write back a check to a local advertising agency I will have contacted and just commission them for two-thousand pounds to place book ads. [laughter]

I can see other organizations watching it, you see. It goes 1,000 dollars, it goes 2,000 dollars, it goes 3,000, 5,000, 8,000 dollars in this account, 10,000 dollars in the account and so forth, and then they get a periodic letter saying, "Make sure that you don't have any excess profits in any of your accounts at the end of the year because, of course, they become taxable and it's all taken away by income tax." And they all of a sudden think of this wonderful account that they've been storing and saving money in, don't you see. Well, how do they get rid of this? Do we transfer it to Saint Hill? (They haven't read the policy letters, you see, or something, you know.) "Well, no, no, just give me the name of a local advertising agent and we will get rid of it for you and there's 10,000 dollars worth of book ads, see." And then they earn a lot of money by selling the books, you see. But the money they earn by selling the books
also goes into the book account. See, so the more books you sell, the more money there is in the book account. And, of course, the more you advertise, the more books you sell – and the more books you sell, the more people come in. It really doesn't depend then, too much, on how many students you train or how many pcs you process, see. There'll be that number, but the number of students and pcs will increase. And the more students and pcs come in – the more books are sold, the more students and pcs come in. Well, of course, the more memberships will be bought, the more advertising will be bought, the more ads will be placed, the more students and pcs will come in. Do you see?

By having ended the scarcity in this particular direction, then the field auditor has just had a pistol pointed at his head if he doesn't become a franchised auditor. And that is, nobody does anything to him, but all these beautiful new book ads – as soon as the person hasn't written the organization for three months – you know, he bought a book and then didn't say anything else, three or four months they didn't come in through the front door or something like that – then that's automatically moved over as an address plate into the franchised auditor files and the franchised auditor can then buy large stacks of brochures which are already pre-addressed, which he simply mails out. And, of course, he's contacted all the book buyers in his area. You follow? Now, because he knows about definitions, all he's got to do is ask them the burning question, "What word didn't you understand?" And if they're the type of person who would never be audited, to apply that particular action. You get the idea?

The field auditor, then, would be rather denied that service if he weren't a franchised auditor, right? He'd have to be a franchised auditor to be able to buy these lists of pre-addressed brochures. And he can buy as many as he wants and, of course, as soon as the advertising goes, these have lots of fresh names in them. He mails those out from his zone or area and he, of course, can buy them just for his area. And so he gets very busy in that particular area if he's a franchise holder. And the field auditor sits out there without any such communication lines, so he wants a franchise, obviously, right?

But a franchise holder now can't teach anything but an HAS Course. He can't teach an HQS Course. I had to drop the boom on that for the excellent reason that I want the guy to become a city office. So he's very successful as a franchise holder and he becomes a city office. The reason he becomes a city office is because if he becomes a city office he can teach an HQS Course and an HCA Course. Of course, he wants to become a city office right away, see. But then if he becomes a city office, he has an HCO book account. [laughter] And he has to control that exactly the same way that it's controlled in any Central Organization. And, of course, then that advertises books and that gets people in and so forth.

Well, this is one of these doubling dissemination programs and I can foresee that the Saint Hill course will probably become just an organizational briefing course by about 1968, probably grooving people in to how they should handle their immediate organizational area, or something like that, and R6 training, by 1968, will pass out to Central Organizations, you see. I see that trend in the wind. So this course will probably run until 1968 and then there won't be any more course as such, which I have been warning people straight along. I wasn't going to do this forever, man.
So anyway, the – this plan has – well, it's got all kinds of little pins in it, one way or the other, which keep it corralled and the thing is forced into a wide-level action. Of course, most of the books within a year – all the books being advertised – will be brand-new books written exactly at the level of the people who are buying them and with very careful dictionary things.

Along with this comes your new HAS Course. And your first week or two of your HAS Course is in actual fact the free PE. And you just start in and teach this HAS Course and at the end of the first five or six evenings or something like that, why, then the person has to sign up for the remaining course and it goes thirty to forty evenings. And it's mostly devoted to just telling people what it's all about. They've come down there to find out what this is all about and we tell them what's it all about and man's relationship to the universe. And we don't give them any brain-cracking words and in other words, they're away.

And this is done in a peculiar and particular way which is brand-new and that is to say – the PE has been one of the hardest areas there is because the staff will normally take somebody who is not too *au fait*, meaning hep, with the business – you know, he really didn't make too good a staff auditor so they moved him over into PE. Well, of course, this guy's got havoc at his fingertips, you know. And that's what happens in PE courses. They put somebody in there who's not quite straight on it and is having a little difficulty or something, because he can't hold another executive... well, this is the most important gate in the organization, don't you see? And every now and then they've made this mistake and so they have shut off their entry into the organization.

Well now, I know this is very difficult to find somebody and it's a very great strain to have somebody stand up there and talk to an audience and so forth, for a long period of time on a subject which he – would have to bone up on. He'd practically have to look over this whole thing. I know you, but you're you, you see, and you've been at it a long time. You got a lot to say. You know a lot of things about it. Well, let's take this city office in the mythical town of Keokuk. There is a town of Keokuk, by the way, and there is no city office there. That's why I always put one there. So someday, someone's going to – [laughter] somebody's going to delight me by opening up an office in Keokuk.

Anyway, the – think of this bird. Now, he's got a lot of other things on his mind and he hasn't got too grooved-in a staff and that sort of thing. How's he going to keep PE from falling on its head? Well, that's a very – I worked on it quite a while and finally worked out a fairly simple answer. You take a book. It has a – it has the lecture in it; it's got the whole lecture in it. And it says exactly what you're supposed to do and every word that is used in English is footnoted at the bottom of the page of exactly what its definition is and then the Scientology words are defined very precisely in the text itself, don't you see. In other words, strange words or words that might be beyond one syllable are in the footnotes and then the Scientology words are described at some length in the text. Do you see? And this is simply something that somebody stands up and reads. And what you got to have for PE then is somebody who can talk loudly with good diction and you can find him very easily. You see? Now, all he's got to do is be on deck and talk loudly with good diction and he can go on down the line of this PE book and then they're certain things he's supposed to do.
And a PE evening breaks into three periods and the first period is simply reading the text. The next period is a discussion of the text, particularly a discussion of the definitions of these various words. The fellow who isn't going to understand any part of it, you know very well that he's stuck back in some earlier subject and you simply read this other thing off and you tell him so. And you tell him to go look up that earlier subject, whatever it was, and go down to the dictionary and get the words in it defined a bit better and then come back. And it's a specific remedy and it's going to hit the bypassed charge, don't you see, so he isn't going to ARC break with you, theoretically, unless you chop him up or something.

He'll say, "Yeah, what do you know, that's true, that's true. I was all mixed up with spiritualism for years. My mother was a spiritualist and... 'ectoplasm.' What the hell is ectoplasm?" you know.

Yeah, and he'll be sitting there after that worrying about what's ectoplasm [laughter] and he'll leave you alone. And you get on with it and he'll finally be curious enough next day to look it up. He's been told to and he'll do so, and that clears up that to a large degree. That'll handle the majority of such responses, see. All right, that discussion period then reveals any difficulty they're having with definitions, see.

And then there's the third period of the evening. We're accustomed to PEs having only two periods in the evening, but actually it's cut up into three periods. So, the first one isn't all that long, don't you see. And the third period of the evening is each student in the PE takes up his little ballpoint and he writes a demonstration of the things which he is asked to demonstrate at the end of the read text. And he writes his name and address on that piece of paper clean and clear and hands it in to the Instructor. Now that – if he was so timid then that he didn't have a chance to get into the general discussion, and if that, as it sometimes happens, gets monopolized by somebody who's got rocks in his head, and you will that – you'll discover that's the case every now and then. Every evening, it's just this fellow Jing Bingblatt is just this – he's just blowing everybody's brains out, don't you see. He doesn't see how this reconciles itself with the local communist policy. And in vain you tell him he's in the wrong meeting, you know. And – but something like that.

Anyway, these little quiet people that sit around and don't say anything normally they just feel a little bit out of comm, but they're perfectly interested and so forth and they never get a chance to talk back, don't you see. And they get sort of jammed in with the flow of it all. So, what you do is put this third period in and everybody there must put down a demonstration, that is, an example out of life that has happened or that he could imagine happened, that would demonstrate the points in that lecture. Now, he may have two or three of these that he's got to put down. And he hands that paper in to the Instructor and that's good night, you see.

All right, now that is the rough outline, not too rough either, of a PE Course. And their textbook then goes something on the order, I don't know how long, but it's something like thirty to sixty of these lessons, and they're actually covering the whole field of ontology with a crash. Because even a little kid worries about the questions which come up in that field – man's relationship to the universe, see. Who am I – you know? Where did I come from? Was I found in a cabbage patch, you know? How do I get along with my fellow man, if one can. And questions of this particular character are quite germane to everyone. And philosophy
only went upstairs because nobody understood it and everybody blew but the professors. [laughter] So you see, it was originally a subject that was owned by man, don't you see, and it no longer is. So we just put it back into his hands again.

And we call this – and here is a trick term and you will find out this term will be preempted and handled and somebody will try to cop it and copy it and that sort of thing. That's why we're going to put it in titles, and so forth – "applied philosophy." Somebody asks you what Scientology is – Scientology is "applied philosophy."

They say, "Gee, you know, I've got no quarrel with philosophy. I thought it was some kind of psychology."

"No, psychology was an attempt..." [laughter] "...to apply philosophy. Oh, well, Scientology takes in a lot of that. I mean there's a lot of stuff in that, but there's a great deal more. Of course, it takes in the field of philosophy."

"That so?"

You get the idea, see?

Audience: Mmmm. Mm – hm.

So along with this we had to have an easy quick way to say exactly what it was and so that was the designation. So your PE courses – they don't come down there to study some oddball psychology or study something else or study spiritualism or something. They come down there to study applied philosophy. And without a philosophy, a man doesn't get along well in life. Because philosophy, by popular definition, is something you use to get you over the rough places. It is what you say to yourself in some tricky epigram that then permits you to face up to the fact you're being steamrolled. And the definition of whether or not you're a true philosophy is whether or not you will take head-on all the slings and arrows of misfortune, you see, without flinching. So, this is more or less the way it sits in the general ken and so forth, but it's actually a very noble, very upstairs endeavor and – in the public idea – and nobody is going to find any fault with it.

And I can see now the medical profession trying to pass a law in Keokuk state legislature or Kangarooiland against the writing and study of philosophy. Of course, everybody would think the exact truth – they're a pack of madmen, you see.

So, this also is part of this general planning and campaigning which I've been at since April and it shaped up so that I tried to figure out how you could communicate Scientology very easily to somebody without getting crisscrossed and getting it compared to everything. Now, some wiseacre is going to start all of a sudden quoting "Kant can't" at you, you know, or something like that. Well, just stand there and nod. Just stand there and nod, "Yes, yes, that's all very true." Don't find yourself in a big argument about it, don't you see. But you won't get into many arguments about it. Something like good roads and good weather, don't you see?

If you do certain things in life and if you really did discover your relationship to the universe – and these are proper subjects of inquiry in the field of philosophy – and what actually is the actual composition of man – you find people going to get awful interested because
they've been asking themselves that question ever since they could talk, don't you see? So, you don't drop out anything that you've got in Scientology, see. You lose nothing of what you've got. This is just your Level 0 presentation of it that makes it very smooth, very easy, very glib, very fast, don't you see? And far from removing vitality from it, you will find out it puts it back into it again.

So anyway, this is – this is the general shape of things. So, that PE Course should be very easy to teach. The people came down there to find out how to get along in life better and on the – your advertising is always on the suspicion that they haven't been getting along in life quite as well as they thought they should have, which is a very safe assumption in this society. And so your – your PE Course, as such, takes up just the first few lessons in that same textbook and then goes on for the remainder.

Now, maybe those – that textbook is split into two volumes one of which covers the PE and one of which covers the rest of the course. I wouldn't be able to tell you at this mo-ment which is which, but, in any event, the book they're being taught from is available to the student being taught, you see? Now, this is another proof of the situation. Even though it is being read to them – and you'll find out people are very funny – even though it is being read to them, even though they've already read it, they will sit there and listen to it being read, don't you see. And actually what they experience is agreement. They don't experience bore-dom.

Now, that's only true of fairly searching truths and fairly searching material on which new thought matter can be found any time you go over it. It is not true of Little Red Riding-Hood, because Little Red Riding-Hood is not designed around the provocation of thought but the provocation of depravity. I think it's been barred from Russia now because it teaches can-nibalism and several other things.

Anyway, the upshot of it is that here is rather searching material in which new mate-rial could be found anyway, and you have a new shape of teaching this. And, of course, all of this is built on the structure of what we already know about education.

Now, in addition to that, providing I don't – providing I can keep meself whipped up and fascinated with it, because whenever I start writing anything for university I myself start yawning. In the first place, you don't ever dare say anything. That's one of the things that you mustn't do. Use a lot of words, but don't say any-thing. And I have such an antipathy to false pomposity in prose or anything like that. When I start to write anything in a very pompous fashion or that sort of thing, why, I get to laughing too hard and I tear it up. Because it's a swindle, you see. It's a mess.

I remember I completely estranged one of my aunts one time by telling her that her son, who was a pianist, needed to develop him-self a style and a public presence, and that these were highly individualistic things and that they were totally planned and they weren't spontaneous things which sprang from the clouds simultaneously with a blast of lightning. They were simply a planned presence or presentation. And unfortunately told her that her favorite conductor was simply standing up there in his tail coat and his white tie, making the motions he was making and acting the way he was acting as a public presence and that it was simply a calculated action and that I knew one of them even went into temper tantrums as a
calculated public presence, you see, that this, in other words, was down to the crass level of press and public relations, don't you see. I'm afraid I estranged her forevermore. She really hasn't been civil to me since then. And her son has not been... he finally branched off and became successful in his own line.

But the point was that if you planned anything like that, don't you see, why, that would be very bad indeed and that this was not natural. That standing up and conducting a symphony orchestra with temper tantrums now and then was a natural action. You know, natural like putting on an old pair of boots or natural... I don't know how anybody managed it, you know. Because of all of the pomposity I have ever watched in my life, it has come from some of these arts which pretend they are above it all, you see, and they've got worship mixed up with art. And I assure you that worship is merely a root word and has nothing to do with art.

Things like awe and reverence shouldn't be mixed up in education. That's all I'm trying to say. Education is a communication. And you've got to have some attention at the other end, but there's no reason to overdo it. Now, it just doesn't seem to me to be a subject for... The church is the church and education is education. You get the idea?

So anyway, writing these materials up will be a little bit of a chore but if I enter into this zone – and that is to write a textbook which would become the standard textbook of schools and university students and teachers – it just mentions that this is out of the materials of Scientology, and, of course, has got my byline on it. Otherwise, it just runs off and tells them how to study what they're studying and how to teach what they're studying and gives them the various axioms and rules connected with this particular line and how to handle the slow student and how to speed the student up and the mistakes they can make and the various types of examinations. In other words, just run this off on a rat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat-a scientific approach. This is a codification of it here and there and so on.

Now, that of course, would answer all academic questions with regard to Scientology. And it would answer tomorrow's demand for Scientology, because little Sammy – the second that he got into trouble in grammar school and so forth – would be being taught out of that textbook (you get the idea) and he'd get through the lines with that textbook; and then when he really pulled a cropper when he was a senior in high school or whatever he became, and so forth, all of a sudden would start studying it himself, don't you see? And he moves over in the university and it's a foregone conclusion of course that he's an expert on this particular subject. So somebody comes along and tells him he needs some processing or something like that. He'd say, "Of course." You follow? In other words, this has been serviceable and workable, so therefore he has a comparable datum to Scientology at large, you see. So therefore, if this education worked and that got people over the rough spots, why naturally then, why, other parts of Scientology would work, you see. So it gives him a basis of comparison and invades the field of education most mercilessly.

Well, that is almost an extraneous project and is not a project on which I have my heart completely set, because I get to laughing when I try to phrase something so that a professor will not find any objection to it at all. Because, you see, I know that if he sees something simply phrased in its totality of simplicity, then he will immediately relegate it to the first-grade grammar school teacher, don't you see. And he won't hold it up along the line. And
at the same time, if it's filled full of a bunch of outrageous English – you see, a command of English is a command of the simple words of English. My vocabulary was tested one time at 250 thousand words, which I thought was rather interesting, because I don't use them. And I think a command of English depends on what not to use rather than what you use. Do you follow me? I didn't mean to enter any plug sideways on vocabulary, but that was the vocabulary figure. But you don't – I know better than to use "prerogative" when I mean "rights." Don't you see. And let somebody crash into syllable – multisyllabification paragraph after paragraph when you could have said it much more easily. A fact which I learned in the field of writing.

It was called to my attention one time that one of the largest vocabularies in the English language was held by a writer by the name of O.Henry. Now, you read O.Henry in vain for any big words. Well, the mystery of all of this is, is he knew so many words he didn't have to use any big ones. And that was pointed out to me by a very wise artist one time that that happened to be the case and that this was the end product of really knowing English.

Well now, how we can get by the professor without airing his particular frailty with which is the only thing he goes into agreement. The guy absolutely dies if he doesn't have an adverbal clause modifying a participial phrase of some character or another which syntaxes itself to death, you know.

You read some of the old articles – that's a strange word that's just thrown in sideways – you read the old Encyclopaedia Britannica and it was fairly simple. But as the years went along, they got more and more experts to write for it. And now, very often, you look up an article on something and you read it in vain.

I finally developed a system whereby I took a piece of paper and blocked off the modifying clauses, of which there might be as many as fifteen or sixteen from the middle of the paragraph, you see, and I carefully sought out the subject and sought out the object and sought out the verb, don't you see, and then would get that sentence straight, out of that particular paragraph, to find out what they were talking about. And, you know, I'd very often find out they weren't talking about anything. Anyhow... [laughter, laughs] very amusing business.

So, there's a certain pose or a certain style, which is accepted in certain areas as the right pose or the right style, which carries with it a certain presence, don't you see. And most of them are calculated and quite a few of them are quite false and some of them are very unnecessary. And in the field of philosophy, actually walking around in old, tattered rags and standing like a statue at street corners looking thoughtful for hours on end isn't actually necessary to having wisdom.

But, you know, the Greek, the later days of Greece, had this pretty, pretty tangled up. A philosopher had a certain pose and a certain style and a certain presence. But I call to your attention, Greece had long since gone past the zenith of its philosophical golden age when this sort of thing was occurring.

So that we find the emperor Justinian had carried the fact of being a philosopher to such an extent that it meant to him not bathing, wearing ragged clothes, being terribly plain, eating very peasant type food. He was emperor of the Romans, you see. He could have had scrambled peasants' tongues, you see, while sitting in the middle of the Sahara Desert. And
eating very plain food, you see, and enduring everything. I don't know, he had it mixed up with fakirism from India. I suppose it was from the Stoic philosophy that he had imbibed. But he would have been very, very happy to have lain for hours on a bed of spikes, don't you see, and this showed he could endure things so well and so on. And that was the way he had it defined, but that was the pose of the day. He got a chance to lay on his bed of spikes. He didn't put the empire together but went over to conquer Persia and got a nice long spike through him and that was the end of that.

But the – I'm just making the point that it becomes a pose, too, don't you see. And whenever you enter a falsity into any particular subject, you may get a perpetuity of that subject. It may get much – may endure much longer, but – but it's going to have something wrong with it.

If you look at anything around that isn't running right, you're going to find it basically has a lie connected with it. There's going to be a lie connected with that somewhere. And if it isn't easy to handle, then there's a lie connected with it in some way. There's something awry.

Now, I'll give you a good example of this in handling a pc's PTP. If you handle a pc's PTP on Monday and handle it again on Tuesday and handle the same pc's PTP again on Wednesday, you can just plain make up your mind that that isn't the PTP. There's a lie connected with this. Either he isn't hung up in a PTP – that's probable – the most probable of these things – he isn't, but it's something else entirely different that is wrong with him, or the PTP being put forward by him is a known and outrageous lie, or it is continuing to be a PTP because he's told somebody some fabulous falsehoods connected with this thing, you see. We're getting, in other words – because of the character of as-isness, we can't as-is it, you see, because it doesn't have in it what it's supposed to have in it.

So when you audit a preclear who is giving you a bunch of stuff which doesn't exist, then of course, he can't as-is it because it isn't there to be as-ised. Do you see? So he gets in a terrible mess and he tells you life is being mean to him. Well, this could be perfectly true. That's right. The environment is perfectly capable of it. But when he starts giving specific ways life is being mean to him and he has no cognition about these things, and then you start asking him for what he's doing in life, you see, or try to unpeel this package of – he's doing something, too, you see – life can't lean on him without him leaning on life, you know. And you start getting those and you find out the condition isn't gaining any – nothing's gaining, don't you see. You aren't getting tone arm motion and you – so forth – and you look at this. Well, just make up your mind you're looking at a situation which has got a falsity connected with it somewhere. Either he's kidding you or life's kidding him or – or there's a lie here some place, don't you see.

And, of course, it's not socially polite to ask your pc, "Now, let's see, is life lying to you or are you lying to me?" You know, that's not socially polite, but could be effective at times.

Now, in other words, the entrance of any false action prevents it from being as-ised. But at the same time, in order to get anybody to pay any attention to something at all, it has to be in a certain form with which they have agreement – they have agreement, don't you see. So, what I'm doing is splitting these hairs of how much am I willing to concede in order to let
the professors have something, you see, and, you know, I'm just being a stubborn dog about it. I just won't give very much.

But then this would mean that without a book on education, you would be trying to reform the entire university educational system of the world without any communication into it. And you know, I think that would be stupid, too. So, I don't know what I'll do with regard to this, so I don't know whether you'll ever have the book or not. But I'm trying anyway – I'm trying.

Anyway, that about rounds up the finite basic administrative planning and steps, and so forth, and covers the last – well, now I suppose it's getting up there to around two years almost. It will be two years on the twentysecond of this coming January and that's only about 2½ months away. So, this has been quite a sprint and Central Orgs are beginning to realize – and city offices – that I'm paying some attention to them now, and things are greasing up a little bit better. But a lot of them got very sad and shaky during this particular period and worked themselves ragged and tried to hold things together and did a beautiful job of it and I'm very proud of them because they had a rough run of it. I wasn't giving them anything they could use on anybody, don't you see. And I wasn't paying much attention to the SOS, ditdit-did-adada-diditditdit, you know. I wasn't on the other end of the line. "Be self-determined," I would say, you know. Used that as an excuse not to get involved. But sort of let things run themselves.

But for the last many months, now, I've been working at it hammer and pound, trying to get things straightened out. And here at Saint Hill, why, we've been very alert on the comm lines and we're putting it all back together. But what we're putting it together for, of course, is a boom. And we're not putting it together for anything less than a boom because there's – hardly worthwhile spending your time on it, you see, unless it was going to boom.

So, don't worry too much about the opposition – there isn't any opposition. A newspaper that would refuse to take copies of a book for advertisements, and so forth, is actually refusing freedom of speech. And newspapers don't go in for stepping on freedom of speech because their whole livelihood depends on it, don't you see. And they will advertise books. They might not advertise courses, might not advertise practices, they might not advertise anything else. But they will all advertise books. That isn't why we're advertising books – we're advertising books because it's the best thing to advertise. That's why we're advertising books. And in Central Organizations I always, when I wanted to gun up their – their activities in any given area and so forth, why, I'd just start banging books, you see, and doing most of the promotion work around there myself, and everything would start moving on up the line. It was all very happy.

Now, whether or not this winds up to anything or not is a question one could logically ask. But one would have to face that question of where else is there on the planet any answers to anything that is going on. And as soon as one honestly answers that, out of his own recognition of what's going on in Scientology, and then take a fairly good look at what's going on elsewhere, we realize at that point that a boom does not to any degree depend upon any further information that we have, because we're filling a total vacuum. And the – there are people around who will shudder at the idea of, all of a sudden, the amount of tumble and turmoil.
We've learned so much about tumble and turmoil and how to handle it, and how to shunt it here and there, and do this and that with it, that it actually doesn't constitute much of a menace. It only constitutes a menace if you don't have the publications, if you don't have the administration lines to put things on.

You'll find every Central Organization, even though they may have forgotten it, is subdivided in such a way that you just start shedding hats. In other words, an individual on a post just starts shedding hats. The hats are all multiple. And I know where they are multiple, don't you see. So that you'll find two or three titles are being packed by the same person but he probably also hasn't noticed that he's wearing as many as thirty-five hats.

If you really started into a landslide of some kind or another, you'd find an Org Sec, in order to get all of his hats worn under stress, and so forth, would in actual fact require thirty-five people who haven't been there before, don't you see. And those people are each handling this one little section, which is now a very busy sector, don't you see.

Now, the only thing that made things enturbulated in 1950 is nobody was prepared for any such action and there was no administrative control. Everybody keeps overlooking this fact. It was a boom with no central control of any kind whatsoever, because there was no administrative control in the Central Organizations at Elizabeth, New Jersey. There was none. I tried to get things done all on my little old lonesome without any board action, without any backup, without anything of the sort, and the board most of the time was in total disagreement with everything that was being done. And the next thing I'd – we'd – I didn't have control of the organization. There wasn't anything I could do to shove the thing through. So, I just threw in the sponge and went off and wrote – worked away on another book, and so forth. But it just couldn't have run, don't you see?

In the first place, that first Central Organization had about six or eight bosses, separate, independent, and not even vaguely in line with each other, so that everything that was done, somebody would come along and say, do something else. There was no administrative pattern of any kind whatsoever. There were two or three people on that board who believed implicitly that Scientology was a business where you made a lot of bucks and it… No, Scientology is an activity which if done well gives you the additional embarrassment of getting rid of money. And trying to organize it along these lines, nobody had any agreement on its basics. But we've got now all these years of experience backing that up so we have no worries about booms.

But, of course, I look at the field auditor who's going to see all of those juicy mailing lists going out to the franchise center over there in the other side of town and who is going to walk around and apply for a franchise on the idea that he might get a couple of pcs, you see. Well, he's already for it. He's for it. Because what'll happen to him from there on, he'd just be caught up in a hurricane. And what's going to occur right immediately after that is he's going to need certain things to buttress up the activities in which he is engaged, and so forth. And as a franchise holder, he's going to find life is very, very hectic – very hectic because, of course, he isn't smoothly organized into a working unit. And eventually in desperation he's going to find out that if he sends somebody to the Central Organization, they can be trained in the administration necessary to run a city office and he thinks maybe that might be better. In addi-
tion to that, you can get rid of all these training requests and they wouldn't keep going over to that new city office now on the other side of town. And that finance would make it possible to do a lot of things, get a new building and that sort of thing.

So, he'll send somebody in to the Central Organization to be trained and at that first moment, why, he will run into the fact that there are orderly ways in order to handle this, unless of course some franchise holder has been working in a Central Organization, in which time he would know. He would also – I find out these guys only go so long and then they turn themselves into a city office, scat. They wouldn't work outside the organizational structure if you held a gun on them. They – they, "Oh, no," you know, that kind of a reaction.

So, they'll learn this technology. So, we're doing things to collect this technology at the present moment, and most Central Organizations are well away on the project of writing up every policy they have ever known about in connection with the particular post which they are handling. And those are being collected here. And we're putting those together into a book of policies which just – got it all down the line rat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat, which of course is not terribly important to you as an auditor in auditing a pc, unless you realize that a boom were being started in your direction with a completely missing orderly procedure of expansion, and that would be a catastrophe. That would be something to worry about. But fortunately we have tremendous experience and so forth in this line; we're putting that together, and that can graduate on up, too.

We actually have a tougher administrative structure than you would normally expect to exist. It's more precise – I didn't mean the word *tough*, it's more precise really, more hide-bound, more squared around, more compartmented. It can get so severely compartmented the whole organization will still function – fall out of communication with each other. I've seen it happen. Everybody got so specialized in his own hat and refusing to do anybody else's hat to such a degree, the organization just went out of communication and it's entirely inside itself but oddly enough still kept functioning. Was quite interesting.

So, the – we had an organization board up there at HASI London, out on the public board. In other words, the organization chart was up there where the public could get to it very easily without walking in the front door. They could just walk into the outer hall. And one day a staff member up there came out and collided with a tall, cadaverous-looking fellow with a long beard, with a piercing gleam through his pince-nez, and he was going over this board 100 percent, "Ooh, te-da-do, is that so, that so, is that so."

And the staff member asked him who he was. Well, he was the secretary of the British Psychiatric Association. Anyway, he was going over this thing and so forth and he says, "It's no wonder we never get anywhere. We never have anything like this." He was very impressed. And all of a sudden he had seen something there that looked like an organizational structure and he, intimate with the leading psychiatric organization of Great Britain, knew that he didn't even have any vague shadow of anything like that. So, it's no wonder Scientology is going. Of course, he now attributed it totally to administration and organization, see.

And I imagine he went back home and invented an org pattern made up out of his hospital administration experience of World War I of – the captain kicks the lieutenant and the lieutenant kicks the sergeant and the sergeant kicks the private and the private kicks the mule.
And fails to realize that this cycle winds up with the mule, being now in a foul frame of voice, kicks the head off the captain. [laughs]

But anyway, there's the size and shape of things to come. Now, none of that is swami. That is to say, I can wear a good swami hat and I like these bath towels and ten-cent-store diamonds; it's just really marvelous. Go to a party and wrap a bath towel around your head and put a Woolworth diamond on the front of the bath towel and tell people's fortunes. That used to be one of my biggest gags, and so forth, only I'd tell them what I saw in their banks.

An FBI man, at one time or another, at a party where it was gagged up there in Washington, a bunch of departmental heads and that sort of thing – this FBI man, I'd already told him the case he was working on slightly, and this had mystified him because that was dead secret, don't you see? I told his fortune with this deck of cards, you see. And he "Er-er – and so on" – very creepy about the whole thing. But he knew there was something false mixed up with this. He hung around the edges and he watched me tell the fortunes to an awful lot of other people around there. And eventually, when I'd finally taken off the bath towel that some girl had gotten me and given the old dowager back her brooch, why, he came around to me. Hostess had given me a drink, and soon as she went away, he leaned over to me and said, "How were you doing that?"

"Oh," I said, "dead simple." And I pulled the cards out of my pocket and showed them to him, turned them over on the back, and I said, "You see these baseballs, well now, you notice the number of stitches in that baseball? And you notice this next card over here? Well, the number of stitches in that baseball," I said, "well, that's seven stitches and then they're at a certain pattern and that makes a seven of diamonds." I turned it over and showed him it was the seven of diamonds.

He said, "Oh," he said, "marked cards," he said, "of course," and went away. [laughter, laughs]

Well, anyway, that – without any – without any crystal ball or anything, that is the shape of the future. What the crystal ball is, I don't know. Along about this time they're busy electing a president over in America and Lord knows what that'll – outcome will be and I haven't even dared to look at my crystal ball for fear it would explode, you know. But the fashion seems to be new governments; maybe it'll be kept up over there.

So, that is basically the planned shape of things to come that we are taking all the steps to promote and put into being and square around. You are here at this particular time rather fortunate because you're into the beginning of the kickoff on this and, of course, anybody's been here since April, has been part and parcel of this. And those that have been with us for many more years than that, of course, they know the drill one way or the other, and they know this will work because they'll say, "Yeah, that's right. Hey, hey, how come I didn't notice that? The book ads were dropped out. How'd that happen?" And I imagine their Assoc Secs and so forth, sitting around right now kicking themselves, you know, soon as they've been tipped off to the fact that this was the missing link. They've been sweating over trying to get units up, and they've been trying to do this and trying to do that. Well, they've dropped out their basic dissemination line, of course, is books, and they even have bulletins in their hats that tell them the basic dissemination line is books, you see. But it was just that one datum
that seemed to be as important as other datums, but doesn't happen to be. Actually it's the datum, you see. So naturally with that out, why, they've had a bit of a rough time, no matter what they did administratively.

You put that back in again with a crash and crush it through, why, the rest of it ought to follow through very easily. How long this will take, I wouldn't be able to forecast at this particular time. I imagine it will be up to very, very good proportions within a year, and with a franchise right now, why, you could obtain mailing lists made out of the inactive lists of Central Organizations, but because that has put it in your area, why, you still can do something with it, and just to get the line grooved in until we get the new book names to start issuing on this basis, you see.

You know, I mean, we'll be selling books and therefore getting new names and, of course, the lists which will be – one will be getting later, of course, will be – have lots of new bookbuyers and things like that and lots of fresh names. But right now, it's just being issued on the other basis.

Anyway, to make a long story short, I would say that it would be – start very visibly getting up to speed in just a few months. It'd be very visible. I would say within a year it'd be going very well and smoothly, and people wondering exactly where and how to turn and fit this in with that and I'd say in five or ten years, why, it'd be a hurricane and in maybe fifteen or twenty years, it won't even be a planet. Well, that's their lookout.

Okay, so that's the size of what is going on right at the present moment. And I was going to talk to you about something else, but I saw that you were interested in what was happening and what had happened and that you have a perfect right to know this because this is your Scientology, too.

Thank you very much.
COMMENTS ON
CLAY TABLE TV DEMO

A lecture given on 4 November 1964

Thank you.

Well, you should give the first team, actually, some applause. Give them a hand. They were very good. [applause]

[part missing]

Well frankly, you know, I'm astonished and pleased. I'm very pleased. The Instructors have done a very beautiful job of relaying this.

Do you realize that both Clay Table Healing and Clay Table Processing – I mean Clay Table Clearing, alike, I have never demonstrated. And this was straight off the cuff and actually I've never coached anybody on this and just written up the bulletins and there it is and it's going along very, very well. You can attribute a lot of that, both to the excellence of your Instructors, which I think is very high and to the fact that I had studied how to write study materials before I did it. You know, the relay of the communication.

But that is – that's one of the most reassuring things I've seen in a long time. Both of those sessions just went along pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. It's a shame – it's a shame now, that I have to – I have to groove them in nicely, but I just want to say that you got the word. And nothing I'm going to say now destroys that fact. We can make this a little bit better but oddly enough it has practically nothing to do with Clay Table that I'm going to mention with regard to these sessions. It has to do with basic auditing. And I have just seen something and recognized it and it becomes important.

I realized that what we had as repetitive auditing – repetitive auditing levels where you keep giving a command – which is now by the way HQS and it's HCA, too, of course. As you give the command, repetitively, over and over and over, that can be learned splendidly. That's very fine. That can be learned very well. A person can get that down and they've gone a long way when they've gotten there.

Now having become able to duplicate – and you see, this is one of those things where after you know your business, why, then you can do something else. Do you follow that? Because if you're doing something else because you don't know your business, why, watch it. Do you see? And those two points of somebody doing something else because he knows his business, you see, and somebody doing something else because he doesn't know his business, is pretty wild.
For instance, I remember when Wilson was elected, there were a bunch of photographers and they were holding reflex cameras over their heads and shooting a picture of Wilson, don't you see. Well, you could have immediately said, "Well, these boys – these boys are – that's pretty wild!" you know, and somebody who didn't know anything about it could say, "Well, I could hold my camera over my head and take a picture." No, that takes a great deal of skill. That takes enormous amounts of skill. A reflex camera has a ground glass in the bottom of it. Well, you wouldn't know that ordinarily. But these press photographers were so hot they could swing a camera over their head, look at the ground glass, get him in focus and fire him. And to the public at large it just looked like somebody was holding a camera over his head wildly, you know. It's very interesting.

European photographer, he often takes pictures around corners with those things. And you know, that sort of thing. Well, it takes a fantastic amount of skill to hold a camera steady at arm's length and that sort of thing. You see, the guy'd really have to know his business. I didn't mean to get photography into this, but I'm trying to give you a frame of reference, see.

On the other hand, somebody who doesn't know enough to look through the view finder, well that's another story. So he holds a camera over his head to take a picture. Of course he never gets anything. And that's the single test of it. Do you get what you start out for? Do you see?

So an expert is only interested in getting what he starts out for. Do you follow that? That is his aim. He wants to get what he starts out for. Now, he has to be pretty well trained as to the stylized or regular or very routine methods of getting what you start out for, see. He has to know that there is a way to get what you start out for, to get this end result. And he has to know for instance that you – you've got to compose and look through finders and ground glasses, don't you see, in photography, see, in order to get a picture in the frame and so on; he'd have to know all these things, you see.

Well, now an auditor – that's because we won on a study of photography, why I hope you'll forgive my interjecting it as a comparative example here. But now, both of those sessions wound up, you see, with what the auditor started for. That made them competent sessions. That's all that made them competent sessions. And there was just one point of the second session which demonstrated very conclusively that the auditor had gotten what he started out for. Regardless of how he was getting it, he'd gotten what he started out for.

All right, now did you recognize the point? What was it?

Audience: Cognition – pc cognition.

Yes, that's right! Pc had a cognition. Pc said there's a place from which to start. There's a what's – what old John Sanborn one time or another said, "You know, I always liked – I always get worried when sometime or another a pc doesn't say, 'What do you know!' or something like that once during a session, you know," and he said, "I get worried." Well, he had good reason to be worried, because a pc who doesn't ever have a "What do you know," he isn't going anywhere. Well, in other words, something had illuminated there. Some new concept had occurred, some new view had taken place, see. All right, when that took place pc expressed it as a cognition.
So therefore, the auditor did get what he started out for, correct? All right, that was a successful session. Now, somebody at HAS level perhaps thinks that he can get what he starts out for by giving some kind of a covert session that nobody knows is happening and he's going around the corners and he's weaseling in and out and he got somebody to talk and so forth, and he thinks he's going someplace and he's often astonished to find out that he doesn't wind up with a proper result. He went through the motions, you know, but of course he didn't know what he was going for or why he was going or what would happen if he did get there. He doesn't know whether he got a result or didn't get a result, because he didn't know what he was going for in the first place. Do you follow me?

Well, so he'd be in a confused mess all the way, wouldn't he? And therefore he doesn't even know there's a method of going.

All right, now let's take Levels I and II where the terrific amount of repetitive processing is done. Now, that gets to be quite a drill and it's an interesting drill and it's very fine and it must be done and it very often is much better to do it just that way than any other way, and I myself very often sit down and give one of these gosh-awful grind sessions, you know, of the equivalent of "Do birds fly?" you know. Right straight on through to the bitter, brutal end of it and so forth, and the pc winds up at the other end and says, "Hey! They do!" you know. And I say, "Yes sir, all right, that's fine." But I recognize what I'm doing – recognize very clearly what I'm doing – that I'm giving a repetitive process. And there is a point between Level II and Level III that an auditor is not trained to bridge. You bridge from the purely repetitive process to the expert tap at the exact correct moment only. Do you follow?

Now, there's a bridge point. So that you'd really – you're being well trained in practical on Clay Table Healing, yes, that's the way it's done. That's a good drill and that drill is right there. Now, when you know that drill perfectly, you can drop about sixty percent of it. How? Well, you don't ask the person if they're satisfied every time because that is the thing you're supposed to do. You're supposed to wind up your eyeballs so that they throw a little line of sparks and flitter and observe the fact that the pc is confoundingly well satisfied that that is it. And then you never mention it. You follow me? Say yeah, he's satisfied.

In other words, between II and III we start tuning it up. In the first place, the person's case state has upped now to a point of where he can observe. Our old subject and brain-cracking word: "obnosis." The observation of the obvious. The ability to look at the obvious. And so at between II and III we expect that the auditor has taken this step – that he has gotten to a point where he can observe the obvious.

So when somebody... You ask them, "What should be near them?" you see, and he says – and he says, "a cow." He gives it to you, see, "a cow," you see. That should be near. Then we don't ascertain a point which we have already ascertained by our obnosis. See, we don't ascertain that point now, because we've ascertained it. There's no doubt in his mind as to what went near it, it almost snapped your head off, see, "a cow!" you know. "Well, of course!" you know, he might as well be saying. No, you know what you're looking for is the, "Well – a cow?" That's what you're looking for, you see? And then you say, "Well now, are you perfectly satisfied that that is what should go near?"
"Well, as a matter of fact, I'm really not," and so forth. "There's some sort of a bovine – uhuh – something there – I know what it is. Milk!"

Now, at that point for God's sakes don't say, "Are you satisfied that it's milk?" [laughter], don't you see. You follow me? And that's the only hole I can punch in that. But you see that the process is quite workable, even with the repetitive. I'm just teaching you the fine point. And you don't keep punching along on something which is already established by your own observation. And along about Level II, why, we expect the person to begin to observe.

Now, the reason for that is very, very precise. It probably has never occurred to you entirely that point of view and power of choice are synonymous. They're practically synonymous. If a person can occupy a viewpoint or a person can be a viewpoint, then he can observe. And observing, he can then choose. Because he is choosing out of observation always. Either the observation is past observation or it's pure extrapolation, but he can still observe, you see.

Now, the detached person – the person that you run into that takes no responsibility for anything in life and that sort of thing – he isn't where he is looking from. See, he's detached. We use that word advisedly, you see. He's detached from existence. He hasn't got anything to do with it. Existence is up here, you see, and he's sitting back, you know. "Has nothing to do with me," you know. You got the idea? But as you process somebody he starts moving back up into a viewpoint. And of course, just before a person exteriorizes or something like that he has to be able to accumulate his viewpoint very nicely. He has to be able to occupy a viewpoint at will, actually.

Therefore, that is raised on power of choice. What's power of choice? You say, "Well, what's right and what's wrong?" and the pc says, "What's right and what's wrong? Oh, my God, don't ask me a question like that." Yeah, at some lower level, you know, "Who knows?" you know? A Pontius Pilate reaction, you know. "Who knows? I wouldn't know. Who's to say?" Well, you feel like saying to somebody like that, "You're to say." [laughter] You see?

Now, how would he say something about it? Well, he'd have to bring himself up to a point of what he was looking at and look at it and say whether it was right or wrong, according to his judgment and experience, don't you see? So we ask him what is right or wrong. Why, this is very, very esoteric, this is far-flung and far away, you see. But the moment we can understand this by saying, "About that," or "about an existing situation," you see. We say, "About this existing situation, what is it – what would be the right action, what would be the wrong action?" We can ask him something like that. Well, he has to swing himself into where he observes it.

And the whole course of processing is actually bringing somebody up to a higher and higher ability to view their existence and the existence around them in life and their mind from their point of view.

And when you first pick somebody up, he hasn't even found himself or located himself or done anything. So that you can bring about the most magical change in a person's life by just asking him where he is in the auditing room. It doesn't sound like a process, don't you see, it doesn't sound like anything, but it's a complete sneaker. You've asked him the very question which will take him all the way to the top. The type of question would take him all
the way, you see. "Where are you?" What do we stress in case analysis? "Where are you?"
See, find the pc, we say. See? Well, that pc, if we just sat there waiting for the auditor to find
him and so forth, he'd remain pretty buttered all over the place. But the actual case of the mat-
ter is, is we're asking the pc to find himself and we'll give him a little bit of help with the me-
ter, but there he is.

Now, I just got through running a session earlier today which was a very interesting
session from my point of view because it didn't have any process that I ever heard of con-
ected with it. It was just me having observed that the pc was upset. Saw clearly that the pc
did not respond to an explanation or a datum or a spotting of bypassed charge or anything of
the sort, pc still upset, you understand. So I said well I'm getting – I'm not getting anyplace, so
this pc must be mired down someplace. Must be obviously mired down in an end word, root
word, something like this, don't you see. And I'll just try to get this out. And I put the pc on a
meter and I got a big surge on one word and I was asking the pc what – I tried to get a flash
answer, don't you see. This is old stuff, you see. "What word occurs to you when I snap my
fingers?" you know, boy that's really going back, you know. And said, "Nothing. Nothing. Noth-
ing. Didn't get anything."

"All right now, what word occurs to you when I snap my finger?" Repeated it, see.

"Oh! Oh, well, yeah, I got a word that time, that's 'survival,'" see, and the meter starts
falling off the pin. The tone arm was way at the top of the meter, don't you see. Well I was
just trying to talk this meter down by finding out what end word was this pc sitting in. And
that was my purpose, see. I don't know what purpose the pc had. But we went on and with a
bit of itsa and a bit of this and a bit of that, I get another word. Zoom! You see, a big surge.
But the surge didn't repeat when I said the word. Did it when the pc said it. Didn't do it when
the auditor said it. So therefore, it couldn't be the word the pc was sitting in, because if it was
the word the pc was sitting in, then, of course, my saying the word would cause the word to
react. Do you follow me? But the pc saying the word – that was all the – the whole cause of
the reaction, don't you see. So therefore, I knew the pc wasn't sitting in that word.

But anyhow, we're getting charge off and we started getting tone arm action finally
and the tone arm was going up and down madly and I wasn't even running a list. Somebody
else looking at it said, "I wonder what this is, a listing session or what?" No, no, no this wasn't
anything. This was a sortout on – based on my observation of the pc.

Well, the pc finally hit some computation or another that the pc was perfectly satisfied
with without a "What do you know." But I hadn't found the end word the pc was sitting in. So
I got the pc to talk some more, seeing if the end word would now fall out of the conversation.
Using the words which I'd already gotten off of the pc. And then got the pc to state the whole
thing as a problem, based on these words. The pc did state the problem, the end word oc-
curred in the problem. It now, after all this time – you see, I knew the end words of the bank
so I just – there it is, see. Hah! What do you know! The meter of course started going
boooooom and started blowing down and heat started coming off and so forth. Well, I'd
reached my purpose as an auditor. See, that was it. And I wouldn't have cared after that if the
pc had gone on and itsaed for an hour or two or anything else, I knew we had it. So I almost –
I didn't interrupt the pc, but I waited for a pause and I said, "All right, now, that's the end
word which has been thrown into restimulation in the last twenty-four hours. And that is what you have been worried about."

"Oh, yes!" the pc said, "that's right! That's right. It sure is! I'm sure glad to find that," and so forth, and the pc would have gone on then. But I said, "All right, how do you – you feeling all right now? Good, thank you very much. That's the end of that assist," and took the meter back – took the cans back.

And you would have said, "That's a very interesting looking session. Because it really didn't look like any kind of a session. There was no listing." But there was listing. But we're trying to find a word but we didn't have any word which would require the pc to give us a word, you got the idea? So what you were seeing – what you were seeing, was simply the camera held over the head – snap! Know the mechanics of the bank, ability to observe the pc, you follow this? Had a certain goal, knew more or less what it was, because of knowledge of the bank, steered the pc and knew then I was getting off locks.

So let those go off, but then used the locks to trail in against the end word and there it sat. Do you follow that?

You would have been surprised at the amount of charge that came off. Would you say in a fifteen minute assist or something like that there should be upwards to twenty divisions of TA? Well, there were in those fifteen minutes. And I don't know how much TA came off afterwards, because I didn't bother to find out. Don't you see? I just ended the session. PC walks off still chattering about it. Not worried about what the pc – because undoubtedly pc walked off with a lot of tone arm action still going on. Well, let the pc cognite on their own time, see? [laughter] You got the idea?

All right, now, let's compare that kind of an approach. You know all the factors involved, you could do them all right, you know a dozen ways to do any of these things and you just go ahead and hit the meat of the situation, and clank! You see, right there. Session rather terrifically controlled, almost controlled right up to the stretching point of – well, if you'd controlled it much more you'd have blown the pc out of session, don't you see. Right up to the point where the pc doesn't blow and is still in-session, see. Makes for great speed of auditing. But the nice judgment it takes to audit at that brink – that's pretty close to the edge, you see. You can hear rocks fall every once in a while. [laughter]

All right, now there is one run you might say at upper Class VI, you see. And here's this other session on a repetitive. Do you follow? Now actually the repetitive could never have done this other assist, of course, but the repetitive would have gotten a person quite a distance with the assistance of the exact routine being run. So nobody's saying anything against repetitive auditing. I'm just saying the bridge between repetitive auditing and your beginning to be your own master is at II. From II to III. The upper II and lower III and in that zone you as an auditor should begin to master this point. Obnosis should start setting in right at that point. Your own determinism as a case should be pretty well up. You're able to occupy a position as an auditor without a flinch, don't you see. You can view the pc from where you are. Your power of choice over what you do should have risen considerably because of skill that you've developed on your lower levels.
And therefore, you start dropping out the parts of the session which are not essential to the – I'm not talking now about parts of the comm cycle or something like that, but parts of – you start dropping out things to do out of the session which are not essential at that moment to the progress of the pc. Do you follow that? And you don't say, "Are you satisfied? Are you satisfied?" Well, it's obvious, see. You follow this?

So at Level III don't make yourself a slave, don't you see, and at the same time don't omit so much you don't make any progress. You see. What's being asked or something. That's why Clay Table is up at this point. You know, Clay Table requires comm cycle the like of which nothing else ever – ooh! You've really got to be an auditor to run Clay Table. You can foul up faster than scat. You just, get in there too obtrusive in the session, see, a little bit too obtrusive. A little mauling around too much. A little too much control, and so forth, and your pc is brrrr – plow! See, you've just pushed your pc right out of session, bang! You've got to be on the ball.

PC makes an origination – you don't understand it. You haven't got a clue. PC all of a sudden says in Clay Table Clearing, "Well, I have just suddenly – suddenly got it here, I – I got this right straight. Fire engines don't always have hoofs. And..." The auditor says, "Okay."

Now, there's a certain rapport exists between an auditor and pc. And when the auditor doesn't understand something and he says he does, he's introduced a lie into the session which will not only hang him up but very often practically flips the pc. So this auditor because he is now trying to be so unobtrusive, doesn't then get anything clarified.

Now, you've got to learn – now, let's take the bridge between III and IV. At III and IV anybody can understand Clay Table Healing, see. You can understand these things. It doesn't take much. You still have to ask once in awhile, "What is that," something like that, but that doesn't require a lot of you, see. But you get up into the esoterics – did you notice between the two sessions, which I repeat, were well run – that they were entirely different in the presentation of clay, see. That's why they are two different processes at two different levels. And did you notice – what was probably not visible is what was being demanded of the auditor was far greater, even though the auditor appeared to be busier at III, what was being demanded of the auditor at IV was far greater. Because he had to be on the ball all the way and all of a sudden the fellow says, "Well, fire engines don't have hoofs. And I – that's – I get that now. And this is a representation of a fire engine with no hoofs" and so forth. And the auditor says "Okay. Okay." Well, he doesn't even have to make a face over it. The pc knows he hasn't got it. And at that moment it all goes appetite over tin cup.

Now, I invite you some time to go on a very sound, solid program of for some space of time take the people around you and every time you miss a word, make them clarify it. Don't develop this as a Scientology occupational disease. I find it gets that way with me once in awhile. Every once in awhile now I'll see a dispatch coming back with a circle around it, "I didn't get this word." Very good! It's very good. The guy's got an order of which one word he doesn't understand, ohh! That would be very, very weird, wouldn't it? But, here's a circled word, "I didn't understand this," and so forth, so I just clarified it.

Now – but, go at it on this basis. I don't care if it's total strangers and the guy says, "Gluff-wuff " Say to him, "Exactly what did you say? What did you say?" Don't give it to him
on the basis of you're challenging what they said, but just clarify it, you know? And your first reaction is liable to be a little bit of a snap! from this person, see? And just train yourself not to let the snap deter you. And ask again. "Oh well, if you must know, I said so-and-so. That was what I said." See. And this person may get the idea that you're a little deaf, he may get the idea that you're so forth, or that you're inquisitive or – we don't care what ideas he gets. But if you followed out that program, you would find something very strange would occur in your relationship with that person. That person will become much more friendly, much more confiding and much more relaxed in your vicinity.

[part missing]

[This tape ends abruptly as did the original master recording.]
Well, either you look better or I do. Wonder which it is? Oh, you're doing all right. One isn't. Somebody audit him. You, too. You look all right. [laughter]

What's the date?

Audience: 10 November.

Ten November AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, what'll I talk to you about today? What'll I talk to you about today? I've had a lecture sitting back of me left ear here for some time that I had just not gotten around giving you.

I could mention in passing – and this is merely in passing – that you have a new bulletin out that has to do with auditing styles and you've all done these various styles but you've never had them categorized into levels. And the first mistake you will make about the bulletin is that the auditing style is determined by the process being run, and the reason you make this mistake is because those auditing styles are so precisely matched to certain processes.

I want to call to your attention that it – that's totally incidental. The auditing style given at a level is the best style for a particular process, but that doesn't make it why that's an auditing style. These are the progressive stages of auditing necessary to make a totally finished auditor, and that's the really – reason for it. And each one of those styles is very effective, and can be performed rather easily by the auditor at that level.

So you have auditing styles and don't – don't make the mistake of saying, "Well, they go with certain processes," because they don't. You can audit almost any process with almost any of those styles. For instance, you could probably audit R6 with itsa. Yes! It wouldn't be very effective, but you could do it. Don't you see? And so on. And the – I think you'll find that this makes training much, much easier. Because I left this until last.

Had to have all the processes and know where they all fitted and know where the person was going to go, you see, what level he had to attain in order to move up to the next one. After I had all that, well, I had to decide how is he audited. And then I went back over about fourteen years of auditing experience and then I found out that there were only a little handful of auditing styles; they weren't enormous in number; they were very few and they could easily be broken down.
There is an auditing style I should mention, between Level 0 and Level I or between Level 0 and Level II, that you occasionally use, that isn't mentioned in auditing styles. And that's – would be a version of Guiding style which didn't wind up with a repetitive process. It's a guiding style that goes into itsa, and you do that quite frequently. And that's actually a coffee shop sort of style. It doesn't necessarily fit the dignity of a level, but it's a – it's a combo, it's a cross.

So it's guiding style; you're guiding the pc into what he should talk about. You very often – well it, at II, is done with a meter, don't you see? And then you let him itsa. We even had a process which calls for that particular style and it isn't one of the styles mentioned. It's a combo of two different styles. Because pure Guiding style – I don't want you to make this error, either – pure guiding style, which is Level II, would be simply guiding the pc into what he was going to run on. And many auditors err: They don't guide the pc, they just let him wander you know? They don't head him off, they don't practice multiple acknowledgment at the right places.

You know, you can herd up a pc just like you can dogies, you know? You can – the dogie has to be – has to be yipped at when he goes too far off the trail, you see? So what you want to do is you yip at the pc by multiple acknowledgment. It's actually a little trick. It isn't covered in the bulletin, but it's multiple acknowledgment. He starts talking about his mother-in-law and we don't – we don't happen to be covering the area of family in this particular session, and he wanders off there about his mother-in-law so we say, "Well, all right. Good, good. Well, I'm very glad to know that. Fine, fine. All right. Now, ahem!" It herds him back on the trail again, you see? And then there's – that's the overacknowledgment. It has a use, you see?

And then there's the underacknowledgment or the half-acknowledgment. And you want the pc to go on talking about what he is, well, you give him these little encouraging nods: "Hm-hhhm, hm-hm, hm-hm, hm-hm." And you'll find out if you do that to somebody he'll go on talking about what he's talking about. And you can actually use acknowledgment to make a person go on talking about what you want him to talk about or, reversewise, use it to head him off. And the only thing you do is just faintly acknowledge and he will go on talking; and of course, if you heavily acknowledge, it operates as a stop and you can halt him.

And that is probably – will be the most adroit use of one of those styles that stands up at Level – at Level II, Guiding style. Actually, Guiding style, as such, is you guide the pc into something, then run a repetitive process on it or some process on it. That's the pure style. It's a guide and a process and a guide and a process and it's just an alternation of that sort of thing. And then of course, we find this appearing up a little bit higher in assessing and processing, see? We process what we assess. It's a harmonic on it.

But this other one is a very narrow-band sort of a situation. Let's find out what we ought to run on this pc and let's guide him around to talking about things so that he can give us enough information so we know what this is all about, you see? And then the next thing we're saying, "All right. Good. Now, what communication haven't you completed to that person? Thank you. What communication haven't you completed to that person? Thank you." Tone arm starts damping out of the thing and you know you've got it.
In other words, it's – you guide him into something, then you run it. And at Level I, you don't guide him into nothing. You see? And that – you find out that these fit at, actually, the stages of development of the auditor and what they're really compared to is the return of self-determinism to the auditor of the ability to occupy a viewpoint.

Now, as the auditor goes up in class, he will partly be going up in case. And he's more and more capable of looking at who is there across the table from him. See? And as such, the early levels, therefore, you must actually never permit a Level 0 Auditor to tell the pc what to talk about off his own bat. It would require a certain amount of diagnosis, you see? (To use a medical term.) He – he'd have to know what was wrong with the pc to get the pc to talk about something. Therefore he'd have to go into upper stages and upper grades of auditing in order to run it, you see? And the mistake you make in training, when you make any mistakes at all, is not keeping those levels pure. And demanding more of the beginner than he can possibly perform.

You look at this poor, poor bloke; he's come in almost on a public co-audit. Yes, he's had some HAS lessons, you see? And you say, "All right. Now, find out what the problem is all about and get the pc talking about it. All right. That's your assignment for this evening." Well, that sounds awfully simple to you! But you've just left the guy sitting there. The idea that he could start and stop somebody else talking will be completely beyond him. How's that done? Now you go in with upper-scale ways of bringing this about and you just get yourself into endless complexities. Your training, then, starts getting very tangled and very long and the student gets very confused and he can't figure out what you're trying to train him in and he gets the idea that auditing is all impossible anyhow, and so forth. Simply because you're giving him an upper style to do a lower style with that he – he hasn't ever advanced to this point, don't you see?

So actually, the styles of auditing are arranged very carefully against the ability of the individual progressively to confront his pc and handle pcs. Now, we get the idea of a Class VI Auditor tells a Class II Auditor, "Well now, it's very simple. Just get him talking about the primary buttons, you see, of his case, and watch those things carefully and monitor them down on the E-Meter and make sure that he itsas them properly and that you've guided him into that. And it's very simple; you can clear him very easily."

Level II Auditor, you see: "...All right."

You come back a half an hour later, or you get the auditing report, and it is the most horrible, messed-up blackbird pie that ever got a wing fluttered in it, you know? It's a mess. What has gone on?

Well, a confusion has gone on. That's what's gone on. Because you just gave this guy something that – uuhuu! So you see, this thing is fitted against the idea that the Level 0 doesn't even get TR 1. Apar... they just never have had it, see? And so where do they get their auditing command? Well, they get it off the blackboard or from the Auditing Supervisor. That's where they get their auditing command.

"Now, what I want all of you pcs to talk to your auditor about is..." see, and you say, "your job – considerations you've had about your job. Now, that's what I want you to talk to..."
And the auditor is supposed to sit there and listen. And you can't even kick him for not acknowledging, don't you see, because he doesn't know anything about that.

And you'll find out people can do that just by the hour. They just do that by – nothing to it. That's easy. That's easy for them to do. But if you tell them to give the pc the auditing command, you have now made them take responsibility, in their eyes, for somebody else's whole life and they ponder this as a philosophic impossibility, don't you see? They're not upstairs far enough to recognize the relative values of these things, and so forth. And you're talking against all the confusions that you ever heard of. All these confusions.

Now, that style of auditing, actually, we take from psychoanalysis. Actually, we developed that independently because many analysts don't listen.

You heard the joke about the two analysts coming down in the elevator and one is all worn out and the other one looks bright and happy. And the one that's all worn out says, "How can you possibly go through that many patients in a day and look so bright and cheerful?" And he says, "Doesn't it – doesn't it just about kill you sitting there listening to all that stuff all day long?" And the bright one says, "Who listens?" [laughter, laughs]

So… And you'll find that the automatic auditing command was put in by Freud, not by the analyst. The analyst really never gave anybody anything to talk about. He sort of just infiltrated it somehow or another, told them about something and somehow or other the guy started talking – they didn't have a TR 1. So actually, the high point of psychotherapy never attained Level 0. Now, if professionals in this field were not up to developing any higher style of action – evaluating, interrupting, do the wildest things, you see – if they were not up… Now, don't expect some bloke just off the street that you've got in a co-audit someplace, or some bird who is just starting in, wondering if he should be a student of Scientology – see, he's still in this terrific rat maze of puzzlement – taking him and throwing on his back anything above that auditing style. And you actually will have to curb yourself from throwing more things on it than that.

That style is the one, oddly enough, that you as an Auditing Supervisor will have the most trouble with. It's the hardest for you to understand, the hardest for you to pass a student on, the hardest one to find out if he's confronting – is the student confronting or listening? It's hard to establish. It's very difficult from a viewpoint of supervision. It's not difficult from its performance. But its performance looks difficult to the person because it's so simple. He's supposed to do that one thing. And you know, you'll have some bird you're training in this, some fellow you're training in this, he will actually go for days and days and days and days before he finally gets the idea of what he's supposed to do.

And then you sort it out – one datum. He's got this one datum: He's supposed to listen. He's not supposed to do anything else, he's supposed to listen. He finally sorts this out as a performance or an action which is pure in its own right and which is performable, and then he finds out that he can do it and at that point you have put an auditor's feet on the road up. And if you miss that, then that auditor would be falling off the road all the way up. Do you see?

But you could make it so unnecessarily complicated as to how you listened and what you were supposed to do, that he'd get a lose before he began and therefore he'd remain in confusion forevermore. Don't you see? So you have to adjust not just your auditing to this –
you can do that easily; that's very easy – but you've got to adjust your supervision to this. And that's what mainly has to be adjusted at that basic style. Because it's very hard to supervise at that level of simplicity.

Oh, you take a Class IV Auditor who is competent and capable at Class IV: He knows very well what should be done for the pc. He sees exactly what the pc should be guided into; he sees exactly what the pc should be assessed on; he sees exactly where that pc should go; he sees what's wrong with that case; and of course his basic impulse as an auditor is to just run the case toward maximum gain. But the mistake he makes is, it's *his* running of the case toward maximum gain. You got it? See, then he adjudicates what the session should be by how *he* would run the case toward maximum gain. You follow that? Well, *he's* short-circuited it because he isn't running the case!

Now, the way to run that case toward maximum gain, oddly enough, is to run the case at a level the case will gain on in the hands of the auditor auditing that case. And once you've made that differentiation and snapped out of the valence of the pc's auditor, you will see that that would be the maximum gain; because now you've made an auditor, now that pc is gaining the little bit possible at that level and so you've got it.

So the material which you have in the way of processes, and so on, is matched up not against maximum gain, it's matched up – matched up against the gain attainable in the auditing at that level that we can be sure of. See, so it's matched up against certain gain in the hands of the auditor who will audit it. And if the auditor doesn't do anything more than audit that level and run the processes of that level, his pc is going to gain, regardless of what you or I would do. Do you see? Somehow or other they'll struggle in – through it and they'll wander out of it and they'll get themselves into some sort of a – of a bettered situation.

You see, for years people were being very successful at the processes we now have at Level I: Havingness, Trio, 8-C. Look at these things, man. And how were they run? Well, you sat the pc down, you told the pc he was supposed to answer the question and you just banged questions at him. And he gave you the responses to the questions and you acknowledged them. All right. Well, that was all the – all you had to know and that's all you had to do and the question was the magic chant and you didn't even have to know it wasn't ev... it wasn't a magic chant. You didn't even have to know that it had any sense to it. Don't you see? It was a rote process. And auditing could go on like that for years. So that level has become extreme, that it is muzzled. That's the style at that. That's muzzled. Level I: muzzled auditing.

We've had it for years. We take an ACC; there are a certain number of the students in the ACC just aren't – their pcs aren't progressing. And you listen to them for a little while: The pc opens his mouth to talk, the auditor interrupts. You see? Other things are going on and crisscrossing; other things are being entered. So we just put a muzzle on the pc – pardon me, a muzzle on the auditor. [laughter] I'm afraid that I would regard those people as pcs; that's the Hobson-Jobson there. They needed a lot of improvement. Well, we put a muzzle on the auditor and the pc would gain.

I've watched it. And I've seen a pc come right on up under muzzled auditing. Rather fabulous. Actually – actually making fabulous gains. Nobody being very smart about what process was being picked, see? So you use of course at those levels the crash, bang, hammer,
pound, exclamation-point processes – you know, like, you know, "Look at that wall. Walk over to that wall."

Those things require no judgment as when to run them; they just get broad gains. Do you see how all that would be? So anyway, the auditing style is adjusted against the capability of the auditor.

Now, unfortunately there are three things – and now begins what I'm really talking to you about – there are three things which are in the road of every case. There are three things. There are all those things in The Book of Remedies, of course. In The Book of Remedies you find there are a great many different things that can be this way or that way about a case. But these data have never been set aside and there is nothing that overpowers these data or overcomes them or fixes them up except addressing them: and one is the PTP, another is the overt with its companion withhold and the other is the ARC break. Those three things. And they're present, potentially, in any session at any level anyplace.

Well, we'd normally handle these things with "call in a higher-level auditor" at the very low levels, don't you see? We'd handle them by special auditing. "You, Joe, require special auditing." You see, that sort of thing. "You've got to be handled at a higher grade." We don't try to run into those things head-on at 0 and 1 particularly. But at II, the door opens and the totality of processes at II are contained in the book which you now have, The Book of Remedies.

But the woof and warp – rug terms, weaving – of any case is composed of a certain mental makeup, attitude or combination don't you see, of a chronic or continuous nature. In other words, there's a continuous case mess-up. You follow me? I mean he's got this wrong with him all the way along the line, don't you see? This is wrong with this pc. These are the rocks in his head; these are the permanent fixtures, you might say, of the joint. Well, you got those things, but then you have the things which keep those things from unraveling.

I can't think of a simile offhand, here, that would exactly – well, yes I can. You've got a whole big pile of rocks in a courtyard, and you could move those rocks very easily, or demolish them or set them up in an orderly fashion so they could be viewed. You could do things with those rocks, except that every once in a while some lunkhead drops the drawbridge or raises the drawbridge and you can't get across the moat. Or once in a while they shut the gates. Do you see? Well, the moat and the drawbridge and the gates would be the PTP, the overt, the ARC break.

All those things just bar entrance to the case. They are entrance barrers. They keep the case from being entered. And of course, those things, one or another of the three can happen at any time. And that's the liability of a session. And those are the three things which prevent the pc from being in-session and oddly enough, there aren't any others. There aren't any others.

There aren't large numbers of things which prevent the pc from being in-session – there are just those three. Given, of course, the fact that he has an auditor of even indifferent skill. The auditor doesn't have to be a screaming genius to audit routine cases.

But sometimes – sometimes it appears to you that you have to be a screaming genius to audit a certain case because you just can't seem to get to first base with this case. You can't
get anyplace with this case. You can go nowhere. Very discouraging. And what you're looking at is a PTP of chronic or temporary nature – continuous or temporary nature; you're looking at continuing overts or past overts; and you're looking at an ARC break which may have just occurred or may be of long-standing. In other words, those three things become six just to the degree of their position in time.

Now, you'll accuse me of expanding it out too far, but if you really know your basics you realize I'm not. You see, the overt act will go into action when a withhold is put on it. You have to have a restraint before this thing really starts biting, don't you see? You have to have a secrecy involved in the thing. You have to have something else involved before you get into any serious mess-ups with this, you see? You have to have censure.

Now, either it's the censure of the fellow's own decency or a censure of the act by the public or social mores or something, but there's censure. He doesn't think it's good or somebody else doesn't think it's good and he goes into being made guilty or becoming guilty of this act. And then, although he is performing the act, he will withhold it. And what we're doing, actually, is discussing the overt-motivator sequence; so when I say "over"s," of course I mean the overt-motivator sequence. You see, the overt is always prior to the withhold. Always.

So the dominant factor there is the overt. Now, what are all of the things we know about handling overts and their consequences and what they track back to and everything else? Well, now this gets encyclopedic. See, this is lots. There's lots to know about overts. Tremendous amounts. There are lots of ways to run them – all of them more or less effective. There are processes and processes and processes.

But how do you – how do you classify all these processes and this phenomena, and so forth, including withholds and missed withholds and everything else? Well, just classify it under the heading of overts.

Now, present time problem is peculiar, and well named, by the way, because even though it occurred in the past it can float in present time. And it's the floatingness of the problem that we find fault with, not the fact that somebody has problems. It's the – it's the present existence. See, even though its genus was long ago, it still exists as a problem because it's peculiar to the problem that it hangs up in space. And it's interesting about the problem that it itself in its examination was what brought me over into a view of the Goals Problem Mass and gave us all Class VI. See? So it's a basic mechanism in which a thetan engages.

And it's postulate-counter-postulate, mass-counter-mass, you see? A is starting – is trying to go north and B is trying to go south, and there they meet in perfect balance, and there they stay and so they hang up in time. And they'll just stay there forever. You've got one and then the other, you see? You've got these two forces counter-opposed.

The Russians actually have dignified this by calling it dialectic materialism, or ecclesiasticism or something – I don't know their terms very well. But I was amazed. I went to the trouble of studying this subject that the Russians have whipped up to go along with German Marxism, and – your Russian really never realizes that he's following a German philosophy; and the public at large doesn't know that it was the last of the Kaiser's official acts to finance the Russian Revolution. He paid for it since, rather heavily. But the German system probably
could be traced back to some philosophical nonsense someplace or another on the line as the foundation of this dialectic materialism or whatever you call it.

And that is that ideas are only produced by the meeting of two forces. It's marvelous. It's marvelous. How anybody has made a philosophy and deified and enhanced and enshrined the problem by giving it this vast virtue of the fact that the only generating force of ideas anywhere in the universe is when a couple of planets collide or something, see? If you got a big idea, it's because two big things collided; if you got a little idea, it's two little things collided. If you want a real idea, why – if you want a nice idea, why, you smack your hands loudly and of course you get an idea. I don't quite dig it. But anyhow, it's very interesting.

I'm being serious about this, by the way. There is such a philosophy and that is its genus and it is "force versus force produces ideas." Well, actually, ideas versus ideas produce force. But they would not be likely to know that one. They've got their hat on backwards, you see? It's like the doctor. He says, "All – all function is determined by structure." That's taught. That's the basic datum of a medical school. "All function is determined by structure." So if you've got your structure out, why, then the function will go out, don't you see? And he's never heard of anybody writing a story with a broken pen, see? But it can be done. You see?

And the reason we collide with them – aside from their own ideas of medical imperialism – is a very elementary reason – is because we have "function precedes structure." In other words, this – what the guy is doing in life influences what's going to be built and made and what he becomes. And we've also worked with the idea, "If you've got your ideas in crosswise, why, the broken leg won't heal." See? Well, the doctor looks at it if you've got the broken leg in crosswise, why, then the ideas won't heal. And that's why they use shock and surgery to try to "cure" insanity. That they have never succeeded in doing so in the entire history of the thing does not seem to convince them that they must have something backwards there.

Any clever research man would look at this sort of thing and he would say, "Hey, well, wait a minute. There must be something wrong with the basic theory." But no, that theory is so enshrined: that if you have a broken leg you get evil ideas about man, see? Yeah, this – it works this way, see? If you're thinking wrongly it must have been because your brain cells were warped. So then of course, all you have to do is unwarp the brain cell to make somebody think rightly. That they've never succeeded in doing this does not deter them from believing it implicitly. It's very funny. It's a backward situation.

So you see, there's a lot of ideas about ideas; and there's a lot of ideas about structure and function; but man, basically, in this culture, is more devoted to materialistic ideas. That is to say, he says that ideas proceed from force. Man is generated – in the whole field of biology, man is generated from mud. They're dramatizing its Darwinian implant that's up the line up here. You see, "Man comes from mud." You see? "Force makes ideas," the Russian says, you see? The medical doctor says, "Mental condition is caused by structural upsets." See? It's all proceeding from mass over to…

Well, I don't know what they could be hung up in, unless they're just totally overwhelmed in their own problems. A problem is basically generated by postulate-counter-postulate. And if those postulates, neither one overwhelms the other, you've had it. Because now force is going to start accumulating on those two points. And if the force, unfortunately,
does not overwhelm – force A does not overwhelm force B, force B does not overwhelm force A, the thing stays in balance now. And the balance, then, is maintained.

As long as the balance is maintained, you will have these two postulates counter-opposed, no matter how buried or hidden they get. And they will be represented by two forces counter-opposed, no matter how big they get. And they will remain to a marked degree equal, because they will only remain that way if they are equal.

So you see, you could have thousands of problems, none of which became a present time problem, you see? A pc could have the most brain-cracking problems he ever heard of in his past or background, you see, without doing very much to the pc, whether he solved them or didn't solve them. Because they're not held at this delicate point of balance. A – force A is not exactly opposed to force B, don't you see? That imbalance there causes it to rock off and go into the distance someplace. And actually the solution of problems is more or less performed by unbalancing the postulates or forces which are involved in them.

You have the North and the South fighting over the 1964 election, something like this. Some are – certain ideas existed in the South and certain ideas existed in the North, you see? Well now, that war would still be going on unless somebody had started to change his ideas. Somebody must have started to change his ideas. Somebody must have gone into agreement with the North or the South wouldn't have lost – something or somebody.

Now, communism right now is playing footsies with coexistence. Well, you see, they've weakened the force with which they're pressing against the West. And it's not going to remain that way; you're not going to see a forever Cold War. In fact, they could work very hard in Russia right now to try to put the Cold War back together again and they wouldn't win. Why? Because the idea has become unbalanced, you see? The idea of "You've got to fight the dirty capitalist in the West" has been watered down.

Now, to some degree, elsewhere in the world, we have the idea that you ought to exist with the communists, but actually it hasn't become that watered down. I notice they still have all their bases and missiles, and so forth, pointed in that direction, that people are agreeing they should do something about it. I notice they're burning up an awful lot of manpower and petrol down in South Vietnam right this minute as a conviction that this should not go on, don't you see? That communism shouldn't go on.

So the idea against communism is, if anything, strengthening, and the idea of communism against the West is weakening, basically because they can't get the materiel that the West has. You can't buy powder puffs the way you can from drugstores, you see, over in New York. The populace itself's havingness is down, don't you see? So it's unsettling them and making them question this philosophy, and that's why they popped off Papa Khrushchev. They no longer believed totally, don't you see? They believe that you might be able to do something.

For instance, one of their number-one men – I don't know which one is which these days, but he is an expert on industrial improvement. And it's interesting that this man, the most – the most informed man, possibly, in all of Russia is – now finds himself in a position of tremendous power in the Russian government. Well, he's the boy that studied how to put industry on the road. How to bring in these various things. And he's the boy who has probably
been standing around recommending Western reward practices – Western supervision prac-
tices. Western capitalism has been consistently recommended and is being recommended
right this moment to Russian industry as the way to get the show on the road.

That cold war is going to blow up. It can't help it because the idea over here is diluting
and, although we're getting some dilution on it, in the West we just had a presidential cam-
paign fought more or less on the basis of we ought to fight communism, which looks like it –
there are an awful lot of people still agreeing, hm? The guy got some votes.

Now you see, what I'm trying to put across to you is if you as an auditor recognized
this, you'd be able to clear cases easily, but more important, you'd be able to get them into
session easily – that it isn't every problem, see? It's just that freak which is exactly balanced –
its postulate-counter-postulate and its force-counter-force. It's just that freak is the only one
you're looking for and that's the only thing that saves your bacon as an auditor. Because let
me assure you, if you counted the number of problems which a thetan had had on the whole
track since the beginning of this universe and you wrote the number up on the wall, it would
exceed the number of years by considerable, because I think that people have more than one
problem per year. Be an unwritable number! It would just go on \textit{endlessly}; you'd go on writ-
ing, see?

And if you as an auditor had to take each one of these up, and even though you be-
came very good and could handle a problem in a minute of auditing, you and the pc would be
something like a million years old apiece by the time you had all the problems of the track
audited. See, you'd have been that long auditing the pc at a minute apiece, you see?

In other words, you got this fantastic, overwhelming number of problems which the
person has had and you're not interested in any of them. And therefore – therefore, at a lower
level, yes, you'll see some pc sitting – oh, you've got problems; and he'll go on about these
problems; and he'll go on about these problems; and he'll go on about these problems; and he'll
describe problems; and he'll go on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on, hour
after hour, session after session, intensive after intensive. And you'll say, why isn't he getting
any better?

Well, it's because nobody has picked up the problem that was balanced perfectly.
Now, in actual fact, there is a problem there. He just doesn't happen to have mentioned it. And
what's very peculiar about this is that any condition – and now we're not speaking of general
pcs but any condition, even a neurosis or a psychosis – is so delicately balanced between pos-
tulate-counter-postulate, mass-counter-mass, that if an auditor just slips it just a little bit, the
guy can't go on holding onto it, see? This is such an accidental series of forces, you see, it's so
accidental that that thing is suspended in time that if you – if you just tick it, it starts going
\textit{bzzz, bzzz, zzzz, zzzz} – where is it? You know?

And you'll sometimes see a dog or something like this that – not comparing pcs to
dogs, but you see a dog once in a while will have a sympathetic limp. And he will – he will go
out racing around the countryside, running on all four feet beautifully and then he sees his
master, don't you see, and he wants his master. He's supposed to have a limp, he just remem-
ers, see? And he'll start limping. And he limps with great patheteness, don't you see? He's
trying to hold one in, don't you see? He's trying to hold in a service fac of some kind, some-
thing for which he got paid and something and so forth. But he really can't do it.
And right in the middle of his great pose of holding this thing in, why, a rabbit runs under a fence someplace, and "Rowr-rowr-rowr!" you know, and all four feet on the ground, man, running like a whippet, you know? Forgotten all about it.

Oh, I just give that offhandedly. You've got a – that dog has to consciously hold in the limp, don't you see? And you will see some poor neurotic sometime or another – you will actually see this as an auditor – trying for days after you have knocked out a PTP or knocked the few little pins out from underneath this delicate balance, that it's gone and yet he's used to it. It isn't gone to the degree... Don't you see, you've triggered this and it's sort of a way of life. You know? And you'll see this poor person trying to recover this thing. You once in a while will see this. And you'll see your tone arm is hanging now between 2.5 and 3 and it doesn't anymore stay around 5.5 where it always did. Don't you see?

But you sometimes will see – when this thing particularly became what we'd call a service facsimile or something like that; it had some element of survival in it, you see; he isn't comfortable about it still – you'll see this confounded thing – he'll be trying to pick it up and put it back on. You'll – he'll want you to audit some more about it, or something like this. And it never even trembles on the needle. You can't even get it to wiggle. It gives no tone arm action and so forth. And yet the pc will be trying to persuade you to audit it some more. You see?

Well, it was a present time problem for so long that it became a way of life and he's not adjusted to not having it. The reason for that is, is he's still got tremendous accumulated forces involved in its solution, you see, and it isn't there. And there isn't any reason you should do anything about it at all. It isn't going to interrupt auditing for a moment. You go ahead and audit him on anything.

Now, just as there are these three things – the PTP, the overt and the ARC break – which have the moat and the drawbridge and the gates closed, you see, there are still these rocks in here, see? And they really got to be moved and straightened out before the guy can do anything at all, or before you could do anything whatever.

Well, now, on those rocks you use processes and those rocks will move, providing you can keep the gates open and get across the moat. See? The rocks, you can move them. Well, that's done by a routine. Just to pick up your terminology. What we call a routine: That's a rock-moving activity. And the only reason the routine will not work is because you couldn't get in the courtyard. The routine always works if you can get in the courtyard. So if the routine isn't working, you then must assume that you're not in the courtyard. And the reason you're not in the courtyard will have to do with a present time problem, long or short duration; an overt, continuously performed or being performed now or someplace, see? Overt: Something about overts with withholds mixed up in them, and that sort of thing; or an ARC break, which means a bypassed charge, which means some incomprehensible influence upon him which is making him go bzzzzzzz! and he can't tell where it's coming from or what it is. Something has made something go bzzz.

He's got some charge loose someplace and he doesn't like it. It's like a – like you had a very large-hoofed donkey with all his hoofs on an organ keyboard. You see, this charge has all of a sudden – is alive someplace. Something is going this way and that way and he can't tell what it is, where it is, or anything else. And that's an ARC break. It's a reduction of affin-
ity, reality or communication, but in actual fact I can tell you exactly what an ARC break is: is you unwittingly ticked some major restimulation. Now you understand, something was in major restimulation in R6: data, track, end words, root words, something; and you ticked something that was already in tremendous restimulation in that bundle of the reactive bank and it went bzzz. And until you tick it again and key it out – and I give you right away that List 1 is perfectly adequate, see, to key it out – why, the guy is short-circuited. He looks like a switchboard that somebody has thrown a wire net over.

He's going bzzzzz! There'll be something there on the whole track that's going bzzzz. And that has various things that can key it in. Now, what you've done is gotten a direct short circuit into the bank.

Now, that's done in various ways and the things that are in chronic restimulation are very few. Difficulties with communication is primary. That is the primary end word that gets into restimulation. There's no reason under the sun, moon or stars why anybody should communicate about anything, except there's an end word on the subject. And this is always there. It's a way of life.

Actually, you can sit down and ask somebody, "Recall a time you communicated. Recall a time you communicated. Recall a time you communicated," and they emerge at the other end of the line feeling much better and you can always get tone arm action on it and so forth. You should realize you're running 268 GPMs all at one fell swoop.

Now, one of these things, you see then, when you – when you fail to carry out a communication cycle on the pc, why, you're going to knock one of those end words into bzzzzzzzzz! And he's going to go, "Nyow! Nyow! Nyow! Nyow! Nyow!" or "Mmm-mmm-mmm-mmm-mmm," or apathy, or "I can't go on," you know, or something like this. Something wild is going to happen. Exactly what the pc does is probably the root word. And if you get the root word "to kill somebody" or something like that, you see, that would be quite interesting. Do you follow me?

Nevertheless, the lists themselves are tailor-made to knock the top off that's got this thing in cockeyed, and if you can locate and indicate – just on, let's say, List 1 – what has occurred, and then tell the pc what it was, then this thing goes on a lie-down-dog thing and it just becomes quiet. And it's quite interesting. You've probably had a lot of subjective reality on it. The mystery at which you're feeling all "Nyaaww!" And then somebody says that it's a so-and-so, and you say, "Oh."

What actually has happened is, is one or another part of the GPMs has been yanked madly into restimulation or existence by some life proposition. But remember, it would have had to have been powerfully in restimulation because of life, before a little something you did could knock it that extra little flick. And of course, when you quiet that down by locating and indicating the bypassed charge, you've simply dropped it back to former status. Don't – realize you've not done anything for the pc, but you've made him – his case – but you have made him auditable. You follow that? And that's the total composition of the ARC break. There's nothing more mysterious about ARC breaks than that.

Somebody has just reached in and pulled half a manual into a dead short. You got to get that hand out of there. You don't have to straighten up the manual. Many an auditor makes
the mistake of thinking he has to rebuild the whole organ in order to cure an ARC break. No, no. "Take your hand out of there, Joe." About all there is to it and the sound dies down.

So this is the – this is the crux for – you'll find that things that are in chronic restimulation with men are something like time, problems – these are the big dogs that are always there. And bits of items, like havingness. That's out of an item. But that item repeats itself endlessly through the bank.

These are – these are the things which jaw at men most of the time and of course which they ARC break on most. And they'll ARC break most on communication or time and much less so on a problem (which is of course an end word). But they'll sometimes ARC break on a problem. Somebody is giving them more problems and they go zzzzzz! But it tapers off then. But there's such a tremendous gap – there's such a tremendous gap between the value of communication and the value of time, and the next nearest competitor, don't you see, that it's a very silly looking chart. You couldn't even draw it on the wall. You have these enormous values, you see, and then somebody tries to tell you that these little marbles lying on the floor, don't you see, alongside of this Mont Blanc – there's a marble in the bottom of the valley alongside of Mount – Mont Blanc, you see? And he says, "Now, that's as big as Mont Blanc." Somebody is crazy, see? That couldn't be.

Well, that would be the next value. That would be the next value, and that's havingness, as compared to communication and time. These are the big dogs.

Communication is the biggest one. That's huge. It's rather unfortunate, because it's way to hell and gone back in the series. It's not close to PT at all. Way back! And you can ARC break somebody snapperoo on that big one, very easily. Just don't answer him. Or answer him a little bit cross-toned or something like that. Well, this thing is in restimulation all the time, and of course time is in restimulation all the time or you wouldn't have any time. Get late for a session sometime, you're going to see a nice ARC break. You as the auditor are late for the session. See, making somebody wait.

You look in vain for something – some significance to the word "wait." There's no significance to the word "wait"; it's just time. It's maladjustments of time. Somebody throwing the switch off. You know, wrong way to. And the motor isn't now running as smoothly as it did. It can't be dramatized. Dramatization of the – the smooth turnover of the clock going tickata-tickata-tickata has been interrupted and it'll throw it into restimulation, and you'll have yourself an ARC break.

Now, knowing that that is the character of an ARC break, you should therefore, at lower levels particularly, devote it very exclusively into the lightest possible feather-touch methods of keying it out. You don't go after an ARC break, you know, with a crash and you certainly don't try to audit one. You just assess it. Pc sitting there not saying a word or screaming at you like mad; you just go on and assess it. You don't care what the pc is doing; this is no auditing. Whatever the pc says, you don't answer the pc; you don't have anything to do with this at all. Because anything you do further than that, you're going to mess it up further, see? Because you're just going to key in that thing harder.

And the thing to do is to find the ARC break fast and find the last key-in of the ARC break quickly and expertly and [snaps fingers] key it out. And you find out it all dies down.
It's a very, very mysterious proposition. It's almost like waving the magic wand across the booming surf and having it all of a sudden go into a millpond, you know?

Very often an auditor has done this expertly on a screaming, howling, raving, homicidal pc, and so forth. And he's just gone on about his business somehow or other (while being almost knocked away from his E-Meter, you see); he's managed to keep the pc on the cans and go on with his assessment and never answered the pc. All of a sudden says, "All right," gets a nice big fall on the fact that something or other has gone into restimulation on something or other, whatever is on the list, don't you see? And he simply indicates this in its purity to the pc, brrrr-bow. And all of a sudden, "...What happened?" Dead calm, you know? Pin drop a mile away would be loud compared to the ensuing silence. This – the pc's all right. "Well, I don't know why we were worried about this."

Now, a pc, by the way – this isn't necessarily so true that it has to be audited, by the way. This isn't one of these conditions that has to be audited. The pc very often feels guilty of overts against the auditor. Very often feels guilty of overts against the auditor, feels propitiative and that sort of thing. And I'll give you news; there's no particular reason to audit it. Because you're just going to get back into the ARC break again. So that, you might say, is one overt you leave alone. Don't pay any attention to it. So he feels propitiative, all right, let him buy you a pack of cigarettes. Who cares? It isn't going to do him a bit of harm. He can just feel as propitiative as he likes about the subject or as guilty as he likes and it isn't going to hold up his case, it isn't going to do him a bit of harm, providing – providing only that he doesn't get up to such a peak that he feels he shouldn't have any auditing because he doesn't deserve it.

And the way to handle that is not by pulling his overts, but by a little rat-a-tat-tat sort of an action of just a little bit of itsa on what he deserves or anything. It's what he's brought up as the reason why. Well, just get it itsaed. Get it out of the road. You'll sometimes run into this sort of thing. But in actual fact, you wouldn't even really have to do that. If his case was making any progress, he'd come out of this too. Do you follow me? Now, this isn't one of these important factors; I'm just giving you some sidelights on it.

But the ARC break is an R6 – not an R6 action to handle, but it's R6 materials going into restim in that bank. And what you've got to do is neat them up.

What you actually are doing – you were in there piling up these rocks in the courtyard, minding your own business and everything was going along fine; and suddenly you find yourself not even outside the gate – you're clear out there on the meadow looking back at the castle, with the pc saying, "Nyooowww!" or the pc just nuhhhh, nothing.

The only one that's dangerous is the one that you don't detect, that he has at the end of the session and so he doesn't come back for his next session. And that's only dangerous because it interrupts auditing. You get what happens?

Now, if you didn't have a recognition of these three things – the PTP, the overt and the ARC break – as being the only three barriers – the only three real barriers to a case – you might have difficulty in aligning all of the different phenomena you find in a case. Because there's tremendous number of phenomena in a case. Oh, and just thousands and thousands and thousands of conditions which you could equate up to "he wasn't being audited," or some-
thing, "he wasn't responding to auditing." Just be thousands of these things, you see? But the funny part of it is, almost all of them depend on this – these three things' direct handling.

In other words, the major things are those. Now, there are other things which prevent the case from being audited, like he doesn't have any money or you haven't got any time, you know, or the auditor hasn't been trained or the pc is being talked at all night long when he should be getting some sleep by his wife who wants him to stay good and sick because, after all, the will is in her favor and here's some guy auditing this bird, you know? No, no, didn't like that. So he's argued at all night, "Well, how do you know you've had any gains out of your auditing?" Typical sample question.

He comes back to session, you see, at eight o'clock the next morning. Well, it's just all covered in the Auditor's Code. He hasn't had any sleep. He would be a troublesome case, because he's a trouble source. He is a trouble source because he has somebody on the other side of him who is doing him in and he's such a knucklehead that he won't knock this off, you know? It's something like somebody hitting himself on the head with a hammer all the time because it's habitual. And he really won't knock it off long enough to let himself recover, you see? He's trying to cover these two spheres. He's trying to propitiate over here to somebody and at the same time trying to get better, and he eventually only winds up by trying to make them wrong, don't you see, by quitting, or them wrong by not getting better. How he eventually figures this out, Lord knows, but he would eventually figure this out.

He would first begin to try to prove them wrong by getting better. Well, let me tell you, if he's trying to get better to prove somebody wrong, you have set up the postulate-counter-postulate and so you have a continuous PTP running in the session. Don't you see? And if you ever wanted to see a graph sit in one place intensive after intensive, it's to get somebody with a chronic PTP which is actually riding in present time which nobody ever does anything with. And then you will see that graph, intensive after intensive remain exactly the same. It's the most marvelous thing how that graph can remain poised in that one place.

He has to be audited pretty clumsily to have all this always missed, don't you see, because auditing itself, chipping away at the case, is liable to hit that PTP, too. See, and it only has to take a milligram off the side of one of the forces to unbalance it. Do you see? It's not really a hard trick, but if it's just blindly ignored and somehow or another never gone into and it somehow or another gets avoided all the way along the line, then you're going to see this constant graph, constant graph, constant graph. Not necessarily a low one. Not necessary a high one. Just any graph. And if you want to see a graph that just doesn't change, doesn't change, doesn't change, doesn't change, well, you know very well that the person has a chronic present time problem of some kind or another. It's just not going to shift.

Now, there's a different behavior on a graph for overts, oddly enough, a different behavior. Overts carry a lot of different reactions with them. Some fellow is just so not-there and so irresponsible that the overt has nothing to do with him. And there are various types of responses or reactions to overts. Somebody is going on doing this "but," you see? There's always some "but." But it's – his attitude toward this type of overt can be varied. Sometimes it's very propitiative, you see? He just can't help but do this overt and he's getting more and more propitiative. But actually, overts are a source of change. They are not a source of constant behavior. And if you see a case – if you see a case constantly and continuously shifting, but
never shifting steadily, see, you get – you get the idea? I mean, this case is shifting – it goes up a little bit and then it goes down, you know, and then it goes up a little bit and it'll go down and around, and this intensive he did well on and the next intensive he doesn't do well on. You know, it's a sporadic result to auditing.

Don't always blame the auditor. There is a bunch of overts mixed up in this that the pc is performing or are going into resti... they are going into restimulation during the session period, or weren't touched by sessions. Do you see this? So there's something – there's something wrong there. Well, what you get is an instability.

And it works like this: The individual won't let himself get any better. If he finds himself improving, he yanks himself back downstairs again. You got all kinds of odd computations on this, like he doesn't deserve to get better and if he got any more – if he got any better he would destroy everybody. He mustn't let himself get strong because he might commit this overt again. Do you see? He's on – either he or the society are on a check, don't you see? If the society is on the check, well, if he commits that overt again he's liable to go to jail. See, that's society checking him. And the people around him see him get more active and know that he's a bad man basically, and they don't want to see him more active, so they see him a little more active...

You find this, by the way – we had one up in New York one time, many years ago, that led the auditors up there the – about the maddest chase I think I have ever seen. There was some girl up there. Somebody didn't have any better sense than to audit somebody who was an institutional case. Well, that's trouble to begin with. All right. The mad spin that went on from that, I listened to for the better part, I think, of a year and a half. Every few weeks I would hear some more about this case. It was something on the order of The Perils of Pauline. [laughter] It was a real cliffhanger. I felt sorry for the poor girl, but there wasn't anything you could do about it. The auditor would get the pc and get her somewhere where she could be audited and then would proceed to give her some auditing. The girl would come up toward anger, and then get loose from the auditor, one way or the other, and get home and ream everybody out. And then would be taken by the family to the local institution and – or to the local psychiatrist and knocked into seven different contortions, don't you see? I think they have seven contortions, is what the code is. (That's a joke, by the way.) I was just thinking – this is very interesting, I wonder if there is a connection between – between some – some certain practice I know of in India and what they're trying to do with electric shock, because they sure go into contortions.

Anyway, the – this poor girl would then manage to escape or get away; and the auditor would get ahold of her, and he'd audit her back up again; she would get angry; she'd go back home, ream the family out. And this went on for a year and a half. Same cycle.

There was another one that went on for a long time, in that same vicinity, that was more pathetic. It was just the fact that the brother con... had the power to sign checks if the girl continued to be non compos mentis. It's just a very sordid, commercial affair. And the poor girl would get auditing, you see; and the second she'd get any better they'd have her thrown back in the institution. And she wasn't bad off, but it just got her so rocky after a while, she didn't know whether she was coming or going. It was just the fact that any time she was in an institution then the whole wealth of the family – which had been left to the brother
and the sister – came under his control for the period that she was in an institution. And he was the sort of a bird that liked to drink and go to Las Vegas and blow dough, don't you see? So it was just a jockey. I think no auditor seemed to ever be able to do anything about it. But these are crazy ones.

You'll see these kind of cycles going at one time or another. Well, they're not exactly composed of overts, they're composed of the restraints of the society against the pc. We must take that into consideration. It isn't just the pc himself, you see? The society could also be chivying up the pc one way or the other. That's why I've given you those two examples. Some mad dance could be going on around your pc, don't you see, that you yourself have wot not of, or haven't evaluated the importance of. Well, you'd have to handle that. You'd have to handle the social environment of the pc quite in addition to that, but it would give the same symptom of overts, is the point I'm making here. See? You'd have the same behavior. The person would get better and get worse and get better and get worse and get better and get worse, and that sort of thing.

Well now, a person who has a tremendous number of overts, when they remain constant, are simply trying to solve a present time problem with overts. And you'll find most anybody is trying to solve a problem with overts. That's why they commit these – why they keep doing these things, because they got some problem. And it goes back to a PTP.

But the overt itself can be on the part of the society or on the part of the individual during any course of auditing. Over a month or year, but not over the course of a session.

So you sometimes wind up with this kind of a situation: You audit the pc just long enough to get the gates open and the pc leaves the session and gets the gates closed in your – your face. And what you've got to have, then, is sufficient gain so the pc gets up high enough that the gates don't get closed in your face before you get to audit the pc again. And that is the primary problem of overts. It isn't whether or not society will be damaged. I think it will take care of itself until we get around to it, by plenty of damage.

We're not worried about, like the psychiatrist, the total evaluation of the psychiatrist is whether or not people in society will be damaged. That's why he has to damage people. He's solving the problem of "the destructive conduct of people." That's the one – that's what brings him in close to the police all the time, why you always find him in – representing people in police courts and all this sort of thing. He's – his problem is the problem of the society – that people shouldn't act destructively – and he considers himself a sort of a mental cop.

It's not for the patient, you see, it's for society that he's operating. Well, that explains most of his inhumanities with regard to the society.

Well, his problem is a social problem and he's trying to solve it in his own way, peculiar as they are. But now, your problem then at that time would become a social problem, and you would find yourself having to solve the social aspect of the case, because you can't make any progress with the case. You sometimes collide with this unwittingly, and you just think it's out of your control, and so you don't handle it.

But a case can commit a whole bunch of series – a whole series, continuously, of overts with consequent withholds from you which park the case into a thud. And this is more
or less the continuous, no-changing overt case. That case, however, does go up and down. It doesn't hang like a PTP does.

But the – the guy – the guy for a whole week goes without hitting any little kids over the head. And then he's just got to hit a little kid over the head toward the end of the week, and this is another overt; but you don't hear about this.

I was very interested one time, in a pc I was supervising the auditing of, to find out that this pc habitually killed animals. It was very interesting, you know? Just well, animal – kill the animal. He had to do it, don't you see? It's all very reasonable. And the pc was making no progress at all. And this was the mystery which was being posed. What was going on, don't you see?

And eventually, why, we dug and dug and dug, and we finally found out that it wasn't something – it wasn't an animal, the way Freud would have had it, that the child had killed when they were two by accidentally sitting on it. No, this was the – this was the simple procedure of when a cat was seen and nobody else was around, then the cat had to be slowly choked to death, until it was very dead, see? So, this was what the auditor was going up against, you see? That gate was closed. Did this person ever dare be frank with the auditor? Oh, no! Do you see?

Well, the pc had the gate shut and intended to keep it shut. And therefore there could be no communication with the auditor, and you saw the result of a wobbly type of gain. The pc, for a little while, would knock off this sort of thing, you see, and the force of the process all by itself would start driving the pc up the line. Now when either society or the pc sees they're all of a sudden getting better and that mustn't happen because they really should stay in a very weak state – otherwise they'd be very destructive – so they pull themselves back down again, and you see the case going this way on the graph, see? Just up and down, up and down, but not getting anywhere. You know, they climb up the well three inches and – at night and fall back three inches in the daytime. They don't even make it two; they fall back three. When you get that you know you're looking at a continuing overt.

That isn't well documented. I haven't got tons of cases against this representation for this excellent reason, is you don't find out about them very often. It's very hard to collect data on, because the mechanism of it is a withhold, see? So you suspect more about that level than you ever really find out on a broad level. Because very often auditors are shy about inquiring into the private lives of others to the force and duress necessary to have cracked this one. And if the auditor... I'm now talking on the basis of a relatively untrained auditor. He has a diffidence, don't you see? The personal privacy of the pc is...

Well, of course, he doesn't know enough about the mind to realize that that personal privacy is what is making that pc have lumbosis, and that it's just about as safe to have around, don't you see, as a handful of scorpions. It – as long as this remains terribly private, our pc is going to remain awfully sick. That doesn't look to me to be a sensible attitude therefore. But nevertheless, you find that auditors, when they first enter training and that sort of thing, you find they're being very diffident. Diffident.

"Did you ever commit an overt against the HASI?"
Well, I missed a withhold someplace in the group right now. All right, that's all right, I forgive you. Now, somebody, some year or two from now, is going to come along and say, "You remember that thousand pounds you missed? Well, I took it, and you forgave me, remember, in the session."

And having asked this question, this auditor received the response, "Yes, I once stole a pen. I think it was off the Registrar's desk or something."

And the auditor was so relieved to have pulled this overt and knew the pc was now going to get better. That stayed in my mind as a classic, man. Classic. This was an overt.

So that's the wobbly condition which you find at that level. They won't let themselves progress because they would do much worse; they've got it all figured out, you see? If they catch themselves getting well, they put themselves down to the bottom of the well again, quick. If society sees them getting any better, why, everybody opens up on them with guns because they know this guy is dangerous, don't you see?

And you get a wibble-wobble going on, but you know that there is a – really a continuous – a continuous type overt there, a repeating type overt. That's what you know about it. And that's – that's the key to that gate. It's a continuous, repeating type overt; there's something going on. It happens over and over; it's happened many times and it's been very dangerous and it isn't stealing a pen from HASI. It's a little worse than that.

And not only that, but society agrees it's worse than that. It isn't the personal mores of the individual has now figured it out... Guys who try to give you overts off the past track – as soon as somebody tries to give me some overts off the past track I stamp them down into this lifetime. Why? Well, if they haven't run well on overts in this lifetime, why, I know that they will then go on the backtrack, because I'll call to your attention that none of the Praetorian Guard of Rome have any longer any power of arrest. That's a safe overt to disclose, see? So I figure the guy is dodging around about something. It's not that there aren't whole track overts. Good heavens! But a guy would have to be flying like a bird to really be taking responsibility for them. Look! To really call them an overt he would have to have taken some responsibility for his past lives and he'd have to take some responsibility and he'd have to have some positive memory of this, and so forth. In other words, a lot of conditions are there.

And this rule, then, it doesn't pervade 100 percent that every time you audited a pc and he brought up a past track overt he was dodging a present life overt. No, I'm talking about this bird – he hasn't been audited that long or that effectively, you understand? And he's giving you past track overts. Oh, no! Don't you see? We're dodging some continuous chain of overts.

And the proof of this thing is – the proof of this thing is that I have watched several such cases never get any better on auditing and finally have chased it down to that. And it was only when I began to load up a blunderbuss and say, "This life, brother! Now! Where you live this life. Where you have been John Jones. Now, that's – we want something that you have done during this period of time. See? Now, when were you born?"

"Well, I was born... Well, you're invalidating my past track."
"Yes, I know I am. Thank you." [laughter] "What I want to know is, I just got to be sure here, that in this span from the 21st of June, since 1921," or something like that, "until now, what's the date?"

"Well, it's – it's – it's 1964."

"All right, that's fine. Now, during that span of time, have you ever done anything that you considered socially reprehensible, or that anybody else did?"

"Oh well, they're always being unreasonable about it."

"Unreasonable about what?" [laughter]

Now, of course, the cat leaps out of the bag. See? What is this thing? Now let's find out what this is. When we get that one out of the road, we're into the gates. Otherwise, this overt running can be sometimes used by the pc to keep you outside. Do you see? So running overts can be a backfiring proposition. And you sometimes can run overts endlessly without ever getting an overt, don't you see? This becomes, then, the peculiarities of some failures that you run into in cases. This is all covered in dozens of different ways in The Book of Remedies.

But now, those are the primary – the primary things that are going on. And you'll find out in The Book of Remedies that they equate down – the general thing is, although it may not be totally plain to you when you look over the remedy, you actually are going toward an ARC break the person has had in life, or is in now; or overts or withholds or missed withholds of some kind or another that have been passed up, that nobody has found out about, and even the pc might not know about. Or it's some kind of a locked-up postulate-counter-postulate, mass-counter-mass that is in that delicate balance that permits no possible case gain.

See, the person is so fixated – he's postulate A, and he's looking at postulate B, and he would so little be postulate B, and he is being so much postulate A, that he is just pinned right there. He looks like somebody, you know, that's just got his eye glued to one of these machines that you drop a penny in, in the penny arcades, you know? And somehow or another it's gotten busted and continues to run. There he is, man. He just isn't going to take his eye away from that, man. And he appears to ARC break easily. He appears to do various other things which are quite peculiar. Becau... truth of the matter is, when you have distracted his attention from what he is so fixated on, it hits him. So he knows better than to let his attention be distracted from this peephole. See, he knows that if he takes his eye away from it, why, somebody is going to hit him. He mustn't leave it, and so there he is.

So you're auditing and he's sort of putting you off over here. You're sort of auditing at this three or four feet distance, you see, from the pc, and he'll sort of handle these things backwards and forwards and you ask him a question and so forth. You suddenly say to him very searchingly and so forth, "What was the question I just asked you? How does that answer the auditing..."

"What question?"

"Well, the question that you were – you were just asked."

Actually, you're talking, you know – this guy – all of his attention is fixated right here, see? And he says, "Well, what question are you talking about?" And you get into some of the silliest discussions. When you find yourself in one of these silly discussions, realize that
you've never had any part of the pc's attention, that you don't have the pc's attention in session; the pc hasn't been in-session. You're auditing his right hand. [laughter]

So when you have a – when you have a situation going – when you have a situation going that you don't easily comprehend, you'll find it added up in The Book of Remedies. But you could possibly whip yourself up a nice bowlful of remedy yourself, if you just carefully took this apart on the basis of. Is it a PTP? Is it an overt with its withholds and so forth? Or is it an ARC break?

Now, you'll find out that in general auditing you don't have to fall back on The Book of Remedies. But you find out if your pc has a PTP in session and you don't handle it, you're going to get into trouble; if you try to audit over the top of an ARC break, you're going to get into trouble; and if the pc has committed an overt between sessions that you don't know about, you're going to get into trouble. So these things you've always got there. And they're – they'll be constant. That's why I'm pointing them up. They are not, then, just merely a remedy of a whole case, they take place in the small portion of a session.

So you see then, an auditor's actions are broken down into two sections. And one is the action of a routine, where he's following through, and the other is making the case auditable and receptive to the receipt of the routine. Now, he's got to do that before he can run the routine. So the auditor has these two different – widely different – classes of action. And the hunt-and-punch proposition of trying to find out what ails this case and that sort of thing is frankly not necessary on all cases. You won't find all cases are equally difficult to start, fortunately. Actually, it's not a majority, even; it's a minority.

So a tremendous number of people, they'll make some distance, in other words, just on a plain repetitive process, don't you see? And as they're going up – as they're going up through I, and so on, they're not getting so much better that it alarms them. You don't have the overt mechanisms jumping in. And you know, various other factors enter in here to support the Grade I Auditor. At 0, well, it doesn't make any difference, you see, to him. And he isn't up there. But at I, when he finally gets up to a level of Release, then he'll put himself back downhill again if you've got an overt mechanism present, so therefore we have to bring in The Book of Remedies at Grade II.

And all the way along the line from there on up the auditor has to be alert to these in any session which he is conducting. He's got to be right on the ball on those three things. Those are the things that will keep him out. When it's something more than this and appears to be more than this and appears to be terribly serious and it – so forth, just knock it off, knock it off, it's one of those three things. "Oh yes, I know, but it's such a terrible situation and it's so ghastly and the results of this are so awful that it must possibly be more complex than simply PTPs or overt or ARC breaks."

No, I am sorry, it couldn't possibly; because they are about as bad as you can get and you can't get any further south with the surface manifestations of the case than a case in a chronic PTP, a case chronically and continuously committing the same type of overt, or somebody who is very badly ARC broken and doesn't know what ails him and is just out of control with his switchboard shorted up from one side and one end to the other.
Now, when you have those conditions, why, you've got the chronically failed case. He isn't going to destimulate because this is so restimulated, don't you see? An auditor is going to have to do something about it to make this person auditable.

So even at Level 0 and Level I, these people exist. Don't you see? And they are in a terrible state, let me assure you. They are – they don't improve. And anything you do – you point a finger at them – they – one or another of these factors will restimulate, whatever one is wrong.

So, your proper procedure at those levels would be to turn the pc over to an auditor who knew how, straighten the pc up, and then turn the pc back over to the original grade. Just because he's been straightened up at II or III is no reason he is now in shape to run at II or III. He's now about in shape to itsa. Because these processes are pretty heroic. If you look them over, they comb a pc's hair mighty smooth, but it sometimes has to be done very roughly. Trying to get somebody to come up with the actual overt necessary to resolve the case, and so forth, it can be a rather duressful situation. "Well, I'm just going to sit here all night long. I'm perfectly willing to sit there all night long, and you're going to sit there all night long, and we'll just wait until you finally do tell me what has fallen on this meter."

And you find the pc saying, "Well, all right, if you put it that way, it was I who threw the handful of tacks down on the gutter that your car ran over and why you had a flat tire last night. All right. Now go ahead and shoot me."

This is pretty wild. Sometimes you come up on this, you can't get onto the gradient of communication at all, don't you see? "What are you willing to talk to me about?" and so forth. That would work in almost all cases. This guy is perfectly willing to talk to you about anything except this one overt. Well, there's only one thing to do from that point on is practically choke it out of him by duress.

"All right, I tell you what; when you're willing to tell me about this, we will have some more auditing. Okay? End of session."

"What?" [laughter] "What happened? Oh, you put it that way, I'm perfectly willing to tell you about it. It's just sort of a nasty habit I have. Nasty habit I have. Actually, it's an impulse to drown girls." [laughs]

It's quite, quite interesting. There are ways to approach these smoothly on a gradient, but in the final analysis it comes up to the fact that it's something you have to do. And you can be as nice about it or as smooth about it as you want to, but remember, it is something you have to do. And sometimes that exceeds being nice about it.

Well anyway – anyway, those are the barriers, but they exist all the way on up the line. Now, The Book of Remedies, of course, falls back and leads to those things one way or the other throughout its length and breadth. And it might be rather obscure how some of those remedies do lead to some of those things because they are empirically arrived at, the remedies are; they're just things that have worked consistently for a long period of time. But these three are the dominant ones and these are the three which get in the road of routines and which you have to handle continuously as an auditor, so I thought I'd better sum them up and tell you all I knew about them as rapidly as I could.
Thank you very much.
STYLES OF AUDITING

A lecture given on 17 November 1964

Thank you.
What's the date?

Audience: November the 17th.

November the 17th, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and we have a lecture here today on the styles of auditing.

And this is something new that will make, actually, the training and doing of auditing enormously easier. And although it would appear at first glance to be an unnecessary separation, and something that is more precise than is needful, you will find that any old-time auditor at one time or another has passed through one of these phases.

Because what – this is one of those things that have been going on for many, many years. Auditing styles have changed and shifted around. And it must be very confusing for somebody to say, "Well, what is an auditing style?" So they think it's some individualistic activity. And they try to find out if they hold their little finger in the air, you see, as they present the E-Meter cans to the pc – or something like this, don't you see. And they think it must be some individualized action.

Well, over the years there have been many auditing styles, and the reason there have been auditing styles is because processes have changed. There have been different processes and they require different styles. And therefore, at one period of two or three years you'll see one auditing style was very much in vogue, you know. And at another period you'll see another one.

For instance, 1955, 56, you saw repetitive command type auditing. That was when the TRs first came out. And everybody was going by the TRs at a crash, you see, and so on. And then in an ACC up in London I found out that these TRs were being broken down by auditor interruptions and evaluations and that sort of thing. And there were about a dozen students on that course that – the biggest one taught up in London – that were just not getting any result from the pc at all. And I made a study of this situation; I found out the auditor was getting in the road to the result.

So we invented something called muzzled auditing, and we muzzled them. And in actual fact the – I've forgotten which way it was – I think the auditor who had a – who had the
right to not be muzzled and talk to the pc had a red ribbon around his neck so the Instructor wouldn't bawl him out.

But the others had to audit muzzled. And we found out that that style brought about progress. And their pcs would progress. In other words, the repetitive command, and so forth, all by itself, not taking any care of origin and so on, would in actual fact bring a pc on up the line. And this was quite remarkable, don't you see? So in those particular case the auditor was preventing the case advance. So we got an auditing style called muzzled auditing.

More recently we had a – I did quite a bit of work on the auditing comm cycle and looked it over, and found out that what auditors weren't doing at the lower-level processes was listening. And we got what has been loosely called, amongst auditors, "itsa," an auditing of itsa. It's perfectly all right to go on calling it that, but just recognize it's a slight misnomer. That is just Listen style.

And then we have another style that came up in Sec Checking and Prepchecking, whereby you steered the pc around. And then you did something about what the pc landed in. And we worked with this and we would – had a great deal of trouble, by the way, because it hadn't been dignified as a style.

So, I hadn't actively planned to simply take these various styles and assign them, but it couldn't have been done in any event until we had all of the processes and gains, and we knew where these things were going.

Well, we're at that point now, so I formulated these auditing styles. You'll find out that you're repeating, to some degree, the various types of auditing which were in vogue at one time or another and they're now fitted to the various levels. Only they're fitted to the expected progress of an auditor's skill. It's what can an auditor do at a certain level and what new thing does he now have to learn how to do, to go up to the next level. And then you'll find that this is fairly easy to do.

Now for instance, one of your confusions about auditing style is that I am sure, somewhere or another, some Instructor has insisted that when you did Listen style that you were – really did Guiding style. "But you aren't listening – you aren't doing itsa. Your itsa is bad because the pc isn't talking interestedly."

At that time – I see I'm hitting a blank spot with all of you, see. Yes, it – you got caught in that one. You'd say, "Well now, can this auditor pass itsa?" And this is probably true through every organization in the world as well as here, you see.

"Can you pass itsa?" All right, well check this person out on itsa. "Well, he flunked itsa." Well, how did he flunk itsa? "Well, he flunked itsa because the pc was not talking interestedly."

So right away this put the poor student – and it's probably one of the biggest bugs that auditors have right at this moment – puts the student in this terrible thing: If you're supposed to sit there and listen, well then, how in the name of common sense can you do anything, you see, about the pc being interested or disinterested? But yet you couldn't pass itsa, you see, unless the pc was getting gains and tone arm action.
So what was this thing, you see? And whereas putting on the auditor the complete clamps of, you see, "He must listen," we then demand tone arm action. We then demand an interested pc. We then demand case advance. We demand, now, no ARC breaks. We demand the auditing comm cycle be perfect, you see. You even get repetitive auditing in there.

Well, what happened actually is you of course, being instructed – however, not you particularly – but students out through organizations were being instructed very carefully by – and with great sincerity – by auditors who of course were quite experienced. And what looked like auditing to them, you see, was far above the immediate ability of the student to execute.

So that, you see, they would start to pass somebody on itsa, as they called it, which is just whether or not the auditor was listening to the pc. But in actual fact what they would collide with as an Instructor is the fact that it didn't look like good auditing, see? So they start out on one thing, you see, start out on this low-level auditing which they all understood to be a very low-level action, don't you see, and promptly check the fellow out for Class IV.

And then, of course, wouldn't let the person pass at the low level until the person had moved into a Class IV classification. But the person couldn't get to a Class IV style of auditing or address, of course, because the person could never get out of itsa.

Do you see the conundrum which was posed here? How is anybody going to find out how to do all these other things if he hasn't first learned to listen? And nobody was letting him learn to listen. Everybody was insisting that he immediately get in this jet, you see – not even the training version, but the fighting version jet, you see – and they were just sending him off down the runway and they were saying, "Now, all you're supposed to learn is to hold the wings in balance. That's all you're supposed to learn." And they'd fire him off down the runway, you see, and he'd go through the sound barrier, and... [laughter] Then he'd hear over his intercom, "I think your acrobatics are very poor." [laughs, laughter] And he'd say, "But I..." "They don't show any polish. Now let's repeat that Immelmann," you see.

And then they get back and then they turn in their report on the – on the student, and they'd say, "Well, he didn't pass."

"Well, why didn't he pass?"

"Well, he couldn't keep his wings level."

See, nobody could get through that sound barrier on the auditing progress. So I've seen this and been working with it for some time and finally formulated this to a gradient scale of auditing approaches that nobody could really skip very badly, because, of course, at once – at once an Instructor, having Guiding style auditing up the line, you see, at II, knowing it's there, would not then try to pass the student on Guiding style auditing, when he was in actual fact trying to do something at Level 0, you see? So this would – is not something now that we'd get involved.

So it was a point that was very necessary to straighten out and it has that instructional value of a gradient scale. After you've learned how to do one thing you certainly can do the next thing, you see. And after you've learned how to do that, then you can do the next thing.
Well, one of the things that's difficult – let's go all the way to the top now, from the bottom – one of the things that's very difficult in teaching anybody R6 is something that's rather hidden there. And that is: The person has to be able to do many different auditing styles *flickety-flickety-flickety, bingity-bingity-bing*, one right after the other, shifts from one to the other and back and forth again. It's the wildest thing you ever saw in your life.

Because the session is going so rapidly that there is no time to handle these things with base, way-back-to-the-beginning-type auditing. Well, I'll give you an idea, I'll give you an idea: We're running this pc down the bank, you see, and the pc is in a GPM and we've got an item all ready to go, and we end the session. And the next session the pc pops up with a PTP. Well now, if we don't handle that PTP, that pc's going to make no progress in that session at all. So now what are we going to do?

In the first place, the case is getting much better and is really flying, and what are we going to do? Now are we going to handle his PTP with an hour and a half of "What part of that problem could you be responsible for?" on a repetitive command? See? Well, we're not going to do that.

Well, how do we explain to the auditor that we're not going to do that? He knows how to handle a PTP. He's been very carefully taught. He's been very carefully taught that when the pc has a PTP, you locate and isolate what the PTP is and then you say, "What part of that problem can you be responsible for?" or something like that, for half an hour or something like this and the problem tends to evaporate.

Well, the only trouble with this at R6 is the problem is undoubtedly closely associated with the item the pc is right now in. It is the tiniest lock imaginable. It has the same order of magnitude of a gnat standing alongside of the Alps. And how are we going to handle this?

So we have to admit that the pc has a PTP. So we bring this up – the pc has a PTP. We isolate what the PTP is – we guide, you see – and then we simply use itsa or something like this, you see. And the pc says, "Well, it's a so and so on, and a so and so on, and a so-and-so and so-and-so." And you say, "Well, that's very good. Do you have a PTP?" – glance at the meter, you see – "That's fine. You haven't got one. All right. Now let's get on with the next item," you see – bang, bang! You know?

Well, you see, that violates – if somebody has never been trained to handle a PTP that way – that violates it and it makes him think that he now audits sloppily. That's the immediate result.

He now gets the idea that the higher you go, the sloppier you audit. No, no, that's not true. The higher you go, the more precise you audit. But the sloppier it may look.

See, it may look awfully sloppy to an observer but it's actually far more precise – rat-a-tat-tat. You're choosing up the process and the auditing style to fit the process right there – bing! Don't you see?

Well, what do you think – in R6 you suddenly start in and you find out that some item won't read. Well, what are you going to do at that particular point? Well, we're not going to now do a tremendous case analysis or something like this. We're going to take this thing as we can, don't you see?
And what does it indicate? It indicates a Prepcheck. Well, very good. The auditor's been taught how to do a Prepcheck. He knows how to do a Prepcheck. You assess the problem or item necessary to prepcheck and then you have eighteen buttons. And you run each one of these flat.

Wow, if you did that to somebody while he was running down through a GPM, he'd half kill you, because some of those Prepcheck buttons are very hot locks right on top of items and right on top of end words and they would ball that bank up like mad if you're running down the bank. It wouldn't necessarily be true if you weren't running down the bank, you see, at the lower levels. But it's now very true.

So we condense a Prepcheck into this sort of a thing. Ah well, we know what's been suppressed: the item, see. So we say, "Well, on that item has anything been suppressed?" And the pc says, "Oh, yes, so-and-so and so and so on and suppressed."

"All right. Repeat the item again ... All right, that reads. Fine. We go on down to..."

That's a Prepcheck. You follow? Well, that's actually Abridged style auditing. It's just abridged. You just cut out all of the nonessentials out of the actual action that you're doing. And re... of course, that has to be terribly precise, because the auditor has to know what's essential about the action he's doing. You see, it's actually more precise than complete full-dress parade type of auditing.

So at R6 we have All style. And all a fellow has to do at R6 is simply be able to do all the styles which are below Level VI and he does them all consecutively and at various – in various orders. He's liable to be shifting from one style to another style. And you very often find yourself, oddly enough, doing Level 0 auditing with R6.

This pc's gone off on a wild tear of itsa. "Oh! you know," – this sort of thing – "Gee! You know, that was why I hated my grandmother," and so forth. "And you know I got some kind of an idea that I had other grandmothers at one time or another. Yes, I'm sure I had grandmothers and so forth and so on. And I've had – always have seemed to have had trouble with grandmothers, you know. Grandmothers, grandmothers, grandmothers." He's running some GPM that has to do with "kill the old," or something.

And tone arm's going at some mad rate, you see, and he's itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa. And – well, let me assure you – you as the auditor – as long as that tone arm is moving, you'd just be a fool to open your face.

And you've been going down the bank, you see. Put in the steps – brrrt-bow! See. Bang-bang-bang, you know. Thud, thud; crash, crash. "All right, now we'll check out the next GPM" – boom, bang, thud. You see, we're going right just at a terrific rate of speed, and then all of a sudden, "Hey! You know, I think this is why I hated my grandmother." And of course, you're right there, ready to commence again, but no, that isn't the end of that cognition.

Now, if the auditor is unskilled in recognizing pc origins and unskilled in handling itsa, he can lay a terrible egg right at that point. See, he can try to force the pc on down the bank, or force the pc into actions or shut him off or herd him up one way or the other or do
something with him when that's – actually what he ought to do is just sit back and smile, as his total auditing action.

Ah, but that requires judgment, too, because supposing the pc was cogniting on other end words in the bank. And supposing he was traveling all over the bank with his itsa. Oh, no, we don't want him traveling all over the bank with itsa. He isn't cogniting, you see, he's just sitting there speculating, "Well, I wonder if this is so on, an end word, and I wonder if that's an end word, and so on." The next thing you know, you're going to have the most frozen tone arm that you could find south of Nome. There it'll be.

Well, so at this point you've got to know Guiding style. You got to be able to herd that pc. You got to be able to shut him up without ARC breaking him. And of course, that's – you – the auditor that's learned that, he's learned it, see? "Well, good. I'm glad you got a lot of end words there. Well, that's fine, I'm glad you're cogniting on that. Fine, fine. Well, thank you very much. Now, I got all that. Now, what do you suppose this next item is?"

And the pc says, "Well, the next item is... Well, the next item is so-and-so and so-and-so," and we go on down the bank, don't you see?

But let's take an auditor who has been carefully trained to do repetitive command auditing and can assess if he holds his tongue between his teeth like that while he looks at the meter. And now let's turn him loose in this lion's cage, you see, called R6, where he himself is under heavy restimulation usually too, and his last session hasn't gone and a bunch of other things are terrific liabilities about his auditing. And now, without any basic training, let's expect him to get some kind of a result. He's still trying to find out various things: Does R6 work? Are GPMs there? Can anybody possibly ever get cleared?

Well, he's trying to get cleared on R6. He hasn't cognited yet that you don't get cleared on R6, that you get cleared back at IV, you see. And he hasn't – he hasn't meshed all of this. He's still got all these searching answers. And then he has no pattern of training on styles of auditing. And of course he's just going to have an awful time.

Because, you see, he'll have a hard enough time if he has the training on all the styles of auditing and he can do each one of these styles. He will have a hard enough time just grappling with the new strangeness and complexities of the whole reactive mind. Because you're just asking him nonchalantly, "All right, go ahead and run the pc through his reactive mind." Because that's all there is to the pc's active mind – reactive mind, you see. "Well, all right, just run him through his reactive mind." And the guy says, "Reactive mind! Whoooo! You know, well..." and so forth. "And let's see, now, what did it say? What was the patter?" You know, he's trying to remember the patter and he isn't skilled at this point and that. And then we also hit him in the head with what style does he use, see. He won't make it.

Because even given all of his information and so forth, he actually should be at least twenty hours on solo audit, after he goes into there, so he gets a reality on the bank. And all of a sudden he'll coordinate the bank against the reads, he'll coordinate his auditing against how to handle this. All of a sudden it all falls together beautifully and it's very smooth and he goes on from there.
If he doesn't go on from there, somebody can get him by the scruff of the neck and take some of the charge and overburden off of the thing, don't you see, straighten him out and do a bit of case analysis, something like that; but not run a bank. And put him back on running the bank. And he eventually will find that he can grapple with his own bank, which is a tremendous piece of confidence. Then he's got a good subjective reality on it.

But for him to do that without any background of auditing styles and so forth would again be almost incredible. See, it's one thing to be a pc and it's one thing to be an auditor. But to be an auditor and a pc with all auditing styles demanded while running on through the reactive bank is quite a trick. And therefore, I have some feeling that somebody should be prepared to do this.

So the auditing, the auditing which you're doing at lower levels is of course very much gauged at these lower levels. Now, somebody the other day was going to go back home and audit a couple of pcs on GPMs – they're not even Releases, you see. He's going to audit them on this.

Well, you'll find everybody is tugging away at the idea of going to the top. Our society is gauged that in order to be successful you have to be at the top. And there are very few ladders around, and if you'll notice, why, there are very few at the top. And the reason there are very few at the top is that there are no ladders provided. There are a great deal of booby traps provided. There are a lot of ropes that are half cut through provided. But there are very few ladders provided.

Now, a pc has to climb the same ladder and these are gauged against what auditing a pc will respond to at what level – which isn't covered in the bulletin, but is quite pertinent. Now look, a pc would have to be up to withstanding All style.

Well, do you realize that it's the constancy of lower-level auditing – short sessions and constancy. It's the fact that the auditor is predictable. The pc now knows and becomes certain, because the pc can predict what the auditor is going to do.

Well, a pc isn't going to predict anything in All style. So he already has to have a high level of confidence in auditors. Right?

Well, how's he going to gain that? Well, he's going to gain that by going up through the levels.

Also, you could describe the reactive bank.

He becomes familiar, in other words, in – to reacting to these various styles of auditing and he finds none of them bite, and he's now familiar and reacting to all of these styles. Well, so when they're all thrown at him one after the other, out of sequence, and so forth – as is necessary at R6 – why, it all seems very usual to him. Whereas he'd do his nut – to use a Britishism – if he possibly were subjected to this kind and type of auditing as his first debut into Scientology. "What the hell is going on?" You see, he had no certainty on it at all and he'd quickly foul up.

There's a case fact that prevents you from grabbing somebody off of the street out here. Everybody wants to get to the top and they want their R6 auditing and they're very im-
portant people. And you'll find out the lower they are, the more important they are, you see. And the more exaggerated their ideas of their ability is. And you get somebody up here and you just drag him off the street at random and you start to run him on R6.

Funny part of it is, you might get away with it. You might get away with it for several GPMs or you might get away with it with this or that. But remember that you're just playing your luck. It's something like running a race with the saddle cinch of the horse cut three-quarters of the way through, don't you see, and with only one nail holding the shoe on each hoof.

Now, the conditions there are so strained that I doubt you would be able to progress fifty hours of auditing into R6 without coming a terrible cropper – a really terrible cropper. And you haven't got any background or backlog in the pc with which to salvage the pc. The pc has no confidence that Scientology would rescue a PTP. The pc has no confidence that this somatic which is now turning on, would ever turn off again. The pc is all leery. The pc may think he's being psychoanalyzed – he's never found out about it yet, don't you see. You never know what the devil this pc was all about. He may be gauging all of R6 as to whether or not his ears sting. His hidden standards are in his road, you see. R6 isn't working because his ears don't sting. He knows when things work – his ears get warm and tingle. You know? When you've got all of those liabilities fighting against you, you're just asking for it.

So if you take a pc off the street and put them on to R6, don't write me and say, "Ron, this person has spun in and this – he's having a terrible time, what do I do now?" Now, I'm telling you what to do right here, see. And there isn't much of anything you can do if you haven't done the other first.

So the nonsense of taking somebody and immediately putting them on R6 just because they wave a lot of money in your face or some other insufficient inducement, it is – it is simply becoming the effect of somebody's bank. And it's nothing more than that. You're just making yourself the effect of their bank. And boy, don't think you aren't going to be the effect of their bank from there on, even more so. It's going to get pretty grim.

So what you want to do in a case like that is say, "Fine. Fine. Oh, we'd be very happy to run you on R6 – very, very happy to run you on R6. Yes, sir! We will sign you up for R6. All right. Now, tell me about your life." And pretty soon he says, "You know, I'm not getting any of these goals and so forth."

"Well, I think we're clarifying your goals pretty good. You see these session goals up here? They're pretty good. Are you making them?"

"Well, I'm not making that one, 'I want to be OT by Tuesday,' because then I get another promotion from the something-or-other."

"Well, all right, I'm sorry you're not making that particular goal."

And go right on auditing him with what you're auditing. And all of a sudden about Tuesday, three months later, why, this guy – after a few sessions a week or something like that – this guy all of a sudden says, "You know, I don't – I think my anxiety about being OT is the fact that I thought I was going to get worse. And you know I've just realized that I'm not going to get worse. That's quite remarkable."
And you've hit the first thing that was really real to him. You made a Release. He isn't being audited in a frame of mind of total desperation that if he doesn't get audited, you see, he's now going to go through the floor and disappear or something is going to cave in on him, don't you see? This most remarkable frame of mind.

Because most people start in their auditing – no matter how quiet they look to you on the surface – they start in their auditing in a total desperation. Oh, they say, "Well, well go along with this and I'd be very happy to get better, and yes, I want to be able to play ping-pong better," and so forth. And they go along with this and so forth. But actually sitting back of that is a – is a total desperation.

They see themselves going on the same old treadmill, don't you see, down the same old chute into the same old bunch of mud. And they know it's a very steep chute. And they know that if they don't keep running like mad on that treadmill they're going to go into that chute and "uhhh. And you build them up to a point of where they have a little more confidence in their own future, see. Just that little point. And all of a sudden they come off this desperation kick. And fine. So move them on up the line.

And you would actually overestimate, now, the amount of time necessary to make somebody walk that ladder. See, you'll probably assign him too much time to it in your own mind because you're assigning it out of your experience and there's been a great deal of technical advance here, a rather dizzy amount of technical advance in the last eighteen months, and it'd be pretty hard to catch experience up to it.

See, you'd have to audit a lot of different kinds of pcs, and that sort of thing and apply the techniques exactly as they were supposed to be applied to gain experience. So actually, your prediction of how long somebody would be on one of these levels – from your own instincts and so forth – would probably be at fault, you see. You probably would overestimate the amount of time and you'd probably tend to overrun the pc at any given level just to be sure. Which is fine. Go right ahead and do so. But recognize that you have to adjust your reality and experience against what's actually happening with pcs.

And you'll find that there is an acceleration of gain. The gain accelerates. That is it – for any given moment of time the gain increases per hour of auditing time, better. You get more gain per unit of auditing time, you see, and then you get more and more gain, and then you get more and more and more gain per unit of auditing time, don't you see? And your slow freight on a pc is 0 and I. That's really slow freight. Because you've got a guy who is crawling out of that well; and he crawls up three inches in the auditing session and he falls back two and seven-eighths inches in the intervening period, see. And his actual rate of advance is an eighth of an inch per session on a well which is several thousand feet deep.

Life to him looks terribly, terribly forbidding.

Now, you actually are only dealing with that strata of the society who are voluntarily seeking auditing. And this is a new thing. Nobody's done that before. They've only really addressed treatment – that is, the – a majority of treatment given in a society was to those people who were lying across the track of society; they were in the road of society.
From psychotherapy and treatment the – of the Aesculapians, and other things, was to get out of the road of the society or out of the road of a family somebody who was in a bad way. And they considered these chaps were a liability. They kept running around the forum, you know, with no toga on, you know. And interrupting the speeches being made, you know. This sort of thing, you see.

So they'd – somebody would say, "Well, there you are, Bill," and get him out of the road. Well, that's because the state could see this and therefore the state or the family head or something like that would then be quite willing to put out money in order to get this fellow straightened out. So the psychotherapist or the Aesculapian or the medical doctor or the witch doctor or any other of the more archaic forms would just follow the line of the least resistance, you see.

"Well, the state's willing to get rid of the very sick and the very nutty and so they'll pay us to get rid of the very sick and the very nutty. And of course, we can't do it, but we can certainly keep them out of their road. Now, what we need is more institutions and more hospitals, and more hospitals and more institutions and more appropriations. And we need more appropriations and more institutions and more hospitals."

And what they needed of course was a better understanding of man, but they weren't paid to have that. See, they were only paid numerically. There were eight squillion nuts in the society and they were allocated as their pay so many – so many drachma or something per bed, don't you see. Quantitative basis. Wrong method of appropriation, you see. So there was no incentive.

Now, you're dealing – and you get very easily confused with that other laughable nonsense, because what you're doing – what you're doing is handling a level of society that yet has some inkling that they can do something about themselves. Now, you remember that; that's your basic entrance point. Now, you can promote that entrance point and you can increase that tiny spark. But if it isn't there at all and you can't communicate with it at all, the guy is – the guy has "went" because he can't go up from there. Because the only person that can make a thetan well is a thetan.

And what's the point of no return? Well, the point of no return is no faintest idea at any time ever that self can do anything about anything. When you hear somebody saying, "Well, there's no reason to vote," and so forth, "I couldn't do anything about it anyhow. I don't care to talk about politics, because there isn't anything you can do about it anyway. You know…"

Well, that person is gone on the third dynamic. And these big supersocialist states that are supposed to take care of everybody (inside the barbed wire) – these states in actual fact only come into existence when the majority of its population is in that frame of mind. It actually isn't the fault of the state. The state comes into existence because a bunch of blokes out through the society no longer feel that anything can be done about anything and therefore they just go through the treadmill and they're simply staying alive, you know?

And you wonder why does one of these socialist or communist states fail to produce? Why do they always have production problems? Why is everybody in Russia starving to death at such a rate that they had to get rid of their premier, or whatever he was? And their
boss over there was moved off, moved off. And it didn't have anything to do with, really, po-

tical issues.

People were hungry and people didn't have any shoes to wear. And nobody could do

anything about it anyway and that was the prevailing thought. And he must have Q-and-Aed

with all these people who couldn't do anything about it anyhow and he did have a few leaders

around who thought you could still do something about it. And so they gave him the deep six

and the population never said a word, because of course they couldn't do anything about it

anyway.

It wasn't that they approved or disapproved of the removal of the head of state of Rus-
sia last month, do you see? They just couldn't have done anything about it.

That's pretty wild. That's a pretty wild frame of mind.

Well now, let's add that up on the first dynamic – that's the only reason I'm giving it to

you on the third, see. "Ohhh, I don't have anything to do about it, the brain is all composed of

cells. I have to obey these synapses and neurons. And they do it all. And if you could do any-
thing about it, there isn't anyplace to do anything about it because who wants to make a syn-

apses well? Nobody can get any better. I can't get any better. There isn't anything there to get

anything any better. There isn't anything there that could get any better anyhow – even if you

could get better." And you get a philosophy like Wundtianism, see? "Man is an animal. There

ain't nothing there. He is a bunch of mass brain-work that is very interesting under a micro-

scope." You know? I mean, that's the philosophy which you would get at that point. So that

again is not premeditated, but is itself only a symptom of the individual attitude.

You actually, then, are appealing to a person who has some tiny, tiny dim spark that

maybe he could do something about himself or maybe he could do something about the soci-

ey. See? That's the person you're appealing to. And so therefore you're appealing to a minor-

ity.

The kickback, of course, that we get from the – from the state, and that sort of thing, is

they tell us – they tell us we're a bunch of fakes and bums, you see, and that we can't do any-
thing and we can't do anything we promise, so... Well, that's because they know there's noth-
ing can be done about it, you see.

The medical profession spends I don't know how much money per annum in the

United States listing and enforcing into Legislation diseases that can't be cured. And they've

got bills. There's twenty-five diseases which you must not treat in California, for instance,
because they can't be cured. And their bulk of contribution to the Better Business Bureau, and

so forth, is to get literature released that demonstrates completely that people can't be cured.

Well, you say that's a very funny thing for a healing profession to be doing. Well, of

course, they – the bug in that is because you call them a healing profession. That's a very –

that's not a very funny thing for a bunch of guys who are getting their total appropriation in

proportion to the number of sick people there are around. So naturally they'll be trying to

convince everybody something couldn't be cured because of course this puts more money in

their pockets; this puts more power in their hands, you see.
The less that can be cured in the society – if you follow out the reasoning – the less that can be cured in the society the more tops they are. And they themselves are incapable of thinking the thought through, that that includes them!

And somehow or another these birds are never able to equate this last one. They're sort of mad and low-toned anyway. And they – you'll find some atomic physicist: "Well, it doesn't make any difference whether you kill one person with a rifle or the whole population of Earth. I mean, the same degree of morality has nothing to do with it. You can kill a city; you kill one person. I mean, war is war. That hasn't anything to do with anything, you see? And there's no difference between these things, and so forth. So therefore, it's perfectly okay for me to build atomic bombs and give them over to a bunch of gibbering boobs that have elected themselves heads of states." That's how he – how he justifies the whole action.

See, there's no difference between it, and so forth. And he goes on and he builds all these things, you see, and he hands them all out to the... You know, like some five-year-old kid and two-year-old kid: "Here, Johnny, have a cocked .45." "Yeah, well, he wants another cocked .45. All right. We'll build him one." You see? And when he gets down to this point, why, he hasn't included himself in.

And just for fun one time, as I think I've told you before, I made an experiment. I took a salesman who wasn't interested in the atomic bomb and I carefully broke him down to points of his possessions that he was worried enough about to be worried about the bomb.

I was trying to explain to him what of his and what around him would disappear if he were in a bombed area. And I broke it down point by point, don't you see. Well, you know, almost a repetitive process. Well, would he be upset if his wife and children got knocked off by a bomb? Why, hell, he couldn't have cared less. It didn't make any difference to him. He'd be all right. And... That's right!

And I just kept breaking this down. And I finally got to his wallet and he started to get worried. [laughter] And – but it wasn't the money in his wallet, oddly enough, it was his social security card. And when he finally realized that his social security card would be charred beyond recognition, he started to worry about atomic bombings.

And he left the room nattering a little bit about people making and using atomic bombs, that it wasn't quite nice. But I had, of course, had trailed it down to a demonstration that it did have something to do with him, see.

Well, similarly, you on a broad public front, first by setting an example that people are getting better and next by showing them, you see, cutting it back to a point where they might possibly themselves quite possibly be able to do about it – in other words, re-awaken this spark – then you would make progress through the society. But that is the course which you will follow up through the coming years. It will be that sort of a – of an action.

You're doing fine and you're getting better and things in your vicinity are running all right, don't you see, and somebody says, "Maybe it was luck, maybe it was this, maybe it's that," trying to explain this all the time. It's a bug that has appeared in their immediate social environment which they can't appear. You're a sort of a – you're an oddity, see. You aren't all falling to pieces like everybody else is, see. Why? And... Well, they're prepared then to have
the question answered. And it's answered on the basis of "Could they do anything to help themselves?" And that would be your first edge in.

There'd be some spark of something that they could either resent or resist or help or something, you see. There would be a little scale running, and when a person hits that line he'll eventually walk up the line to want some processing.

But you're doing something that has not occurred before on this planet, see. Therefore, it's very easily confused and gotten upset about, is because you're taking people who yet have some tiny inkling that they can get better. But all through their auditing that must be improved. And therefore, this emphasis on wins. That's how we must keep the pc winning. Keep the pc at cause and winning.

We mustn't ever knock them around into a situation where they believe they can't better themselves — have them get tremendous auditing failures, you see, with a tremendous crash. And it's that little point of self at cause which must be reached. And of course, your readiest people to reach are those people who do believe they can do something about themselves. You see, they're very easy to handle.

But rekindled by various mechanisms, such as example, discussion, and that sort of thing, in others, you see, and you're working with that level of society, and you're not following the route of "There are eight million nuts, and so therefore, we have eight million people in our charge, and therefore, we get appropriations to take care of these eight million people," don't you see. That's the old approach. And that's why nobody was really interested in doing anything about anybody. They're being paid for their disabilities.

Well, now, you're going at it on a reverse line. And that reverse line isn't harder; actually, that reverse line is easier. It's always easier to indulge in a successful activity than one which simply holds everybody in cages and they grunt and groan, you see. You follow that? Because it's more rewarding. The actual fact is, it's easier to make somebody better than it is to make them worse.

A thetan resists getting worse; he's resisted it for ages. And he's so used to resisting getting worse, don't you see, that it's a brand-new vector, it's a brand-new vector to say you could get better. And it — he finds it very hard to resist this. He has no built-up resistance to this at all. And you keep telling him he can get better and he keeps hearing he can get better and so forth, and then all of a sudden he begins to realize that he himself would have to do something about it in order to get better. At that point, why, he moves up and he gets to the point, finally, of realizing he's not now going to get worse. And he at that point is a Release.

And if you're not at least working with a Release on R6, why, the guy is just sitting there going through some kind of motions and the environment around him is going to smash him in and his cognitions, you see, aren't really very pertinent. It's rather ridiculous to listen to his cognitions. He's running the actual basic points of the bank and you'll find him cogniting on the fact of "Oh, I see now, maybe that's why I cut my finger yesterday. And maybe that's why — why I sometimes cut my finger, yes. We've solved my life," you see. He's running some engram "to kill everybody in sight," don't you see? He doesn't cognite on any magnitude, don't you see? There's nothing going on, really.
And you're just handling charge and there's no pc there much to handle the charge, and you can just assign it to the point that you as the auditor are running through, now, at R6, the same experience that Dianetic auditors had perpetually. They could always knock out somebody's arthritis and they would be very, very happy as an auditor to have fixed up somebody's lumbosis, or something of the sort, and the only difficulty was the pc hadn't found out about it.

Actually, you could force somebody through an auditing session, cure them up one way or the other, straighten them up like mad, fix them up so they never had any more domestic trouble. You do the wildest things with these people, you see. And it was like repairing a typewriter. It was still a typewriter.

And the – one of the reasons we came off from Dianetics is because self-determinism and other factors of that character had entered in. And we ourselves in this study had found out that there was something there. And there was something doing it. There was something getting better and it wasn't all just negative gain; there was also positive gain, hence Scientology.

Now, the auditing styles are all part and parcel of this. So you've got these things plotted at the most win or the most likely win at that level where you find the pc. Now, the pc originally will most likely win at Level 0. It isn't that you need tremendous, new, sparking, beautiful processes in order to push this pc up the line. No, he's more likely to win with this very simple process of itsa, see. He's just talking. He finds out he can talk to somebody. Big win, man! Terrific. It isn't what you're erasing, it isn't what you're doing. Nothing like that.

So, the auditing style, then, is adjusted to the most likely progress for the pc. You possibly have never much thought of this subject of "How does the pc receive auditing?" see. "How does the pc react to auditing?"

We think in – more in terms of the pc has a case and the case gets better, don't you see, or the case improves, the pc's behavior improves or his environment improves, or something like this. And we probably don't too often equate that to just this: That's the pc's reaction to the processing. See? The pc, then, responded to a certain level of processing. That's why the pc won. He didn't necessarily respond to a particular button that was pushed on his case.

You see, we've always had with us this other factor, that just auditing – almost gobbledygook auditing – was quite capable of improving somebody's case. Did you ever get puzzled about this? Did you ever see anybody in a – doing TRs get a case win? Well, why? There's no process!

And sometimes, particularly back in 54, there were quite a few auditors around who were absolutely mad on this subject of the process. The process was everything, and there was no auditing connected with the process. The process did it all and they didn't have to do anything, and the pc didn't have to do anything, you see. They had it mixed up like it was a pill or something. I quickly broke them of this but – as fast as found, but the point I'm making here is actually, yes, the process is very valuable. Unless you knew what processes to run he'd soon come to a point of no gain, don't you see?
But the actual fact is, the actual fact is that the actions of auditing all by themselves, completely devoid of processes, account for a very respectable portion of the pc's gain. It makes a terrific mystery to some auditor who sees – if he sees that Joe always gets gains on the pc... But the question he's liable to ask Joe is, "What did you run on them?" No, the answer to the question was, is how did Joe run pcs? It's how he was audited, see; it wasn't what was audited on the pc. And that is something that we have never paid very much attention to and haven't covered it to any great degree. But you'll find it in auditing styles. And it's how you audit the pc to a gain.

And frankly, if you were simply to ask him about his old boots and hobbies, at itsa style, don't you see... It – see, everybody's being very significant, saying, "Well, what questions do you put on the blackboard?" Well, at that level it just doesn't matter what questions you put on the blackboard. You shouldn't put too beefy one on the blackboard that's too significant because that isn't what's happening. It's the style. You're conditioning somebody to speak to somebody else. See, that's what you're doing. He finds out he can talk without getting his throat cut.

"Hey! There's somebody I can communicate with," is his most usual cognition. Whether he expresses it or articulates it or not, that's usually his cognition. Well, actually it doesn't do much good to run him beyond that cognition. That's the ability regained. But it's regained by the style, don't you see?

All right. Now, let's take the very next style above this, which is muzzled auditing. Boy, that's quite a jump. That's a fantastic discipline. And unless you train your pc to some degree as to what's expected and show him what this auditing cycle is and what this muzzled auditing is all about, he can't predict it and he doesn't know what to do and he tries to fall back into itsa.

Well, no, let's just graduate him upstairs at a hurry, because he's quite capable now, you see, of taking this step. He has learned he can talk to somebody. All right. Now, let's teach him this other thing that he could enter in to a piece of this drill. And that is when he's asked a question, to actually look it over and answer it. And now, that's something. Do you realize that that is a sort of an 8-C all by itself? That's a fabulous thing to...

And you know there's tons of pcs I've seen that – somebody's trying to audit them on some upper level who have never gotten that skill. They have never, never been able to do that. You ask them a question, you know, "Do birds fly?" and they say, "Birds ... Birds ... I visited the Smithsonian Institute one time or another."

Do you see – look on that as not something fundamentally wrong with the case, so much as an inability which can be knocked out and the ability of it can be regained. Can you answer a question when you're asked one? And if you put muzzled auditing to the pc on that basis: "All right, now we're going to go through a long series of processes and processing and so forth, and the one thing which is at stake here is whether or not you can answer the question you've been asked." That's quite a process all by itself, isn't it?

And therefore, he'd take very kindly to your saying, "I'm sorry, but I don't think you answered the auditing question."
"I guess I didn't. Well, I'm not so good at it yet, am I?"

Instead of ARC breaking, you see. He had an understanding, that that's – completely aside from other things being run on him – that that basic fundamental is something he should learn how to do. And you can pull him up short then, can't you? You can say, "Hey, hey, hey now, let's see if we can't get a little bit better at this," you know. "All right, now in this next session here, we're just going – we're going to see if you're very good at this. We're running times you've communicated. All right, that's fine. That's all we're running. But let's see if we can't really get the ball here."

Well, what in essence is the whole gain of 8-C, which is one of the – one of the most fabulous processes? You don't think patting the wall is going to do anything for anybody? Well, it isn't going to do very much, it's reach and withdraw from mest and that sort of thing. Well, that's fine, yes. We know there's a gain involved with it, but what is it essentially?

The guy finds out that he can execute an auditing command. Well, that's pretty interesting after awhile, he finds out, "You know, when he says to walk over there, you know, I do. And I'm – he says touch the wall, I do." And then the next thing that it picks up, all in one fell swoop, is duplication. And boy, the individual who has individuated from all of life on the basis of not being able to duplicate anything in life is a mighty lonely Joe. He's way out, man! He can't be anything. Remember the old beingness processing.? He can't be anything because he can't duplicate anything.

Well, this is all part and parcel to orders, too, isn't it? You'll find out that this person, when you give him an order, you say put the cans down, and so forth, why, he'll put them in his pockets or something.

Well, unless you've gotten a human being out of that wobble and scrabble and so forth, you haven't improved his ability to confront existence because of course he can't – he can't see those things he can't be. He can't duplicate, in other words. Well, duplication is simply a repetitive action.

I may have skipped over that a little fast for you. Some of you may remember the old Beingness Processes. That was taught up in London about 1954. A thetan can only be what he can see. And what he can't see, he can't be. And he can only see something because he can duplicate it.

Actually, he can't see anything... you'll be – you know the remarkable stories and reports you get of an accident. Well, it's peculiarly an accident. It isn't that people's observation in general is bad. They're looking at something they jolly well don't want to be. And so you get the most distorted stories of what happened at this accident.

A cop is always up against this. He always gets a half a dozen different stories. And how a court ever admits evidence of watching a crime as reason enough to hang somebody, I wouldn't know. Because it's the most unreliable evidence in the world. Because of course the fellow couldn't see it; can't be it. He just knows very well that he wouldn't want to be hit by a car. So he actually doesn't see anybody hit by a car.

Well, you have a slight occupational liability as an auditor is that you're looking at a pc all the time that you don't particularly want to be. You're trying to improve him, aren't
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you? Well, fortunately for us it isn't necessary for you to be willing to be aberrated to get well. You follow that thought through? It isn't necessary for you to be willing to be aberrated to get well, see. Because we have the whole anatomy of the reactive bank, there's no sense in it, see. You see, if a thetan didn't have a reactive bank and he hadn't made his GPMs and he hasn't agreed on all of this, and so forth, he would probably be completely unaberrateable. He couldn't be aberrated at all. He – there would be no dwindling spiral.

See, there's basic things that you say could get wrong with him, but in actual fact he wouldn't have any of those things wrong with him. He would actually have to determine to have something real wrong with him. And when he determined it as thoroughly as make a complete reactive mind that would keep him crazy from there on out, this was almost the accidental perfect trap. The trap he ordinarily wouldn't fall into. But there he was in it. He did it.

You see, he had to decide to be aberrated with exclamation points, for some reason or other best known to him, and then having decided so, he was too stupid to get himself out of it. It's just – it – you see, that that is what's wrong with everybody means in essence that the other things that were wrong with him actually have blown. See, there's just that one thing left. There were a lot of things that could have been wrong with a thetan but that one – he had to decide to be aberrated. He had to decide to make and create and put in place, and continue to create a reactive bank and the universe. He had to decide this all off his own bat, incredible as it may seem.

Oh, he could have agreed and he could have been persuaded and he could have talked to somebody, but let's not miss the point; he did do it. And having done it, why, he was then in the soup. And that's actually all we're unwinding, don't you see. There isn't anything else there to unwind.

But because there's so many locks on the reactive bank and because it tends to group and bunch up and get into restimulation, you have degree of aberration of cases. And there's certain basic things that can go wrong with a thetan which are above the level of the reactive bank and GPMs, and these certain basic things include duplication and communication.

They can be aberrated all by their little old lonesomes, regardless of any end word. Yes, there's some end words that have to do with these things, but that really doesn't matter. These are then not low-level ideas. These are very high-level ideas. These would be native to any thetan anyway, whether he had a bank or didn't have a bank.

And you can work on them and you can improve them because they have such a strong influence. You see, these things he should be able to do pretty well. He shouldn't be stumbling around on communication and duplication. Bank or no bank, end words or no end words, you see. And actually, they do improve rather remarkably, and he comes up scale to a point where he can confront bank, and that sort of thing.

So what are you asking him to do? You're asking him to – at itsa, your Listen style auditing – you're asking him to communicate and find out he's doing it, and he does; and somebody's going to receive the communication, so it must – therefore, it must be communication. It proves to him that he is communicating because somebody's receiving it, don't you see? And then we go up to the next stage here of muzzled auditing. And now, he's got to receive a communication, and he proves it by answering it. Do you follow that?
And then he proves it to himself that he has answered it. And he proves it to himself he has received a communication because the auditor is satisfied with the fact that he's answered the auditing question.

And of course, any time the auditor lets a pc receive a communication or a question that he doesn't answer, then the pc is not then satisfied, because he knows he didn't answer the auditing question. And so therefore, he begins to doubt his own ability to receive a communication. It's as elementary as that.

It isn't he's doing you in as an auditor by not answering the auditing question, it isn't that the process wouldn't work unless it were received or anything like that. No, he now doubts that he's received the communication. And he doubts he's received the communication because he didn't answer it. And then the auditor, the auditor didn't call him up on the fact that he didn't answer the incoming communication, so therefore, everything gets kind of unreal to him.

Now, he's proving it to himself continuously, by answering the auditing question, that he is capable of receiving a communication. Because it proves itself; he's answered the thing he received. And not only that, but he can do it repetitively. He can do it again and again and again and again. And when he first gets the idea of answering three questions in a row, man, he's ready to go round the bend.

You may not realize it, but you ask some people the same question, just twice, and they blow up in your face. Did you ever have that happen? Ask them the same question twice. So therefore, you've got to make a point to the pc, "Now, we're going to get you so that you can answer several questions in a row, all the same question." And he'll begin to see this is a skill, see. All right, so we've got muzzled auditing.

Now, the next level is mainly devoted to "is there something there?" Now we're up to Guiding style. Is there anything there? You see, the whole world to him is reasonless. Although he's being very reasonable about everything, actually there's no reason for anything. He's on the lower harmonic of the truth. All reasons have to be dreamed up. But he's down to a point where they really – the average human being – there's no real reason for anything. He doubts, for instance, that there's any real reason for him to be unhappy. He's unhappy, but there is no reason for him to be unhappy, there's nothing making him unhappy.

You get this expressed all the time as "I feel nervous today." Somebody says, "I feel nervous today." It's an accepted fact. There's nothing causing this nervousness. Hence, you get people going off into numerology. You know, like "On the 17th of the month I feel nervous." And it has something to do with the number 17, and 1 and 7 added together make 8. Eight is money, so therefore, it must be money. But that person is still trying to find a reason for his nervousness.

You'll find the bulk of the society does not ever try to find any reason for their nervousness. And you very often as an auditor are completely baffled. You say, "All right, let's find out why you've got the headache." And you see the person says, "Oh nuts!" [laughter] "You've just said something awfully silly! There's no reason to have a headache, one simply has a headache! Of course!"
Now, the doctor gets far too serious about this. This person has a headache every once in a while, so the doctor wants to – wants to remove the brain. [laughter]

It's like the American military with their "overkill." I think it's fascinating, a fascinating word – "overkill." They've got a thousand times overkill now in the arsenals in the United States. They've got enough atom bombs to kill every man, woman and child on Earth a thousand times each. [laughter] I don't know how you compute that. You'd almost have to be a Scientologist to even approach it. And by that I mean, yes, well, you could figure out that every lifetime you could kill them and you'd have enough to do that, so we could stretch it out in Scientology to make sense. But it doesn't make any sense to them because they think you only live once anyway. And you're just a brain, see. So it's a completely senseless statement – overkill. Why should they have one, see?

Now, you take – you take reasons for headaches and things like this – completely beyond people. They've got a headache; they've got a stomachache.

Now, once in a while – once in a while you get a big cognition out of somebody, you know. You say – they say, "Oh, well, I've got a terrible stomachache today." What you're missing, you see, is you, yourself, know that things cause things. See, you're not living in a causeless world and environment, you see. So it doesn't make any sense to you to have somebody over there that you're talking to living in a causeless world, see. The stomachache is a fact. Nothing caused it; it appears and disappears with complete mysteriousness. See?

And you get a big cognition out of them one day when you ask them, "Well, did you eat something that disagreed with you?" And every once in a while if you ask somebody that, under those circumstances, they would say, "By George, you know – you know, I – I did. You know? I had twenty raw weenies last night. You know, I'll bet that's what..." You know? But you wonder what's the pur... and what you would become hung up with is "Why?" Why the emphasis they're putting on this, see? How come they seem to be so happy about this? Or they seem to be so relieved about this? Well, that isn't what they're cogniting on. They're cognizing on the fact that stomachaches could be caused by something. That there is cause. Big idea. Big brand-new idea. See? And they'll be pleased as punch. They haven't really grappled with the idea itself, you see. But it's just suddenly they're very relieved about something.

Then this goes hand in glove with it: "Natively, I'm just not a stupid man. There's something that causes my stupidity." You see? That go – that thought goes along with it. Then they get other thoughts that "Well, my life doesn't have to be a horrible mess all the time; maybe something in my vicinity is causing this." And they do a terrific resurgence. "Maybe something is causing the condition I'm in, in existence. Maybe it isn't – just isn't – it isn't just reasonable that husbands and wives fight all the time. Maybe something is causing this." Well, of course, it's the wife, naturally, you know? [laughter] And then they'll hit the handiest target, you see?

But – in other words, you now got the guy looking. He's got a new idea, a brand-new idea that things are caused. That's terribly elementary, isn't it? It isn't something you ordinarily would even look at or even respect as a source of aberration and yet it's one of the primary
ones. Your Guiding style auditing gets him to look around in his life and find the causes of things.

Now, having found them, of course, you can do something about them. And as you will get another bulletin on this, it's – just covering here the bulletin of November 6, AD 14. But there's another bulletin, just a little more recent than this, which talks about what styles you use with remedies. It's the beginning of the series of bulletins about how to adapt auditing style to The Book of Remedies. Just neatening up Level II, you see?

And there's Guiding Secondary style, which is the most elementary thing in the world; although you'd use it in session, although you would also use it in assists, it's peculiarly adapted to several remedies, which is simply steer plus itsa. Steer plus itsa. We used to have a number for it. Steer plus itsa, see, and you guide the guy into talking about something till you get a tone arm blowdown and then you make him talk about it, you see, to get the tone arm action out of it. And then while he's talking about it he mentions several new things, don't you see, that give him tone arm action, so you note those things down and you come back afterwards and talk about those things, don't you see?

Well, that's the process that goes with it, but this other is just a pure style all by itself. You get pc to look and then you steer him and his looking, see, and you herd him around and head him off here and head him in there, don't you see? And then you get him to talk about what you have found, see, while holding him on this subject. You don't let him wander. And he itsas on this subject. "Well, it's-a-this and it's-a-that and it's-a-something-or-other"; it makes a marvelous assist. Remedies A and B, of course, are the first two in The Book of Case Remedies, so the auditing style with which they're handled should be quite considerably described. Because they're the most flagrant ones. They have to do with definitions and – definitions in Scientology or the present subject.

You mustn't miss that it's present subject – immediate subject. It's the immediate subject the guy's trying to study. You see, it's not just applicable to Scientology. This guy's trying to study engineering and he hasn't understood a term in engineering. All right, well, you can handle that, see, with Remedy A.

Remedy B is former subject. That's what makes them different. He's got the present, immediate subject mixed up with some former subject. So now you've got to find the former subject and find the word in it which hasn't been defined.

Well anyway, these have nothing to do with Clay Table, you see. They are processes all by themselves, and they are Guiding Secondary style. But the only difference between Guiding Secondary style and Guiding Primary style – or just call it Guiding style – is that Guiding style runs in and does a repetitive. You guide, and you do a repetitive process on it. You guide, and you do a repetitive process on it. And we want that process to be the dominant process for Level II because it teaches the two things the fellow is now doing, you see.

He's finding out that there is some cause. And then he can answer questions about it and look at it. See? So you've still got repetitive action on the cause.

But this is – this is the style that is improving him. See? It's quite important what you find but it's only partially what you find.
He's got this new style. Things cause things. Wow! See? Gee! The world isn't all a solid block with no distance between anything, there's A causing B and there's D reacting to A and golly, this brand-new world out here. There is some reason for things, don't you see? Buildings don't just suddenly disappear in a puff of smoke, don't you know? There'd have to be an explosion. Big cognition, see? And then after the explosion, why, the bricks would be lying around on the ground. And what causes bricks to lie around on the ground? Well, there must have been an explosion to cause it.

And although the person realizes these things instinctively, he never thinks them out or looks at them. Things cause things. And life then is – looks entirely different to him, because he's no longer just a pawn. If things cause things, you might be able to predict. If things caused things, you might be able to do something about something. If things cause something you might be able to do something yourself! Hey, whoa! What do you know! Gee-whiz! You know.

And that's the doors you're opening at that particular level. You're guiding him and he finds causes. And having found causes you can now do something about the thing, too. Wow!

You find out he's been suffering from a present time problem for – same problem all along the line – and now you say, "Well, what communications didn't you ever finish to that person?"

"Oh, so-and-so and so-and-so." The problem's gone. You've asked the question repetitively, "What communication haven't you finished to the person?" "What communication haven't you finished to the person?" "What communication haven't you finished to the person?" "What communication haven't you finished to the person?" Maybe only ten minutes worth, but the tone arm action disappears out of it. "Wow! I don't have any worry about Aunt Martha, you know. Gosh!"

What's unpinning him? He's stuck all over the universe. And by this "causes of things" and that he could locate it and then do something about the cause and straighten out that situation – that's pretty fabulous! And that's basically what he is finding out at Level II. So it's the style that's doing it. See? You're always beating yourself over the head about how clever you have to be. Actually be clever enough to realize that the style is doing it.

Now, by the time he's learned all that, it's perfectly safe to, run him on an Abridged style. At muzzled auditing the pc cognited or did something or other and didn't answer the auditing command. Of course, because we're teaching him what we're teaching him at that level, is that he can receive and answer an auditing command, we must say always, "I will repeat the auditing command," so forth, so forth, so forth. Always at Level II. But not at Level III, because our pc is now capable of doing that. See, why rub it in?

A lot of people get irritated after they've been through the basic of the thing. At first it seems to be all right to them to have this happen, and so forth, but after a while it isn't all right. The auditor's sitting there saying like a wound-up doll – they've said, "Oh, I've just realized, that solves a whole problem of my life."

"I will repeat the auditing command." See?
Well, why is the pc now reacting that way? The pc might not have reacted that way earlier on the line, you see. The pc is now over this hump and you're auditing something that doesn't have to be audited, so you have an Abridged style. And it's – of course, "abridged" is termed to the lower styles. It isn't an Abridged upper style, it's only an Abridged lower style.

So it's the styles for 0: Listen; I: Muzzled; and II: Guiding. And now we can abridge them. And by abridge we mean we can look and see what's going on.

Now, the pc is getting pretty good because he thinks his life is more easy to handle and that sort of thing. You find out his PTPs are blowing quicker and various things are happening with the pc that wouldn't happen ordinarily, and so forth. And you're just slowing down the whole progress of the game by putting in the whole package, do you see?

Now we do a present time problem. The pc has – says he has a present time problem. We don't guide him into it, we say, "What is it?"  
**Bang!**  
See? And he says, "Well, this present time problem, I've got an awful problem. I've got to go to Aunt Martha's tea party. And my God, I almost die every time she feeds me a cup of tea. She boils it for fifteen hours on the back of the stove, you know. You could float a sounding lead in it!"  
"Well, all right," you say. "Fine. Is it blown?"  
If it's blown, you don't do anything else. In other words, this is audit by pure result. Having brought our pc up and gotten him out of his nappies, why, we can now let him walk, see.

He says it's a present time problem, that's what it was, we saw the reaction on the meter and it blew. Oh well, an auditor would be very foolish to pursue this thing. In fact, he'd get the pc all invalidated if he pursued it, don't you see? "Well, that's the end of that present time problem!"

But if it – the pc sort of looked **googed** on it, and so forth, you'd say, "Well, give me some communications that you haven't given to Aunt Martha." Well, he says, "So-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so." You get multiple answers and things of this character. That's where that belongs. "Well, I didn't do that and didn't do that," and you find a pc eventually gets indoctrinated into a multiple answer, you ask him one question and he gives you the five answers necessary to flatten it and that's the end of the process. Along about the fifth question you get a blowdown on your tone arm, and that's it.

Well, by golly, auditing can happen at an awful rate of speed. And you watch some pc who is – who is well indoctrinated as a pc, who's, you know, had enough gains now – it isn't that they've trained, it's that they've had enough gains so they're more self-determined, they're more present, they're more there. And they can as-is things now; they don't just dodge, you know? And you ask this pc – you'll see some auditor do this sometime in some session and I'm sure somebody at Level I would say, "That's awfully sloppy auditing."

"Do you have a present time problem?"

The pc said, "Yeah. Yeah, I was afraid I was going to be late for the session. I realize I haven't, and so forth."

And the auditor says, "All right. Thank you. Now, what we're going to do this session..."
And the lower-scale person will say, "What – what went on? You know, that auditor didn't handle that pc's present time problem."

Oh, yes that auditor did. That auditor's good enough now to notice that meter moved. If the meter didn't move, why, he would ask him another question. In other words, you audit against a finite result, and that's abridged auditing. You just audit against what you want to have happen. You audit enough to make that happen. You don't audit another step beyond it.

You make sure you've got the tone arm action out of a question; you do not then run it for twenty minutes to find out if the tone arm action is out.

In other words, you're good enough at this particular time to know when the tone arm action is out of something, during the last ten minutes of the run or the last five minutes of the run, don't you see?

Well, that tone arm is starting to climb and that tone arm is not now blowing down. You must be into some other zone of action and the pc has been going on and you've been going on with your process, don't you see, and you see that this tone arm action is out and it's gone. You're going to give this thing a twenty-minute thing and stick that tone arm up good? No, you're not. In other words, you don't now give it a twenty-minute test or something like that, as you would, you see, at Guiding style. Guiding style: grind it through, man, don't take any chances, see.

Well, at this level, you see, well, it blew! Pc says, "I have a PT problem. Well, it blew." All right, you know you're not going to get anything out of that and besides you don't want to audit Aunt Martha anyway. So you just sail on through, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, see. You're just auditing against the finite result. You want that result. You want that cognition. You want that ability regained.

Now of course, what's the pc learning? Wow! He's learning that he gets a finite result. When he gets audited something happens. And he doesn't get beaten to pieces because something happened, he just – when he gets audited something happens. Bow-bow, you see? He's taught against the finite result.

The auditor also at this point realizes you can obtain a finite result from auditing. Hence abridged. Everything is out except the absolute essential action. The whole works is out. So the pc's audited – being audited now against direct result. He doesn't say another word beyond what is necessary to obtain that result and he is upscale far enough now to know when he's gotten the result. The pc's comm lags are all the same now, the thing is regained, the ability is regained, the pc's had a big cognition. Tone arm action seems to have damped on this particular thing. Well, out man! Don't fool around.

Now, we've got Direct style auditing. We want – we've got Direct style auditing. Now, if you'll notice, an Abridged style is not necessarily direct. It's simply got things missing out of it. And some of the things I've said about the auditing against the finite result apply to Direct Auditing style more than they do Abridged. That is to say, you've got the exact result. Direct means straight, concentrated, intense, applied in a direct manner. We do not mean the sense of direct somebody or to guide, we mean it is direct – boom! Do you understand?
Now we're getting somebody up that – suddenly the pc realizes that he can be given one God-awful assignment, he's supposed to just carry it out, and that's it. Big look, see?

All right. Well, let's apply this to Clay Table Clearing: "Give me something that you want to improve." We're not going to have a pc saying – giving a goal or something like that, because if he's been brought up properly, why, he of course won't tell us "to be Clear." No, he'll give you a subject he wanted to improve. "To be Clear," you see, doesn't answer the auditing question at all. It's a goal. And it isn't even a GPM. So then you try to audit that, of course you've already flunked. But you say to this fellow, "All right, give me a – give me a subject you want to improve."

And he says, "Ah, golf."

"All right. Tell me something there that you – some term, things like that, in golf, you never understood."

"Fore."

"All right. Good. Represent it in clay ... You didn't label that."

"I know, that's a golfer."

"You didn't label it."

"What do you mean, I didn't label it? I got a sign on it, 'golfer.'" "Yeah, I know. You've got some pants on. Oh, you're on a course. The club, club, club. Label it, if that's what it is. Go ahead. All right. Well, I'm glad you realize the fellow's in a shooting jacket. Fine. Good. All right. Is that it?"

The pc's, you know, looking at it.

"Well, go on. All right. Give me another term you didn't understand about that."

"Greens."

"All right, represent 'greens' in clay."

Now, from the pc is coming a total shower of action. The pc's action is all direct back, direct, direct, direct, direct, straight to the auditor, straight to the auditor. He doesn't expect anything. He doesn't even expect any encouragement. See, he's just work, work, work, work, work, work, bzzzm. You see? And to somebody outside it looks like the auditor isn't doing any work, and it looks like nobody's doing any work, looks like the pc is running the whole session. It looks like the pc's in total control of the whole session. Of course, the pc would be in total control of the whole session right up to the moment when he failed to label that club! [laughter] You understand?

And then, in R6, of course, we combine all these styles. The person does them one and another, and the other one. The pc, by that time, can stand up to it. So it's bringing a pc up right. It isn't just training the auditor.

You understand auditing styles a little better?

All right. Thank you.
COMMUNICATION:
A GRADIENT ON DUPLICATION

A lecture given on 15 December 1964

Aw, you just set out to please me, that's all. [laughter] And just for fun, I am pleased. What – what's the date?

Audience: December 15th.

December the 15th, AD 14, AD 14 is fading away.

Today I had nothing to talk to you about at all. I just wanted to come out and see you. It's a fact. It's a fact. Been a lot of things happen, but I forgot my notes and bulletins and, laid out Level 0, laid out Level 0. We've now got Level 0 laid out and Level I laid out and we know the substances and the materials exist for II, III, IV and VI. They also exist for V but we're not teaching them.

I should probably introduce a little piece of news here. HAS has become an Academy course with a very strict curriculum as per HCOB, I think, 8 December. Now, that is good news because it gives a sliding scale of courses. But it also shoves the PE Course back down below 0 which is all right because it is usually taught at that temperature anyway. [laughter] But it leaves the old PE just the same sort of mess-around PE it always was, and it probably needs some improvement and I've got a new design for the thing such as a written book that I've already talked to you about and so forth, and I will still go ahead and put that out.

One of the main reasons why the HAS became an Academy course was demand from minutes of national committees that were appointed to decide on pricing, all of which have now met and pricing is all finalized and no shocking new figures emerged.

A lot of things happened that would be of considerable interest to the franchise auditors. The main advance along this course line was brought about by the fact that in the US and some other places, they've apparently had a considerable amount of success in having a low-price Academy course which was the HQS, don't you see, and then bringing people on up into the upper course from there. Well now, the HQS is really just the old-time HPA. What actually happened – you can't teach an old-time HPA, you see, dirt cheap and still have it a quality course because you've got to have some Instructors and you've got to have some people paying attention to this thing. So it can't be just thrown away, otherwise you're going to ruin every auditor you've got, you see. So HQS, being the old-time Academy course of HCA/HPA, now when we move these on up the line, you'll remember that in an HPA/HCA you had yourself an awful time with Axioms and things of that character. All those odd bits and pieces that
everybody forgot until the last moment and gave you as extra reading and all those catastrophic occurrences and so forth, well, I just took up the whole kit and caboodle of those and shoved them into HAS so they're studied all by themselves. Do you see? So, HQS is a little bit of auditing, listen-style, with certain definite and finite results and it's all this odd bit theory work and so forth. It actually, done all by itself without the pressure of other things, is a fairly easy hill to climb; but what you found it a hard hill to climb is you had to sandwich it in amongst everything else.

Most Scientologists, when you get right down to it, have trouble with just that little section and area – just Axioms, and definitions and vocabulary and little things like that – and they miss something back there somewhere, so I'm just making it easier to grasp at that level.

But they wanted a course that somebody could buy a book and then they'd come in, you see, and have a course that didn't kill them that they could sell for a lower amount of money and so on, so the HAS course was all that was left to give them. And so there it was and that isn't terribly dear to teach and if it's taught pretty well, why, people come along very well; but that still puts PE still there and puts it below there and although I don't think Central Orgs will really go on teaching a lot of PE, PE is then relegated to a field, franchise-type course. And I'm still going ahead and write the book for it and that sort of thing, if I get around to it. We seem to be going downhill, not uphill, you see; but that's because things are so well trimmed up on the upper realm of this activity.

When you went all the way to the top, you see, why, then it was very easy to see what lay between it and the bottom. Now, the funny – the very funny thing, you stand down in the valley and you can't see the mountains for the trees and there's barns in the road and everything, and you don't get a very good view and you might think you're in the middle of a desert and you're not, don't you see. You might think you're in the middle of Maine and you're in Wisconsin, you know. But you get up to the top of the hill, why, you can take a look back across the countryside and see where all the little ripples and barns and trees and everything else are and that's essentially what has happened here.

And it's pretty easy to say where an auditor has to go and what his road has to be in order to make it through to the top, and I've just been dropping things like mad that are nonessential to that particular progress. But at the same time there's a danger in dropping too much and you get too much dropped out of the lineup and you leave some gap that somebody will fall into, so it's – hence the Gradation program is fixed up so that won't happen.

Now, some of you are going out of here and you're going to say to yourself, "Well now, I'm going to just do myself up royally and what I'm going to do is I'm going to get a lot of people and going to run them on R6 and I'm going to get them right up there, see, and boy, they're really going to sail." And you're going to get one of these people by the scruff of the neck, you know, raw meat, and you're going to sit them down in the chair and you're going to say, "All right now, let's start on the first end word and that's absence and – and..." which it is. And you're going to look at the meter and it's just going to sit there. And you'll chant this end word – I'll have a pity on your colds and sneezes and I won't chant it at you – but you'll chant it at this pc, see, and you'll say, "Blank, blank, and wha, wha, wha," and your meter just sits
there and so forth and you're going to say, "What are you thinking about – what are you thinking about?" in desperation, you know.

And the pc is going to say, "Well, I wasn't, you know. I seldom do." And then you're going to find out that he has a perfectly open mind about it [laughter] and perfectly willing to sit there while you work.

After you have done this a few times, why, you will say, "What did Ron say about a gradient for pcs?" And then you'll get sensible and you'll start them right in at the bottom and roll them on up toward the top because there's a certain number of things which a humanoid is going to have to be able to do to make it. And there are certain things which humanoids can't do very well, and until you get them so that they can make an orderly forward progress over these particular barriers and bumps, why, you're not going to be able to do anything with R6.

Now, you see you yourself as you get up toward the top of the barrel, and you've been through lots of processing and so on, you forget how much auditing you've had, and you tend to discount it, you know, and so forth, and you make an immediate comparison between yourself and this guy who is walking down the street bumping into the trees and fire hydrants, you know. And you say, "Well, I – all I have to do is take him from where I am, see, on up," only he's not where you are, you see, and that is the basic error.

So we want to get him up the line. You can rather rapidly. We're not talking about hundreds of thousands of hours, but it'll vary from case to case of course, because the various cases are in worse shape than others and this variability will pronounce itself and stick its neck out at the least expected intervals. For instance, you're going to find out as you are processing along, you're going to find this dear, nice old lady and you – snap, see, nothing to it, and you run your communication processes and mmmmm – runs fair, gets a little tone arm action, and you jump her up along the line, you get her into duplication, well, it's fair but it's not too good, and then you get her into PTPs which is situated there at Level II and you find out she doesn't have any present time problems and got everything all solved, and you'll be starting to get a little bit desperate about this time – you suddenly realize this case has gone no place. And then you suddenly find you had the continuing overt case. You've got the one that almost has to be manhandled, you know. She's got it all solved because all she does is cut somebody's throat anytime she has a present time problem or something like this, you see.

You could still be prepared, don't you see, to be tripped up on your forward progress because of course, the unsolvable case, unless you can get them aside and corral their mad impulses to commit overts or something of the sort, is this person who is just going to be solidly dramatizing some overt. You probably never looked at it this way but you realize that most solutions to problems of a desperate nature are overts. People solve their desperate problems with overts. And if you've got somebody who has a lot of problems, you have somebody who is committing a lot of overts. That's why that pair belongs so intimately together at II. You're not going to find somebody who has no problems at all. You're going to find a gradient that goes from – well, he has problems, perfectly normal, yeah, he's got problems down to his problems are absolutely desperate, oooh, oh my God! Nobody had problems like these, don't you see, down to no problems at all. See? They're going downhill. It's the reverse order to the way the guy goes uphill, too.
And in other words, the fellow who has no problems at all is the one you should be worried about, because this person's got it all solved. He solves it with this great big overt every morning, don't you see? Has a perfectly quiet house now. He hits the baby on the head every morning, you know. And you'll run into the – you'll run into the case – you'll run into the case that doesn't have anything to improve. You wonder if – after a while you get curious as an auditor as to why this person is sitting in the pc's chair. You look at these goals that are set and they all seem to just be nothing and nowhere, nothing important and so on. You'll say to the person, "Well, what – what – what happens? I mean, wh-wh-why – why do you want auditing? Is there anything about you that you're trying to improve or anything like that?"

Even though that's IV, you see, your curiosity will get the best of you. And the person will tell you quite surprisingly – this case is not infrequent, these cases, I give you some – just a vague idea, maybe one in thirty or something like that, "No, I – as a matter of fact, I'm perfect." Well, why is he being audited? If he's perfect, well, how come? You see?

Well, of course he has never confronted any frailty. You have to handle that case very delicately because if that case – that case is on this borderline: If at any moment that case found he was doing something wrong, that would give him the last little push of personal degradation necessary to tip him right over the cliff. See? If this person is down to such a point on service face and all the rest of it – down to such a point that if this person admitted that there was one tiny error that he committed in his life, it would finish him. And when you see these psychiatrists ranting and raving around trying to get somebody to admit that they're guilty or something like that, you realize that they're dealing almost exclusively with the insane case, who can't admit, whose insanity is an affirmation of an error. In other words, they're confirming this error all the time.

You ever see a little kid do this, see? He's just busted a glass, you know, or he's busted a little piece of glass or something like this, and you say, "Johnny, you shouldn't bust that glass." And he busts another piece of glass, you know, and then he just goes on busting more and more glass and you just seem to have nothing but strewn glass all over the place and so forth. He's trying to assert that it's right to break glass, don't you see? He feels to himself that if he admitted it was wrong to break glass, and if he himself realized that he was doing something wrong he would be finished. That would be the final degradation and there he would be on his way south with no parachute, you see. And therefore, a murderer, a repetitive murderer or something like this – I was listening to a copper yesterday on the subject of murder and it was quite entertaining how they've got it figured out. Murder is a familial crime, and therefore is really not a crime and it doesn't belong with the rest of crime and is its own particular thing which is entirely different and that's why they're passing a law against hanging people for murder in England. Well, go ahead, you try to follow it through.

Well, of course, if you're following it through, you're making the same mistake that everybody else makes when he tries to follow a pattern of aberrated logic; you can't turn that many corners too quick – because it isn't that quick because it isn't logical. That's simple. And of course it's a noncomprehensible piece of balderdash into which somebody has argued himself and so forth. In other words, we have a guardian of the law arguing that murder is somehow not much of a crime and is right. But this boy, himself, was not arguing from his viewpoint, he was arguing from the Parliamentarian viewpoint. He said this is what they think.
And of course, he receives his reports all the time explaining what they think and so forth and so he's probably quite authoritative on the line. I thought that was very interesting – that murder is not a crime. It's usually a familial affair, and I don't know where they got their statistics. There are a lot of murder statistics they don't have, such as the fact that only 3 percent of the murders committed are ever proven guilty – anyone ever proven guilty is something like 3 percent. And I have even seen a figure ventured of what percentage of murders were detected. Now, that's just about the most adventurous figure to release I have ever heard of. Imagine somebody releasing such a figure. What percentage of murders were detected!

Now, you get a society figuring that way, you get an individual figuring that way, see. And he's got it all figured out how something or other isn't a crime and yet it is a crime, and he does it and he gets the full recoil from it – all mental mechanisms are operating – and yet at the same time, he's got this thing totally suppressed because it's all right to do this, don't you see? It's all right to do this except it kills him to do it, don't you see. It's all mixed up one way or the other. You're going to be sitting there as an auditor looking at a case that's this snarled up along some particular line and you'll probably say, "Why didn't I take up some other line of activity," after a while of this because it can get very, very confusing. If you didn't have a pattern with which to track this case up along the line to sufficient responsibility to improve or any one of the cases I have mentioned – if you didn't have a series of steps to walk up, why, you'd just never get these cases up and that would be the end of that.

Now, the only trouble you've had as an auditor is actually not walking cases up those steps. When you didn't, when you – when you grabbed the guy on the fourth step when he was on the first step, then the pc was not on the same step you were on and therefore, you and the pc were in disagreement. His state of case and your estimate of the case were in conflict, and therefore to get any gain for that pc became impossible and you began to think that it was all unreal and auditing didn't work or something was weird was going on. Yes, the type of auditing you were doing, the type of approach you had to that case, yes, absolutely correct, wouldn't work.

It would work on the case later, after the case had been pulled up to step three, but at the time that you were doing it on the case, then it's perfectly true to say that auditing wouldn't work on that case if auditing means exactly what you were doing with the case. If the case isn't advancing, auditing isn't working. So the problem of how to make auditing work is the discovery of an orderly, generalized step that can be taken with any case that will bring them up to the next step where a generalized step can be taken with the case, don't you see. Look at the – look at the brain strain this saves you. After all, you don't want to strain your brains too much, because they ought to be – ought to be preserved carefully. A psychologist and so forth has got to have something to work with. And the strain which you would get into in this case is very horrible. Just "What do I do now?" you say, you know, "What – what do I do now?" You see, very desperate. Case isn't advancing and that sort of thing.

Well, what I've tried to do is give you a series of generalized steps that if you can get this case over this hurdle at this particular time – if you can get the case over the hurdle, why, then you can now approach the case with this next activity which will get the case over that hurdle and now you've got the case there, and now you can get him over the next one without in actual fact costing you too much particularization.
Now, there's one exception to this – the *Book of Case Remedies* is the totality of one step in actual fact, the second level, which is devoted to overts and present time problems and at that level the individual, being in better communication with the auditor, being in better communication with life, then is able to face up to some of these actions and you can take these actions and solve little things like hidden standards and so forth.

But the trick is how do you get him up to being run on the *Book of Remedies*? I know there's some of those remedies apply all the way south, but in general how do you get him up to being worked on the *Book of Remedies*. Well, that's a totality of a level you might say. Well, fortunately there are things which a thetan can do which are above his bank. In other words, a thetan is always really senior to his bank. He always is.

There are certain things on which a thetan would become aberrated whether he had a bank or not. The presence of the bank makes it difficult if not impossible for him to recover in the absence of auditing. And if he didn't have a bank he would come out of it eventually. Do you – do you understand? If he didn't have any bank at all, he wouldn't then go into a permanent spin on this particular subject but would come out of it later. In other words, he'd walk in and out of aberrated conditions. He wouldn't just become more and more and more and more aberrated. He wouldn't be in a dwindling spiral because the bank is designed to give the person a dwindling spiral.

Now, the design of the bank is what makes the dwindling spiral, but of course a thetan has to be capable of supporting a bank and giving himself a dwindling spiral, too, don't you see? But at the same time he's gotten this worked in so much that you can say it's a designed dwindling spiral from which he cannot recover. And that was beyond his basic planning. But there are certain things – there are certain things which a thetan would become aberrated about whether they are in the bank or not.

Let's take a thetan who isn't aberrated and let's examine now what would happen to this individual, what would happen to him if he didn't have a designed reactive mind. Of course the reactive mind is a total design. Now, what would happen to him? What would he become aberrated on? Well, he could determine to become totally aberrated and go into a dwindling spiral and spin in. He could determine to do this and he probably could make this stick with a great deal of ramification and so forth, mostly because he has done so in the past. We know for sure that he has that skill. But when we look at how complex and how calculated it must be – when we look this over and know the amount of trouble that he had to go to in order to get himself into this and also realize that he could not possibly have realized how much trouble he was getting into – otherwise he would not now be trying to get out of it. Follow me?

So, he's also then capable of a miscalculation. He's capable of a miscalculation of how much trouble he can get into. See? I think that's quite fascinating. That's obviously one of his basic talents of getting into more trouble than he can foresee. And we look over several of these points and we can trace out just paralleling what he has done, regardless of the particularities and peculiarities of his peculiar, particular bank – we see then that he is capable of having these things happen, not necessarily done to him. But he's capable of having these things happen to himself. He's also capable of making things happen to himself. He's capable
of setting up time, but he's also capable of setting up masses that suspend in time as the GPM
and that hang timelessly.

When I first figured that out, I figured it out a little bit in reverse. The masses that are
hanging up endlessly in time are the masses that create time. I think that's marvelous. But
anyhow, that's figured out both ways from the middle, you see. Now, therefore a thetan is
capable of a certain amount of aberration. But it's very difficult for him to aberrate himself to
such a degree that he can't recover. And the only way he succeeds in doing this is blocking
out duplication. That's the only way he can totally booby trap himself on a dwindling spiral.

Now, that probably, you think, requires just a little bit of amplification, and yes, it cer-
tainly does because it was a considerable discovery when made. You can't brush it off lightly
with a sentence. But it goes back into our Axioms on as-is-ness. Those Axioms are all senior
to the reactive bank. And it goes back to as-is-ness and of course, that which a thetan cannot
as-is is gonna endure. You get it? If he can't look it over and erase it by inspection, it's going
to last forever. If he's totally unwilling to erase it, it would last forever; and also the only way
he can erase it is by being willing to duplicate it. Do you follow? You have to make a perfect
duplicate in the spot where it is. That's demonstrable. So, he has to be able to duplicate it.

In other words, you'll just get madder and madder and madder at somebody that you're
unwilling to be like. Let's take it at that mild state. You're unwilling to be like this person so
you're just going to be madder and madder and madder at this person, you see, and more and
more stand-offish and this person will eventually disappear; but not because he's gone, but
because you can't see him anymore. You follow that? In other words, erasure or knocking
something out or making something cease to exist depends then on duplication – a willing-
ness to duplicate it.

So a thetan can become unwilling to duplicate something and cause it to endure. And
now we're dealing with native thetan ability. This he can do with malice aforethought, but
apparently it's quite natural for the beast to do this. He's quite happy to do this. He likes to
have things like bricks so all he's got to do to have a brick is say, "I'll never be a brick," –
there's bricks, do you see? He's got modus operandi by which he proceeds, do you see? You
therefore have a universe.

Well, a thetan is nothing and he's unwilling to be something in terms of mass, so there-
fore of course, he then gets an endurance of masses. It's the trick by which he makes mass
endure. But he can be caught in this trick. And the way he caught himself – it took this
amount of action to catch himself – is he made up a bank which told him what he should be
willing to duplicate and what he shouldn't be willing to duplicate. And he made that bank up
in two halves: He made it with the cowboys in the white hats, which he must be willing to
duplicate; and the cowboys with the black hats that he must [not] be willing to duplicate. And
therefore, you would find all the cowboys in the white hats duplicatable and thus disappear-
ing, and all the cowboys in the black hats becoming more and more real and solid. And I
frankly don't think a thetan ever figured this out at the beginning, because he's for sure going
to go on a dwindling spiral, and it depends on this one factor of duplication.

Now, the gradient scale that leads to duplication is communication. Communication is
a gradient scale toward duplication. I know you think it might work the other way to and sure
it does, but you might not be willing to duplicate – well, let's say a bum on skid row, but you would say, "Here, my man, here's a quarter," or something like that, you see. You'd communicate to that degree.

In the process of communication you might also get over, without obsessively duplicating him, the obsession not to duplicate him. And so then feel perfectly comfortable about talking to a bum on skid row. Do you understand? You can talk to a bum on skid row without being afraid of becoming a bum on skid row. Well, that's done by communication. Not only do you knock out the nonduplication, see, by mere communication you not only knock out this ferocity of "don't ever be that," see, but also knock out the "don't ever be that," see. Both sides of that thing can get knocked out and you suddenly find yourself able to talk to bums on skid row without feeling like a bum. You follow this?

So, obviously then the thing in the bank which is the rough, rough, rough point is duplication, willingness to – unwillingness to. That's the rough point of the bank. And the gradient scale to that is communication because that's cause-distance-effect with duplication and intention. Now, because it's a broader formula, you can take part of that formula called communication and oddly enough by practicing it, knock the duplication factor back into some kind of shape. You might not knock it into a totality so the bum on skid row disappears simply because you're making a perfect duplicate where he is, because that's not part of the intention. Do you see? But you'll knock it out to a point of where whenever you even vaguely come near a bum on skid row you don't have to say to yourself, "Oh, I must never become a bum on skid row, I must never become a bum – ooooh, I'm never, never, never…" See? By the process of communication with this bum, that "I must never," you see, gets knocked out and one no longer is upset about becoming him or not becoming him, do you see? And so therefore, he can talk to bums on skid row. That's it, blah.

Now, the fellow says, "I'm never going to be in an automobile accident," I'm telling you now why your assist works. We're right at that level of action, but it actually is a much more subtly pervasive process than we ever imagined. It goes all the way – such a thing as a Touch Assist or communication with the object and so forth, that's terrific stuff – very powerful and that doesn't always work because the guy doesn't always get flattened on it, you know. It might be a lot longer than you would ordinarily think in starting a process. You say, "Well, I'm going to audit him for fifteen minutes and his gout ought to disappear," you see. Well, if you said, "I'm going to audit him for a hundred and fifty hours and his gout would disappear," you might have made it, you see. And just how much does it take?

All right, we – let's get this person and he says, "Ooooh! Horrible – blood all over the place," you know. "Don't want to be anywhere near an automobile accident." Next thing you know, he's driving down the road and the steering wheel just apparently all by itself turns around and runs him into a tree. Well, what has to happen in order for that to happen? He's gotten to a point where he can't duplicate a car, so therefore he can't communicate to a car, so obviously he can't control a car. So, we get, that which you resist you become. We could rephrase that. That's perfectly true as it is, but we could also make a more fundamental observation of. that which we're unwilling to duplicate will persist and eventually overwhelm.
And the road out is not to go around obsessively duplicating it as the young – young actor does. He says, "I've got to live all parts of life in order to be a good boy in life. I've got to be a good actor, I've got to live all parts..." You've seen artists go this route. "I've got to make a bum out of myself, let's see, I've got it on my schedule here. I've got to become a pervert, a dope addict and so forth..." In other words, "I've got to live!" exclamation point, you see. "I've got to experience!" Well, I've already gone this whole study, I've looked this whole study over, gone right down the line on studying it very carefully and I find out that the single action of experience is nontherapeutic. That's a fascinating thing. Experiencing something is not therapeutic.

There is something, however, which is and that's communicating with it. Guy's worried about becoming an alcoholic, he doesn't have to drink and experience alcoholism to get himself out of it. No, he'll more likely go the route and he'll wind up down there with Alcoholics Anonymous, you know, embezzling their treasury or something. No, the thing to do – the thing to do if he's got this and so forth, well, he actually could communicate in some fashion and with something with relationship to this subject and all of a sudden that duplication factor would click out. See, the refusal to duplicate would click out by the process of communicating. So, that opens the door to a lot of think, you see.

You can figure a case out here very nicely. You want to get a case over some kind of an obsession or something like that, well set this alcoholic down. Give him a bottle. Give him a glass. Now, what he mustn't do is experience it, see. That's what – that's the only thing you as an auditor have got to make sure he doesn't do. It's nontherapeutic. But communication, yes, he's got to communicate with it, and you just run Reach and Withdraw from the bottle, from the glass. Get photographs of alcoholics on skid row or something of the sort and have him reach and withdraw from the photographs. Anything you want to do, any way you could figure it out and the guy all of a sudden would not be able to become an alcoholic if he worked at it.

That's what I mean by it's very hard to hold a psychosis or neurosis in place. Well, that makes sense if you realize that the simple communication will unbalance it and knock it out. But what does it knock out? It knocks out the ferocity that one isn't going to duplicate. The "Oh, my God, I would never be a psychiatrist. No! Never, never, never be a psychiatrist. They're a bunch of dogs, bums." See? Watch it! There he is down there at the registrar's office at the local university signing himself up. "Well, I guess I'd better take this course. Next twelve years, I'll be studying away – I don't like it – don't seem to have any aptitude for it, but I gotta be it." Do you see what's happening.

It's very interesting. There's a very, very, very notable personality in the world today, a very notable, newly ushered upon the stage of politics and nations who has a 48-hour comm lag on won't – got to.* Knowing that, you could destroy that man just like snapping your fingers. He's a near nut. He's only got a 48-hour comm lag between saying, "I will not under any circumstances..." to doing it. And he's got a tremendous number of these "I will not under any circumstances..." And if you very carefully examine the record, you'll find out that the comm

* Editor's note: LRH probably means Harold Wilson who was leader of the British Labour Party, won the elections in 1964 and became Prime Minister.
lag is about averaging 48 hours. Sometimes it's more, sometimes it's less. I think that's fascinating. It's the wildest thing you ever saw – 48-hour comm lag! Of course, forgive him, he knows not what he does and he's just a humanoid. But I don't think he should be that pig-brained. He never notices this about himself "I will not under any circumstances increase the bank rate." "Increase the bank rate!" "I won't have anything to do with the multilateral force." "US – we're with you."

Why can you detect it on this man? If you followed it very closely and you knew these mechanisms, how could you detect it? Well, he just happens to be in the public presence. He just happens to be a humanoid and he's so much in the public presence and he happens at the moment to be in a lot of trouble that it would take a superman to figure out. You'd have to be at least Level 0 to figure him out. [laughter] He's spectacular, you see, merely because the spotlight's on him. How many people are like this? See, he's not single and solitary and alone.

So you have to watch this very carefully and wherever you see these, "I will not" and "They shall not" and you see that bird up in that pulpit, you know, and boy, he's talking about *hellfire and damnation*. He's talking about *sin* and he talking about, *whoooooo*. Watch him, brother, watch him. Don't be caught alone in that vestry, you girls. [laughter] Or you boys. [laughter] He's agin it and he's saying at that moment, "I refuse to duplicate it." He's immediately forecasting this: That he's not going to observe it or its consequences in a very short space of time. It's going to sort of cease to exist. It's "Where was it? Why was I so angry about it yesterday? I'm it!" Don't you see? It's horrible to behold.

I didn't mean to enter English politics that violently, but I don't think that I have entered it any more briefly than he has. [laughter, laughs] I usually abstain from politics, and he should have. But there's what you tune your observation up to. I've shown it to you out in the public sphere. You can watch this. It would be a good stunt to go back and look in the papers of just the last few weeks and find the "I will nots," followed by the more or less, 48-hour lag. Fascinating! Well, you look at your pcs.

Now, a registrar is probably used to this mechanism, probably has never figured it out – the guy who comes in and says, "I will never under any circumstances ever be processed by this organization because you've got nothing but bums, tramps and boobs for auditors and you people are terrible and you're awful," and so forth, and then the following week have him come in and sign up. And I'm sure that registrars have noticed that, but it happened every now and then. All you had to do is make the guy a little more vehement and it would happen the next day, not next week! Do you follow this? Which he is – of course, by doing such a thing would make a bit of a mess for a staff auditor. It isn't really very orthodox selling.

But here's – here's the point: It's this duplication factor that is the bug in the case and the reactive bank says that 50 percent of existence must be shunned. There's some communication mentioned in it but it's mostly just, "not have nothing whatsoever to do with it nohow." And the other 50 percent is "love it," "gotta be it," "cherish it," so, of course, the universe will eventually become the 50 percent you mustn't have anything to do with and then would become quite unreal and would be all around you. And that practically is the only secret there is of life.
If you feel you have to experience something in order to prove that you can duplicate it, of course, you're really not going on any gradient that anybody can attack and you simply collapse terminals with it – bang! Don't you see? "Well, all right, I've often said, 'I was never going to be operated on,' but they say the operation is necessary – all right, cut my guts out." See! See, that's sort of communicating without communicating, you know. That's not communicating – so how are you going to hold anything off if you can't communicate with it? And the things which bother you in your bank as you wake up in the dark and miserable hours with the wind howling outside, is something you mustn't be or have anything to do with. And of course, if it's something you mustn't be and have anything to do with, of course, what is there up there that keeps it from falling in on you? What's going to hold it out there? There isn't anything there to hold it. It's like trying to hold a small boat away from the side of a ship with no boathook. You say, "Well, I must never use a boathook and I must never touch a rope." Why is it that every wave that comes along smashes the cutter against the side of the ship? "I must never use a boathook. I must never use a rope." Smash! "Ohhhh, I don't know how to get out of this problem. Mustn't ever use a life preserver either because I would be communicating with that ship. Well, how do I solve it then?" Well, of course, there is no way to solve it then because you have already said that the two or three available solutions mustn't be employed. It's like saying to somebody, "It's perfectly all right for you to work with mathematics so long as you never use arithmetic or formulas." He might work with mathematics without arithmetic, but you certainly couldn't work with it without formulas. Well, let's throw away arithmetic and formulas and then set ourselves the problem of working now with mathematics. Well, it can't be done.

Let's say, "Well, I've got to gain weight, but I mustn't have anything to do with any food or use any other means of adding mass to the body. Why don't I gain weight?" You see, it's as silly as this. It has to be that kind of idiocy and that is the basic idiocy of a thetan. He's laid out a bank 50 percent of which says he mustn't duplicate it. The other 50 percent, that's fine to duplicate it if he can get there. Yes, but if he can duplicate the 50 percent of it, it's not very aberrative is it. And furthermore it will tend to weaken as time goes on and be less and less forbidding. Ah, then that remains the only part of the bank which is really tough even though the good cowboys in the white hats are all there, too – cowboys in the white hats are missing their hats and pistols and chaps and left feet, you know, by this time. No those – those cowboys in the black hats are getting bigger and bigger and bigger and tougher and tougher and there's nothing to hold them off with – nonduplication.

Communication – communication, therefore, is the key which unlocks duplication. Duplication itself as a practice is a very steep gradient as you've found it from time to time, that also has some workability. You practically can't do any duplication on somebody without having something happen to his case. He doesn't even respond or cognite or anything else but maybe – but something happens. Now duplication could also have a scale. It's almost impossible to divorce duplication, unless we say experience, from communication. You could be inside of something experiencing it without communicating with it, pulling in all different – trying not to communicate with it while experiencing it, you get the idea. But you could just have a pc lay down a piece of chalk as a duplicative action, and eventually he'd get the idea he was doing that. The funny part of it is it's liable to be totally over his head the whole way. But
still something happened to him by reason of doing that, do you understand? Might be not detectable – be detectable by him nor immediately detectable by you, but something would happen.

You... there are gradients then in the field of duplication itself I don't want to tell you there are not, because there are gradients. There's duplicating something a little and duplicating something a lot, you know. There's making drawings on a piece of paper to represent something. If you want to make a little kid come up the line, use drawing – not hobby therapy now, don't everybody misinterpret this – it's not what they do, it's what accidentally happens sometime in hobby therapy that makes it suddenly get a gain and they look at these isolated unexplained gains and then they haven't bothered to find out what in hobby therapy – drawing or weaving or basket making or something like that or modeling – what in that, you see, gives us a resurgence. Nobody ever bothered to investigate it. They just said, "Well, you – we've got it all explained, it keeps the guy out of mischief," something like that, some brushoff. But there was something there. Those hobby therapies which work are those hobby therapies which serve as duplication exercises, only they must be pretty remote.

If we took a little boy who was having a hard time in school and simply had him draw for us and explain what he was drawing – don't even – you understand – don't even tell him what to draw, see. Say, "Draw something and tell me what it is." This is the game, you see? "Draw something, tell me what it is. Draw something, tell me what it is." Let him draw something else. He starts to come right on up scale. He'll eventually bother you to death. Every evening, why, he comes in and he wants to draw you something to tell you what it is. Well, that is an effort, see, to remotely duplicate something and all you have to do is encourage this effort. I don't care how sloppily you do it or not.

Now, of course, you could directionalize what he was supposed to draw. You see that – we're getting steeper, see, that's steeper up, a little – little bit higher. "Now, let's see. Draw what you don't like about school." Got the idea? Ah, it's good and steep. But the funny part of it is he would eventually come up to being able to do that, see. "Now, let's make a school in three dimensions," see, duplication as such, see. Well, of course, the end product is, "All right, take a glance at school. As-is it. Thank you very much." Wouldn't be appreciated by the state, but it would be by the politicians who make their votes through contractors. The point here is that you could follow along a line of duplication. It wouldn't necessarily be fruitful because it would be too difficult here and there to assess where the gradients were; but it would not be – it's not a barred route, you see. It's a perfectly acceptable route. It's just that to take somebody all the way along this particular line, he's liable to fall over these too-steep-a gradient here or there and interrupt his forward progress – bang! You know, and then he doesn't want anything to do with that and he doesn't want anything to do with you and he doesn't want anything to do with drawing, don't you see, because he'll come off of it awfully quick because it's already steep. In other words, he could have a failure on it that would throw him all the way back.

Now, you could, however, approach the whole thing the whole way on the single factor of communication that wouldn't be a steep gradient. In fact, it would be so unsteep that occasionally you'd wonder if he was getting anyplace, but he would be getting someplace. Now, communication as a word is in the reactive bank, to make my earlier point. It's part of
the reactive bank, but that is not what makes it therapeutic or not therapeutic. That it also is part of the reactive bank has no bearing on it because in the reactive bank it has equal value with a tremendous number of other things.

But in actual fact, a native thetan has this as one of the top points of his makeup. See, it doesn't matter that a lot of the things which you have in Scientology are in the bank. They are also in the bank and with what glee your pc will suddenly discover some end word like "communication" or "music" or something, see. He'll say, "Oh, wow, is that why?" and so forth, and clear up on the situation and everything will be fine, you see, and they'll feel much better – or "understanding," you see. "Gawd, that's obviously..." All these various – these things are in the bank, but they also come under the heading of something that would get wrong with a thetan whether he had a bank or not. They could get right with him; they could get wrong with him. Do you understand? So, if you took his whole bank away he could still get into a mess, but the difference is unless he had created a brand-new bank and had weighted it in some peculiar way and had gone around and then forgotten what he was doing some other way and then pretended he was somebody else, you see, messed himself up. He just had to work on it for weeks, months, years, not unconsciously, you know, but knowingly. "Now, let's see, I am going to wreck myself. Now, let's see, how do I go about this?" No, if he wasn't that interested, having now experienced being wrecked, I don't think he'd be that enthusiastic.

Now, as he comes along this line then, he's going to – in the process of livingness, he's going to hit some slump spots, see? He's going to hit some dips. And those will be centered around communication and duplication, making things, unmaking things, you see, persistence, any value that time might be, you see, any value there is to experience on a track. See. He'll do all these things anyhow. He'll make up pictures of things and unmake them and so on. And he'll go in and out and upside down and around and coast along in life in other words. But he's going to have a certain aberratable pattern that isn't particularized or planned anyway. He'll be able to go out here one day and he's looking at something and he says, "Oh," he says, "what a beautiful – what a beautiful red flower that is down on that planet there. Isn't that a beautiful red flower." And he looks a little bit closer and it's a burning school and all the kids are burning alive in it. "Oh," he says, "that sort of thing shouldn't go on." Well, of course, he's denied himself and denied his observation, hasn't he? And he says that sort of thing shouldn't have gone on, don't you see. He may make a hobby of it for awhile, going around fireproofing schools or something you know. And everybody – all his friends think he's a little rocky, you know. They think, "Er-what-er dududu, instead of him sitting around here playing yup-yup with us, he's around fireproofing schools. Gone." But he'll get tired of the game and he looks over this span of time he's been fireproofing schools and he goes back and he sights this lock originally and he decides it's not very important and the whole thing as-ises and doesn't stay suspended in time and that's the end of that aberration. And that's all the processing it would have. It would have to be locked into an endless amount of time on the track which would have to be pushed into a tremendous amount of reactive bank, you see, for him to be in a state where he couldn't approach it and as-is it.

Now therefore, you do have however, certain factors with which you are working in a person regardless of what is in restimulation and regardless of what the experiential track of
that person has been. It's been my job to isolate what those were, so then you'd get a uniform case advance. Communication – that is one of your first and foremost leaders. Marvelous! Because it knocks out refusals to duplicate. If you ran it long enough and put down all the pc's thoughts and cognitions, you would find a great many of them add up to refusals to duplicate. In other words, that's what's running off the case. His cognitions consist of, "You know I said – just said I would never be a fireman, now, I wonder why," you know. If you – if he was running and you had a record of everything he thought, these nonduplication decisions would go off along with his communication actions.

Now, how is it that you can take somebody then who can't drive a car and you ask him to touch the fenders and touch the wheel and touch the top of the car and touch the back end of the car, you see, and touch the pedals and touch the motor and touch the switches and touch the knobs and touch the seat and touch the wheel and you go on and work on it. The trouble with you is you don't give it enough seniority as a process so you're liable not to do it long enough, don't you see. Or not liable to do it often enough or liable not to do it in regular session or something of the sort – scant it, you see. And then marvel of marvels, we find this guy really, my, he's quite a rocket jockey, he couldn't drive and now, man, can he drive, you know. If you carried it out to its fullest extent because you would have knocked out his unwillingnesses to have been wrecked or his unwillingnesses to be carried or some such unwillingness would have gotten knocked out in the process of your Reach and Withdraw. See. That's why you take a pc and run him for a little while and on 8-C, something like this. It's – well, obviously that's very steep because you're asking him to communicate with MEST and that is the one thing he will not be. See. He won't be – really doesn't want to be solid, so you're making him communicate with a solid and MEST and he doesn't want anything to do with that; and he doesn't want to duplicate anyhow and the commands are duplicative. So between those two it really catches him in a cross-fire and it makes quite a process and that's why you get such results with it when it's run with some intelligence.

Now, therefore – therefore, communication is the keynote of a case and it's what you monitor a case by and it's what you try to solve first, not only with regard to levels but at the beginning of every session. You've got to realize that just because you've got the guy past Level 0, you haven't gotten rid of his reactive bank. No, it is still sitting there, man. And you haven't gotten rid of his peculiarities as a native thetan and you never will, which is the fact that he can communicate and he can create and he can do these sort of things. He has certain abilities, don't you see? And he also has the ability to say he won't duplicate things.

And so, just because you got him by Level 0 is no reason why this problem ceases. You very often at Level IV will find yourself sitting down at the beginning of session with a pc who is out of communication with you and with the universe and with the room and with the meter and everything else and you just can't get any place. You say, "He was perfectly all right yesterday, now, what the dickens is this all about?" Well, a clever auditor always reestabishes the pc's communication where it ought to be before he does and goes on with something else.

I see a pc sitting there in a sort of an abstracted cross-eyed fashion and I don't go on running yesterday's representation. I want to know why this pc is not in communication. That is my burning question and that is what I set out to solve. And I solve it on the basis of just
finding out what's going on. Now, we can call this, he's got a PTP, you see, he's committed an overt, he's got a withhold from me, he's done this. We know these key points. But notice that these are all points – an overt is a – usually a regretted communication. A PTP is a partial and thereafter refused communication. He communicated a little bit and then he found out he couldn't go on any further; he couldn't get a solution to this thing, don't you see. So much so that if you ask somebody who has a present time problem, "Well, what communications are incomplete with regard to this problem?" and he says, "Brrmp, brrump, brrump" and it won't even register on the meter. Well, it's very magical. See, communication is woof and warp of this PT problem. A withhold is of course just an unwillingness to communicate. Now communicating with an unwillingness to communicate, if half done, creates a problem so you get a missed withhold. You see, you partially communicated with an unwillingness to communicate without carrying it all the way through and of course you found yourself having a little bit of trouble here, which you in this case brought out, but you get the person's withhold and you do these various things, you straighten these cases out. You find out there's something... now let's get a broader look.

They've got a PTP because they were unwilling to duplicate something. So you could run it this way: "Well, who'd you meet since I audited you last you didn't like?" or "What situation occurred that you didn't want anything to do with?" This would be very un– ungradient, but it's with a thud, you see. "Who'd you run into you wouldn't duplicate for nothing." And you're liable to get right back in the teeth from the pc, "My old man, I got a letter from him and errrrrrrrr." Boy, that was fast but also very ungradient because he's quite – being quite misemotional about it so you must have approached it too rapidly to get it to blow easily because he's experiencing something; you want him to communicate with something.

So if you're too clever for your own britches, this sort of thing can happen. You can throw the pc into it with no gradient of communication with it. That's about the only mistake that an auditor can make – throw somebody into his bank. Now, how does he go about that? He just finds a no-duplication decision, and no gradient of communication with that and poweeeee the guy interiorizes into that very point and you occasionally, you – as an auditor you've probably seen this happen. And it may have happened to you. You all of a sudden were saying, "I don't know if we should continue this list. Something tells me that we are off on the wrong steer here..." Bow! There you went. The auditor asked that one more question, "Well, just give me a few more before we end it off," you know or something – something happened there, you see. You found yourself in communication with something which you figured you better not communicate with any further and then there was a bit of an insistence, a persuasion and of course, with modern processes this is all very easy – bluhh, in he went, head over heels into the asphalt, nothing showing but wing-foot on his heels and he isn't flying! That's – that was the end of him and he bail out gradually and you straighten him out gradually and somebody runs overt off against that particular auditor because, of course, that mechanism works out, too. If he got an overt then he had to have it, didn't he, from somebody, so he's got his motivator. It's all very complex, what happens is – but in actual fact is – it was just too steep a duplication when a nonduplication decision existed.

All of that is complicated by the fact that there is a reactive bank and you can throw him, also, into the GPMs and end words of duplication and communication and also they have
their negatives. All of which is very interesting because you could not only – he's not only natively aberrated – aberratable in this way, but there's also a whole, great, big, man-sized bank that's got those very words to booby-trap him in. So that if he ran for a while – any pc that's run on "What would you be willing to communicate with?" has run through some portion of the reactive bank. It hasn't killed him, but there it is. He would inevitably go into some quarter of the reactive bank. All of which I find very interesting because as long as we process this... At first I looked at it with considerable horror. I said, "Oh, no! Oh, my God! We've been running people up against the reactive bank." Yeah, in some instances many – some of the words we've used have had to do with the reactive bank; but on the other side of the picture, a further study on the thing would have delineated which of these words were also capable of becoming aberrated, bank or no bank. And it happens that communication and duplication are there.

Now, therefore, as you look over the scene of auditing a pc, you've got a destimulative factor. You're putting him more thoroughly in communication with his bank without throwing him into it. In other words, he communicates it without experiencing it. Sometime if you run a pc through an end word or into a new series, let's say it was – let's say it was "roofs," in view of the fact that isn't in the bank, and he instantly arched himself on a 45 degree angle and lay out flat and a pattern of shingles appeared on his back, you could assume that he was dramatizing the end word. And you could also assume instantly that there hadn't been enough of a communication gradient there.

In other words, if you skipped the communication, you're going to get the obsessive duplication – Crack! Crack! Don't you see. If you don't sneak up on it with some comm, why, it'll experience and that's when a pc dramatizes in session or dramatizes in life and so forth, immediately after being audited. It isn't necessarily true the auditing threw him into that particular dramatization, because he might have been doing it for a long time; but as a general thing if he ran into a dramatization he ordinarily didn't do, then what happened was: is without a gradient, without – without sneaking up on it with some communication, the auditor simply had picked him up, threw him around in a couple of circles and threw him straight into the bank, thud! And there he was. You see?

Now, you could – you could develop a process that would do this to a pc and it's a very, very good thing to know that a process could exist that would do this to a pc because it puts it in your hands as something that doesn't happen accidentally. For instance, the Egyptian had the right idea with doctors. Any doctor had the right to cure or kill, see, because they were going to run both sides of the bank, you see. It isn't that you should run people in this particular direction, but you should know the process that would. And you've had one process for a very, very long time – "What wouldn't you mind going out of ARC with?" And that – the pc will run that and so forth. Now, the other process, the most direct one – the most direct one is, "What don't you like?" "Good. Duplicate it." Well, that'd be good. That'd work on some pcs. Also, oddly enough, it would work therapeutically on some pcs.

"All right. Now, what have you decided not to be in life? All right, thank you very much. All right, I notice, however, that although you have decided not to be an entomologist you have a couple of hairs that you grow up here as antennae." That would do it, too, you see. Prove to the guy conclusively that he is now duplicating something he said he would never
duplicate. Be another process – you have to be careful of some of these Scientology process – approaches to that because you see that really isn't a Scientology approach – that'd be a psychiatric approach. "You say you never wanted to be a bug, what are you doing with antennae?" You know. I mean that'd...

The Scientology approaches are hard to think of because they might work. See, you might get an as-is, such as – such as this: "All right. Decide not to duplicate anything. Thank you very much. Decide not to duplicate anything. Thank you very much. Decide not to duplicate anything. Thank you very much." It'd spin some people and put some people in their banks and make them dramatize like crazy but at the same time on some others it just might as-is a bunch of decisions not to duplicate and the guy would get well, so that wouldn't be a safe process for psychiatry. [laughter] You get the idea?

Then demanding that the pc experience, or demanding that he decide not to duplicate, such as scolding punishment – all that comes under the same heading you see, "You mustn't do that again," you know, "Don't duplicate it!" – it's synonymous. All of that dramatization would occur. In other words, if you – if you forced a fellow by scolding and so on, to promise he would never under any circumstances something or other, something or other, something or other, why then you are actually running a nonduplication on him, you see. So, the less an auditor evaluates for the pc and so forth, why, that's pretty bad. Funny part of it is an auditor sometimes has to do this. "You just take one more drink while I'm processing you, buster, I'm going to bust your skull. Is that understood?" Well, he isn't being very original because if the pc is sinning by drinking before every session, you know you're not going to get anywhere with the pc and we know the pc must have been a souse anyhow and that he must have been told ten thousand times this, so if you tell him one more time, what does it matter? Do you follow? But it's still heading him in the direction of nonduplication.

Perhaps the problem would get so much in your road that you decide without any further gradient to process that thing which is getting in your road as an auditor, when it's that magnitude and that messed up. Sometimes you win at this and this makes you stupidly brave. The next time you don't win. You get some guy that can't talk to you as an auditor and you force him to run some way-up process – "All right, let's make a list of the bad habits you've got. Now, we're going to get you over these bad habits because they're getting in the road of my auditing you." They'd get in the road, that's for sure.

So the solvent of nonduplication is communication. And therefore, as you're bringing a pc on up the scale you are on very, very safe ground if you improve his ability to communicate with you, with his environment. You could even go on a little shallower gradient. You could say communicate with you, with the auditing room, with his current environment in life, communicate with his bank, communicate with people, their activities. You could figure out an expanding line of communication which would all carry with it a certain unwillingness to duplicate, you see, and wash it out as you went. Therefore, he'd become more relaxed. He'd become less and less nervous and he would of course be easier and easier to audit, wouldn't he? And you'd eventually bring him up to a point of communication where he was frankly doing quite all right and then you could run something toward his bank.
But you understand the reason you couldn't run him all the way through Clear to OT with such processes of merely increasing his communication, even though it is the top solvent that sits above a bank, is because of the complexity of the bank itself. He's sooner or later going to run into some fringe or corner of this bank and you're going to have to pay some attention to that bank. You are going to have to pay some attention to his peculiarities. You're going to have to pay some attention to his physical peculiarities as his -- in healing. You're going to have some -- to pay some attention to clearing him up -- certain buttons that he's got in wild restimulation. Of course, that first goes along the line of a service fac. He's got something there that he just wouldn't get rid of, man, that's too good. The way to make mama guilty is to have these splitting headaches. That'll fix her for rapping him on the head with a thimble when he was two.

Anyway, he's got some of these things that have reversed and so they've got survival values you -- in other words, these are bank considerations. And the bank is taken apart by you knowing what the bank is all about and walking the guy into portions of it that can be assigned.

But your auditing in general is not all addressed to bank. You are not just auditing the pc versus his bank, because there's a wide, wide world out there and that is surrounded by a wide, wide universe and there're an awful lot of other beings in it who are perfectly willing to surround themselves and everybody else. And there are a tremendous number of banks walking around that are in collision. And when you get all this added up, you see that your pc is actually piloting his way through a trap to get out of the trap of his own bank. See, in other words, you've already got him in an environment which is sort of a trap environment, do you see. He can walk out of the session -- after you've given him this session he can just go out and walk out the door and run into his \textit{bête noire} to end all \textit{bêtes noires}, black dog, black beast all over his back, you see.

"Oh, Johnny, I was looking for you. Here's a telegram from your ex-wife. You've been arrested in Wyoming for not paying alimony. They've got a warrant out for you, rather, I think it says..."

This is shoveled off on a guy who is already half-way through a service fac. Well now, if the coincidence is too deadly for words, it'll be a service fac, "How to make women wrong and self right." And this sort of thing will get all confused and messed up because in actuality there's more than one bank that he's up against. He's up against his own bank. That's for sure. And he wouldn't be having trouble with these other banks if he wasn't mixed up with his own bank. That's for sure. But at the same time that he is getting extricated from his own bank, he is also mixed up with all these other banks. Joe, Pete, Bill and the rest of them, and he's mixed up with all these round objects that go around these flaming round objects called suns and planets, and he's tripping across an awful lot of space and stardust, you know. He's still eating, remember. He can get a piece of bad fish that'll throw him for an awful loop. Fish decided that it was a crime to eat all those herrings so it decided to make people sick.

The upshot of the situation, then, is that your piloting of the pc through his bank also involves piloting him through his contacts with all these other banks. So, therefore, you have to make a fast gain on the pc which is still sufficiently gradient for the pc to know that he is
gaining; and this has to be done so that when you've got hold of him and are auditing him, you can make enough gain so that what will hit him immediately afterwards, and so forth, won't make enough of an impression on him to bar out his being audited the next session. Do you follow? Very nice adjudication. Fortunately you don't have to worry – worry too much because it's built into the subject. But all these are the considerations of the subject itself and a gradient and how you bring a pc on forward and so on.

You've got all these things that are possibilities of strewn wreckage. You've got a pc, he's already walking too steep a gradient just breathing. Hey, somebody's asking him to breathe, see, hummm. Sounds pretty grim. And your best processing for the guy might be just to let him rest. "Why don't you go out to a farm in the country someplace and get a room and sit down for a month or two and not communicate with anybody." Well, you say, well, that's a noncommunication. Well, yes, that's right. That's a noncommunication but I haven't really told you that a noncommunication was that aberrative.

I'd say a soldier standing up being shot would be much better off without that communication. And if life – if life looked to this individual like a series of shell splinters flying through the air, and if you said, "Well, why don't you crawl in a foxhole for a while, Joe?" I think – I think he'd be better off for crawling in a foxhole. Do you understand? So that you say, "Well then, there's too much of that. The fellow's now gone the other way and he is now withdrawn from life and he's this and he's that." No! I would not advise him as the medico advises him. "What you want to do now is retire and take a rest because you shouldn't be in active life." No, you're telling him something entirely different. "Why don't you catch your breath for a short time and sort of get unspun with the quietness of the countryside and so forth and then thee and me will have at this thing hammer and tongs and we will clear it up and get you back into the realm of the living." You see, it'd have to be that kind of a plan. But I would never advise the pc to experience life. "Now, what you want to do, Mr. Jones, is make up your mind that there are no spiders on your wall in your office. And just go to work and that's the best that you should do. Just go to work and sit there and do your job and grit your teeth and pretty soon you will get used to it. I think that's the best thing for you to do, Mr. Jones."

Forty-eight hours later, of course, they're issuing him a ticket at the local spinbin, you see, for one padded cell. That was the thing he couldn't duplicate anymore. He couldn't even duplicate the idea of being there.

So, it's all a question of gradients, all a question of communication. It's all a question of how fast can you bring this fellow up. And if you find some guy who's awful slow to bring up, why, don't blame yourself. He's had plenty of time to do himself in and some people have simply done a better job of it than others. [laughter]

Thank you.
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You can take a pc and find the lie he has introduced into his problem and he will recover. So all you have got to do is find there is a falsity in any existing situation and it tends to fall apart.

Man is a spiritual being capable of certain potentialities. He progresses along through the apparency of time in this universe and he assumes different identities and he has his own difficulties trying to get on his way and one of his answers to these difficulties is to blot out all that went yesterday and therefore his idea that he should have a new identity every time he turns around, thereby blotting out the old, gives him an opportunity to start freshly. The identity of man proves itself in that instance, because you can exteriorize an individual and as soon as he realizes this, he feels better.

There are a great many false answers that can be offered. Any individual who is stuck in his bank can dramatize that as the total answer to everything.

We know that the individual is capable of creating something that he wishes he hadn't, and we also know that he's capable of getting himself in deeper than he can personally get out of. Dianetics is almost solely taken up with locks. Engrams are simply locks on the reactive mind. It's a dramatization that everyone does and has on the reactive mind. The discovery of the individual himself through exteriorization brought us to Scientology.

An individual has to be straightened out to the degree where he is no longer dramatizing parts of his reactive bank before he can get a subjective reality on the bank itself. We must get him straightened out so he can see. The reactive bank itself is a relatively simple affair, but by livingness has gotten itself added to and made complex until it appears to be a formidably complex affair. Trying to reach that reactive bank is then a problem of how do we destimulate, how do we take away these outer fringes and get the fellow in somewhere close to being able to view it.

That's stage one, and that stage now occupies all levels from 0 to IV. We are bringing this fellow into the scene of the battle. The bank itself has a pattern. It goes together a certain precisely mathematical way, and from individual to individual does not vary one iota. It's the same bank, and this bank is the same, thetan to thetan, all across the universe. There is not one slightest bit of difference. You get the idea that the bank is disorderly. No, it's not – the thetan is disorderly. The bank is terribly precise and he's very capable of mocking up the most confoundedly precise bank and keeping it precise. "Well," you say, "where does this bank come from?" The things that are given to him are implants. An implant is socking someone with an electric shock and saying something at the same time. Also it could be making a loud
noise and at the same time saying something, doing this on a patterned basis. That is not the basis of the reactive bank. The reactive bank does not happen to have any implant characteristics in it, in the centre there.

When I'm talking to you, I'm talking to you about the reactive bank, its core not its collection. There are the GPMs, and it's the most confoundingly precise, mathematical mess you ever saw in your life. It's the same, person to person. It itself is so charged that when you have got through the thorn bushes, once you have got through the out work, it's something like trying to sort out individual atomic explosions, don't you see, with four going off at the same time. You say one word and you get four going, so you have an awful time trying to find which is the right one, which is the explosion and which is the sub-explosion, and where do they belong in relation to one another.

A thetan, having run from this during his entire tenancy in this universe, has to vault these around and sort it out and say "This is what I'm doing, where does it come from?" He's mocking it up himself. Why? He's doing it on an agreement. After he mocked it up, he couldn't undo it, he couldn't front up to it, because part of the agreement was not to. So he just keeps it mocked up, and when you say a certain thing to him, he will just mock up that section of the thing on a totality of automaticity, he just does it and he makes big masses with it and so forth.

A thetan is not powerless. When you realize he can make a brick or he can make heavy cloth or he can grow a body, you realize he is very capable of mass. But he doesn't like it much. He put together a system which made a universe, to be brief, and putting this system together he put together a reactive bank to make sure the universe ran right. He stayed in agreement with everyone else and it all set, hence the precision of the reactive bank. It's the bank itself which causes the individual to continue making the universe.

Now, a thetan – one of the capabilities of a thetan is, he never lets his left hand know what his right hand is doing. Like he's busy mocking it up, and saying "Good heavens, there is something going on behind my back. I'm frightened. Well, there is nothing there!" Like he mocks up aberration and says "Good heavens, I'm aberrated." Well, we can get him to look and sort it out, and when he does this it as-ises, it disappears, and all of a sudden he realizes he was doing it. "Wow, was I doing that?" And he becomes aware of his capabilities.

There is no difference, thetan to thetan. The basic lie is that any pc is different. So he says "I'm a strange being. I'm good, they are bad." Just recognize you are dealing with dramatization. There is mass etc. and these things are capable of enforcing upon the individual thoughts, and he thinks the thought. These things are capable of seizing him while he is creating them and so his thoughts are directed.

They are composed of 18 reliable items. It means that it's actually a reactive bank item out of a GPM. The item is part of this, and in one GPM there will be 18 items or 9 pairs. These are all the same line plot up and down the line. All the way up and down the line, same line plot everywhere.

Now what are these things? They are basically purposes, explicit purposes. They enforce a purpose upon the individual and then the line plot (which is these 18 RIs, how they fit together for each one) has blanks in it and you just substitute the parts of the goal into it.
There isn't much to this. The line plot, always the same line plot, here is a column of 9 items faced by a column of 9 items, the ones opposite each other are pairs. You come down the line – pair, pair, so on – now you run these things backwards to the way they are formed. You run them from the top to the bottom, you don't run them from the bottom to the top. Right now, if you are anywhere on the time track – but of course the reactive bank contains the whole idea of time track – if you are anywhere on the time track you are at the top of the time track, or the last one you formed, if you want to say there was a last one you formed. The track looks circular to people because it's locked into the first one that you made. In other words, the top to the bottom are joined. But you rapidly know that you have entered the first one you formed, because you go ice cold. The top one is red hot. The bank then appears to be circular and timeless – which it actually is – but it appears to be timeless because it's circularly connected. Simply, the top GPM is connected to the bottom. Each one of the GPMs as they string out are connected to each other.

Now, if we take a couple of GPMs here and connect them to a couple of GPMs here, we will find that a couple of items here connect to a couple of items here. In other words, this purpose here is expressed in the top of that GPM, and this purpose of this GPM here is expressed in this GPM here, the bottom of the next GPM. So they are interlocked. In other words, although this has a singular purpose, it is also expressed in this next GPM, so they mustn't be out of line. The problem is, how do you find the exact order they are in?

Finding the line plot was very tough. What is the exact order of these things as they stack up one to the next? Now, if we look at this all the way down, we will find that each one of these GPMs has 18 RIs. How exactly are they lined up, one to the next? If you get them lined up wrongly, you will put the items that belong in this one in that one, let us say, and there will be a creak, and so one, and you have got the GPMs lined up wrongly. So it has to be done accurately. We have to know exactly how they line up. How do we get at them, how do we line up GPMs so that we know what we are doing?

R6EW. R6EWS. R6EWP. These are three processes which will give you the characteristics of the reactive bank.

When you start into the bank and take an individual and run these items here, then you are in a position here where you are taking him down the bank on to a particular single GPM. It has a purpose, a mass, it's big (about the size of this chapel) and has 18 RIs. Each item has an opposition to it, and the individual has a suppress about doing it.

Each one of these RIs has an opposition to it. There is something against doing it, and as you come up the line here, you will find the individual has been suppressed from dramatizing or using this particular purpose. He can't use it, because if he did it would get into the oppterms. These tell him to do it, and these tell him not to, so he gets into a mess.

So the main stunt here is, if you put the individual simply into one of these GPMs as the first thing you are doing to him, you have got him in the middle of too much charge, and as you come down the bank you find you are getting less and less TA action and he will probably get upset. If you make a mistake he practically goes around the bend.
So I could give you the whole pattern, and I will, but I also must give you the technology by which the whole pattern of the reactive bank is found. I think you will find that much more valuable, because you might be on Arcturus one day without your notes.

Here is the way this goes. We have here a situation where the individual has a purpose, a goal, a GPM. These things are almost synonymous, even though "purpose" is an end word. He's got this impulse to act. Now if we took a GPM – let's say a GPM concerning cats. "Cats" is the common denominator to the GPM, the root word is what we are going to do with cats. As we go up the bank on one of these things, we have an altered root word. It has to do with "catching cats" and "caught cats". "Those who desire to catch cats" would be only one expression. "Having to catch cats" – these are all correct items. "Having to catch cats" isn't an item in the bank, but "cats", "cats", "cats" – this end word is all over the place in this GPM. It's there consistently and continuously, so of course it reads like mad. The root word here changes. You would only get one item because it's variable, it changes. But here we have the end word. It doesn't change, so you can cut all this charge off the top of the bank. It's enough charge to make a lot of locks blow. I'm not talking about theory, you just get bang, that's gone. You get less of the GPM there the second you say "cats". Your meter starts acting like crazy and you just sort of bobtail this bank, that being the common denominator to it.

By finding these end words and leaving the root words and the line plot alone – "cats" is only a finite section of the track, it's a brief section of the track which doesn't echo elsewhere on the track. Root words repeat down the whole bank. When you give a guy a root word, you are in essence asking him to run the whole bank, and when you give him this combination with the item, an item combination like "having to catch cats", do you realize that you are touching one-nineteenth of the bank? One-nineteenth goes simultaneously into restimulation, and that's a lot for the boy to take, do you follow? When you catch one of these roots, when you catch one of these line plot words, a reliable item, that has a tendency to take a large percentage of the bank, one-nineteenth of it, so the answer is to take the end word, which is limited even though it appears in more items. It's only in this little section and it doesn't appear elsewhere in the bank, so it isn't the more highly charged item but it's the more confrontable in the bank. Our business when we start in on the bank parallels the research line on it – let's find all of the end words, let's get end words, just the end words, the common denominator of the whole GPM.

All you have to know at this stage, if you are finding end words, is the pattern of the end words. This is simply a plus and a minus. What do we mean by plus end words? Good. Minus end words? Bad. If we find good, we will have bad. I'm describing R6EW. We always find a pair, and they are always the same order of things. In other words, you don't have "good" and "pancake".

R6EW simply consists of this: find an end word, preferably the one you are dramatizing (that would mean the one you would be most stuck in). If it's a plus you find its minus, and so on. It sometimes takes some doing. The main rule is always find the pair, don't leave one. If you are in trouble after finding an end word, it's not that end word that's troubling you.
Run it good and steady and you finally wind up you will have the whole pattern of the enforced areas of the bank, and naturally you have cut the charge down, and the charge that remains in the bank is easily confrontable by anybody.
THE PATTERN OF THE BANK
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Around the edges we will get something like fog. Those are locks. Engrams are locks on the reactive bank. They are locked up on more significant material.

Next is a rim of secondaries. A secondary is an incident containing misemotion which depends for its presence and persistence on a moment of physical pain and unconsciousness.

Next comes an earlier band, the incidents and strata of the whole track. The reason people get themselves mixed up (pc who was Caesar) is that civilizations follow a pattern. There have been other 17th Centuries etc. It's like the bank, it follows a pattern. They are quite identical, these civilizations.

In the bank, the pc has to confront an awful lot of unconsciousness and pain, and you get the phenomenon known as "boil off". It doesn't do him much good to boil off. He's simply dramatizing, he's not as-ising. We could say that it's the accumulation of unconsciousness which blanks out the track, because he tries to confront it and off he goes. Or he does contact something and a spear goes through his stomach.

GPMs have as their first manifestation just the fact that there is a lot of mass and significance present and it's awful black, and you find a lot of pcs who can't confront it, who are just in this blackness.

When we approach this, either a terrific significance or a lot of mass moves in on the pc. So there are two routes of aberration, significance and mass, and the two phenomena that you encounter as an auditor are only significance and mass.

Now, there is also space in the bank, and energy, and also time. The thing that really kicks the pc around is the mass or the significance. When energy turns up it's because mass is sitting there, and when he's having trouble with space – why, it's because he's hung up in a piece of mass in that space, and if he's having trouble with no space at all it's because he's in mass. Time you can do things with, like dating incidents and so forth. Everybody's wound up with this thing called time, and it's not directly approachable. Why is his time sense out? Well, it's because he's got too much mass to confront if he moves up to present time. It's the mass that holds him from moving up to present time.

People dramatize significance or mass. The one who is in the institution is dramatizing significance totally. In other words, the "think" in it is so overpowering that he is just it. The one in hospital with aches and pains is dramatizing mass.

The primary is significance. Mass is secondary, but the truth is that mass impinges upon the individual. If you don't believe it, run into a brick wall.
The real route into the bank is with significance and mass – familiarity with the significance and mass, erasure of the significance and erasure of the mass. Even when you only try to destimulate a thing, you can't help but erase a bit of it. If you continue this, by the time you've got him down to here he's getting familiar with the bank and erasing it.

It takes familiarity and it takes erasure. If you got your pc up to the point where he was familiar with the bank but he hadn't erased any – well, he would eventually stick after he had gone so far.

So a person has to be brought towards the bank on a gradient of greater and greater familiarity, and greater confrontation, and greater ability to handle mass in the bank. If this isn't done you have case failure.

These are the two roads, and they must be travelled simultaneously. These things aren't neatly on the perimeter. I've laid this diagram out nicely for you. They are also sandwiched in between there.

There is the overall pattern of the reactive bank, and its approach is by familiarization and erasure simultaneously, and the two things you are handling are significance and mass.

The pattern of GPMs themselves consists of a chain of GPMs under the heading of one purpose or goal.

A goal starts with "to" and then it has a root and then it has an end word, like "to catch cats". "To catch" would be the root, and "cats" the end word.

These string out down the bank in a very orderly fashion. We have here the top – it's not a circular bank, it's linear if it's anything because time is of course included in this and it represents itself to the thetan as linear – and way down the line, many many GPMs away we have a finite bottom and that is the furthest from the individual. This is so organized that the statement of the goal and the progress of the GPM is upwards, so it actually runs from the first GPM at the bottom. This is your goal as an RI (reliable item), bottom opp term; this would be your top terminal and your top opp term.

The bank then sits with the goal as an RI, and appears to run linearly up this way. The place however where it is approachable, where it is runnable, happens to be here. So the bank must be run backwards, it is run from the top opp term of the top GPM. You run it top opp term, terminal, and so forth, back and forth, down.

But the top has an interconnection with the bottom, so that the first four terminals (here) and the first two terminals (there) are interlocked. You want to know what is the top opp term and the top terminal of the top bank? Well, it matches up to the bottom of the one furthest away.

Well, let's see what the individual sees when he first starts in on this. He gets just a big horrible confusion, and out of this he can pick a significance. He's not likely to get in much contact with mass, although the mass is going to upset him if he does get in contact with it. His first contact is going to be upsetting, it's not just a walk in the park. He's liable to get a hold of this area here, and it's an item of some sort, and he gets some charge off, and the charge most likely is more likely to be a lock. If he gets very enthusiastic, he will get this
much closer into it, and this will be merely a closer lock. And what will it be a lock on? Well, the most expressive significance in any GPM, it has a common denominator to each one of its items and that's its end word. Its end word is the same in each item except for the two that join up to the upper and the two that join down to the lower one. The end words are the same through the remaining items, so of course it's a significance which comes off the whole thing like a horrible miasma.

The next thing he gets is the end word of the GPM, and it will check out, and you will get a *whoom!* on the meter and a slab of charge off this GPM. He has actually cut a slab of charge off this GPM. The next thing to do is look around and see what else he's got. The nearest one to it, sitting next door to the positive, is going to be a negative. Now let's say this end word was "running" and the opposite to running was "stopping" or something like that. If you found "running", the next easiest one to find would be the one that's adjacent to it and would be its opposite, a dichotomy. The penalty is that you are liable to go up here to "pausing", and you will have "running" and "pausing" and it will look like a dichotomy. But it's not, it's part of the pair up because it's a dichotomy, too. It will be "pausing" and "rushing", then "running" and "stopping".

You can get a pc to persevere along this line, picking things up. What he's doing is picking up the positive end word and then he will pick up the negative end word, and then he will pick up a positive end word and then he will pick up the negative end word, and then a positive and then the proper negative end word. From the middle of the bank towards the top of the bank, the negative end word is closer to the top than the bottom, and from the middle of the bank to the bottom, the negative is closer to the bottom of the bank. He will pick up this pair, and he will pick up this pair, and then we get to a very interesting phenomenon.

All the time we are walking him through big masses and the only reason we are getting away with it is because erasure is occurring. If you find someone who is going into the bank with no TA action or no needle action, watch out, because you are not getting any erasure. It's very dangerous if you play around the GPMs with no TA. Watch it, man. All you are getting is significance. If you were running the bank linearly (which you wouldn't be, under this system) and you went down six items with no TA, well there are six masses that are just about going to blow your pc's head off. You haven't erased them. It's necessary to have TA.

R6EWS, six end words in a line, they go in sixes, there are six of these things associated and they will all be the same breed of cat. The principal one will be in the middle, this would be something like "start" and that would be "stop", and then down here we have a modification of that pair, and above it we have a modification also. In the middle we always have the main pair and on either side the modifiers, a gradient of meaning. They are not as positive as end words, so when you start putting together your R6EWS, you will actually run into this. You are going to find this bank has been all pulled up into one crossroads.

He's got GPMs pulled up here from down there etc. etc. and there's where he lives. If he's got a physical illness or a hidden standard, it will be found at that point. By running R6EWS, you will blow the rest of his hidden standard, because you are going to find where he has his track bunched up, or where he has got two words mixed up or some word that
doesn't belong with some word. They have these two things that don't belong together consistently pulled together, and they have the whole bank out of shape, and that's where they live.

You have got some locks and then some closer locks and then you get an actual end word and then you could find the pair to that end word, and the first moment that you find the end word the pattern of the GPM starts to unsnarl. We have the pattern coming clear to the individual. The pattern is an actual thing, it's the orderliness with which the bank is put together. He's been living in a very disorderly bank all these years. Now the pattern is starting to emerge in pairs, then it starts to emerge in sixes, and then he starts to fall wise to the remaining patterns. He may or may not cognize at this point, and I wouldn't leave it to chance, because he could get in too much trouble.

The data is known, why not give it to him? There is only one GPM per end word, that's all. So you look at your 18 item GPM as the whole one. That's one end word, 18 items. The next to it is the positive of that negative. The top one is absence, by the way. The next to it is the positive of that negative with 18 items and a different end word and a different root. This has one root and a different end word, the same root as your first one but a different end, and this one has the same root as your second one but a different end, and this one has the same root and a different end and that's what your dichotomies are. They alternate. They are just alternate next to each other all down the line, so therefore you could run out the bank in three months just like that.

Now, only two roots and they alternate all the way down the line, but you must know this, that this top here joins that bottom there to sound like a dichotomy. I won't bother you with what the end words are. It also sounds like a dichotomy because the middle of the bank is "now", that is the "present", and the second one is "here", so of course it looks like all the bank is now present here, and then you get earlier and late all mixed up because they are the flanks of now, so that gives you three here in the middle and "now" doesn't have a dichotomy as such. But this thing flips, it's got a couple of negatives, so at the middle of the bank you get your sequence of positive closest to the top and negative furthest, the negative end word is prior to the positive, but from this end of the bank up, you get your negative closer to the top than the positive. What are the root words? There are two root words, two roots and several hundred ends, a pair and because of that one and because of an item compulsion and all that sort of thing, you get a tendency to make up GPMs to run. So you move it out and you make up all kinds of GPMs to run because of that, but you must run them because that is the second one, "destroy". Horrible, isn't it?

Now, this is going to shock you. All the bad end words have "to create" on them, all the good end words have "to destroy" on them, and that just boxes you up. It proves my basic contention that man is basically good, because he doesn't dramatize this 100% of the time. You find it relegated to the average action of a society or government. The individual is mostly not dramatizing his bank.

So let's hazard a guess as to why this bank was made up, and why you agreed to make up a bank to this pattern. In other words, let's see if we can get at the reason why a person has this bank. Like all cures it becomes the eventual poison, and it is poison.
Well, to do this we have to look to the line plot. The line plot is the line plot of these 18 items, and as we go up this line plot (actually it's run down this way) we find that this goal is blocked by other doers of the goal. So the bad goals one could get were booby-trapped so that no one in the universe would go bad; you would immediately run into its opfterms. If you tried to carry out that goal you would get into trouble. If someone had the goal to destroy sanity, it was comforting to know that he would run into the line plot and it would be booby-trapped. So after we have got the pairs, and after we have got the sixes, then we begin to (actually you can do another thing with the end words, you can plot them on the track R6EWP) – well, after we have got that, then you have the line plot of the sixes, then you could work out your line plot and find out what it's all about. It's the same line plot as you run on down the line as far as I know.

You do find people do dramatize these things. Take fame; we know that societies destroy fame, they work on that pretty hard. So you have got this whole thing that just wouldn't dawn on you. It's incredible. It's so strange and so foreign to a thetan's way of thinking that he never duplicated it and he's been going all this time because he couldn't duplicate it. He's basically good and he's got nothing but basically bad goals and the whole GPM is wrapped up on this one thing.

So what you do is take the line plot and fit the goal into the line plot and you run it down item by item, and you run the next goal item by item, and you get lots of TA.

It's rather incredible that the bank would be backwards, that everything you love in life you have a goal to destroy, and everything you hate in life you have a goal to create.
Thank you. Thanks a lot. I thank you. Appreciated, appreciated. Nobody did that in Spain, although when we left, when we left, you would have thought we – the whole foundation of the area we'd been living in had been pulled out from under, the people turning out to see us and say goodbye, and tears in their eyes and all very wild. And I see I've been gone quite a while – what's the date?

*Audience: the 23rd.*

The 23rd of February, the 23rd of February. That's right.

Mary Sue looks younger and, and you didn't really know, but she's the shortest-eared burro in the world.

*Audience: we didn't hear that.*

It's the shortest-eared burro in the world. Time you've carried the huge bags of photographic equipment over hill and dale. John Lawrence offered to go down and, and carry my photographic equipment for me and so forth, over the hill and dale, and I said, "Oh no, John," I said, "This is, this is mainly a matter of putting my foot on a rail and sleeping it all away, don't you see? And I'm not going to be very ambitious and so forth." Well, as soon as I got down there, I got ambitious. And there was nobody around but Mary Sue, and she gainly started packing all sorts of baggage over her shoulder. And I kept noticing that the – kept noticing that the burros, you know, that the Spaniards use down there and so on, they were really recalcitrant, so she started getting recalcitrant. She, you know, she wouldn't climb over a pile of rocks or something like that. So I started calling her a burro, and then I noticed, oddly enough, that she was the shortest-eared burro in the whole world.

She did very fine. The only thing that she did wrong, she did something wrong while she was gone, and that is to say she petted a cactus. Now the, the Spaniards do something weird, they pull the spines, they use the cactus for decoration, they pull all the spines out with a pair of tweezers. Pretty wild, you know, who'd ever think of doing that? And so, she saw one of these cacti, and she was going around looking at a lot of them, and she didn't realize they hadn't gotten the little spines apparently. So ever since, every few days, why, we'd pull another cactus splinter out of her hand. Little tiny things.
But otherwise, we had a good time and everything is fine. And it was cold in Spain, cool in Las Palmas. And there is no winter vacation area over on the European side, North of, I think, Liberia or something like that. And you have to go quite a while but, quite a ways, but anyway, they're getting faster and faster aircraft and I'm very, very close to not needing any aircraft anyway. Symptoms of this are turning up. Well, we had a good time and mainly I got a good long distance look at everything. I did quite a bit of research and I cracked Level VII. I haven't run Level VII, I haven't finished Level VI by an awful long ways. But all of a sudden, one fine day toward the end of vacation, actually it was on the boat coming home, and I was sitting there and I took a look and all of a sudden, realized that although I hadn't run VI, I found out there was something over there, and what was that, and suddenly realized I was looking at Level VII. And you talk about being right, my God, how right can you get?

Level VII, of course, is the 8 Dynamics. And we're right back at the beginning. It's the 8 Dynamics, and you run them out, and that's Level VII. And it isn't experiential track and it's not very hard to do. In fact, it's so easy to do that I'm having a hard time not doing it. I know I've got to finish Level VI, and when I discovered it and so forth, plus my stomach, too – too much, don't you see, I mean, it's like a little boy and he's been wishing for a lollipop, you know, somebody gives you an icecream factory [laughter] turn ??????????? somatics chasing all over the body and me and so forth, while I was looking at this stuff. You know, it's just – just – but that's me, you know, to try to climb that escalator vertical. And it's right there. And oddly enough, there isn't anything more to find out about it. I got it all taped, I got its patterns and actions and everything else. It only took me about 45 minutes, when I'd finally seen it, to see the whole thing. And it's not very complicated and you probably could run out Level VII, I don't know, in two or three sessions.

But, you see, to make myself more, more, more clear, there's the ancient question of "Are we one or are we individuals?" Well, I told you, someday we'd have to solve that, so that's solved. And what's this stuff? [pounding on podium] Well, you see, there isn't anything much beyond this because then I found out that you don't really have to destroy the MEST universe to get out of it. It's an individual proposition. It appears to be a collective proposition but it's not, it's an individual proposition. And you can go ahead of it in time, back of it in time, you can go out of it, it can still be there, you don't have to destroy it – you don't have to destroy it for everybody. That was one of the things I was a little bit worried about, oddly enough. If I ran out the MEST universe, would it still be here for anybody else? Seemed to me to be a bit of an overt. And you can run out the MEST universe and it's still there for other people. You don't have to be in it and you don't have to not be in it, you know? But that's Level VII. And so, the vacation wound up in a, in a very high-peak win, in spite of it being cold and so forth.

But one, one, about the only thing that really happened that was of very great interest is I found that psychologists were wrong again. And although that isn't news, it's interesting to find a point. I've been told by them that animals don't commit suicide and I've even thought myself that animals didn't commit suicide, and that's not true. I ran across an animal that committed suicide and he was a bear, a big Alaskan brown bear, that they had in a zoo down in Las Palmas. And the way this zoo got started is of some interest. Columbus shoved off from Spain to discover the New World and his first stop was the Canary Islands, which had
already been conquered by Spain about a century or so before, or less than that. And he stopped off and spent a bit of time and then, of course, after he discovered America, why, he called in at the Canary Islands again. And before he got back to Spain, at one of his, his way stop was the Canary Islands, so actually, he got to the Canary Islands before he got back to Spain. Well, the Canary Islands are very "au fait" – savvy, to go French on you, the kids are studying it so I have to – the Canary Islands are very knowing on the subject and very up to snuff on the subject of the discovery of the New World. And they probably know more about it than they do in Spain. And the natives down there still sell models of Columbus's various ships, you know, all these things die out slowly, they still carve and sell these little wooden models, it's the Nina and Pinta and Santa Maria. Anyway, there's a museum down there, there's Columbus House and so forth, "Columbus slept here" – actually, that's what they tell you – and a lot of his relics. And when he came back from the New World, well, of course he gave them some cheerios and so forth, and apparently started them a zoo.

And the zoo has been going on ever since, but not the same animals. And one of these animals in the zoo, there's a pair of them and actually, one additional one in some other cage, but a pair of, of Kodiak bears, of a smaller edition, and the Spaniards didn't know that bears hibernate. Although the Kodiak doesn't do too much hibernation, he nevertheless is a hibernating animal, a bear is, and they wouldn't let this old bear go to sleep, but kept turning him out to do his stuff for the visitors. Typical Spanish treatment of animals, you know, they're very rough on animals. And they kept turning this bear out and they're ripping him out of the cement cave that he would get curled up in and he'd finally gotten very sick. And the temperature down there was running, daytime and so forth, about 60, 65 and so forth, and it's very cold to the Spaniards, so he considered the bear was getting sick because it was "cold" weather. Well, naturally, this bear, probably before he saw the zoo, and his breed and so forth would consider 40 like London considers "a sweltering 77 in London today." I mean, that is a headline, a serious headline. But he'd consider 40 degrees a "sweltering 40 degrees," you see? And they kept turning him out and he got sick, and he started to protest on the basis of getting very sick and he was a very sick bear, one of the sickest bears I've ever seen. He'd go into shivers and ice cold and his legs wouldn't hold him up and he'd get frozen in one spot, don't you see, and then all of a sudden, why, he'd get red hot and start panting and so forth. And he had fever and chills the like of which I never saw, and he was weak as a cat. The other bear in the cave was, of course, stark staring stir-crazy and she'd attack him all the time, and life was just to grim. And he was about the least climbing bear that anybody ever, that breed doesn't climb anyhow. And that iron cage came up to the top and met in the middle, very high and very difficult to do anything with, a monkey would have had a hard time climbing it. And that bear, a few days later, climbed up to the top of the cage, all god-knows-how-many pounds of him, in this horrible state of not being able to walk, he climbs up to the top of the cage, gets to the total top crown of the cage, and drops on the cement. That was the end of the bear. The most forthright case of suicide I think I ever saw in my life. So apparently, animals do commit suicide, because he sure did. Only one of the few interesting stories we ran across.

Of course, one runs across lots of interesting stories, but this, we, we saw the bear and we knew the bear and it happened while we were right there. Fantastic situation.
Well, I see I've been gone an awful long time because this student list goes pretty long and some of you have been here for quite a while, and so it will seem strange to you to be introduced at this particular moment. Nevertheless, I am going to introduce you one by one. Stand up and take a bow. Ron Pook. Cal Rigney. Val Rigney. Constance Flemming. Joe Gains. Peter Rost. Wally Pallas. And Barbara Poole, to whom I owe a considerable favor. She, she acted as another burro. Thank you, Barbara. Dorothy Knight. Laura Printer. Roger Throw. David Hollywell. And Nan Beardsley. And Arthur Francis. And last but not least, a retread, Leon Bosworth.

Well, I see in, in calling that roll, most of you, most of you newcomers are in very good shape and everything is cheerful, and some of the others have some overts, so I will be watching that. Now on, on the basis of I don't want to have missed a withhold, so I call to your attention the fact that I have already announced it so I haven't missed it. Alright. Well, I'm very glad to see you here. And I'm glad to see the rest of you and I'm glad to see that you're getting along the line.

I noticed there's been a few separations, but you should be having a ball. I noticed you had an alter-is in one of the processes, you were doing some listing you shouldn't have been doing on Level VI. Yeah, there was some listing going on that shouldn't have been done and it was slowing down your tone arm action, but that's all straight. And then you've got – you've got a wide-open road on that particular level because right now, I'm, I'm just putting up the – putting up the rack of GPMs. But let me give you a little comment here, just as we, as we go in passing here, R6EW and so forth is not about to fade from view. Let me call to your attention that when you bring a student in onto R6, he is for the first time on solo audit. It's going to take him some time to get used to that, to run a meter. And about that time, he learns why a meter works and he learns all sorts of things about auditing, which is quite remarkable. It's a very educational action for him to undertake. In addition to that, he does several other things in that he finds out why he has been operating the way he has been operating and so forth, and he gets himself pretty well settled down.

Now, at that point, if he cannot get tone arm action with R6EW, he has no business at the level in his auditing. He's back there, he's unable to talk to the auditor, don't you see, and he's got too many worries about his PTPs and he's got this and he's got hidden standards. And he's got the Book of Case Remedies, and he has no business at the level. So at that moment, if it's too grim and too gruesome, he can be taken off and jumped through the Book of Case Remedies and put in some kind of condition and run from the bottom up till he's back up there case-wise. You see, you can run any process on him, there is no process that is barred out. Just because he's been on R6EW does not spoil any lower level process, you see, you can run any of them. Now therefore, it gives us – it's very important that we have this – it gives us this breathing spell because the truth of it is if you ran him into actual GPMs, they would run just enough to get him into the channel of the GPMs and start him down the line. And it would go just enough to get him completely smeared in and after that, you couldn't run anything on him that had words [end words] in it. In other words, it'd be a near thing. He could be fished out of this, but it would have to be very delicately done. In other words, he's gone in over his head
and as a pc, he's wandering around in a lost state somewhere in the reactive bank, don't you see, and now to pull him out of this with some junior process becomes a very difficult thing.

That is what is wrong with R6 and that is R6 – the biggest problem – and that is why R6 is only being taught at St. Hill, you see, because when this sort of thing happens, it's quite catastrophic. Well, that was happening here for a while and I always run a very heavy pilot, right where I can straighten it out right up close, before I let any dynamite package like this go out very far. And it's – that's why it's only being taught at St. Hill. It is solved now, however. It is an intricate level and it can get so much good that we just know very well somebody, if it was released too broadly, who – who should be being trained at Level 0, don't you see, why, somebody would be ambitiously for a quick buck or something like that, trying to audit or train him at Level VI. We already have an example of somebody who's running a group someplace or other, and he, he had them all on Level VI, you know, of what he thought was Level VI, and we had another thing of a guy bringing somebody on and audit him for a short time and, and then a perfectly green PC, turning him loose with an E-Meter to run Level VI on himself. Well of course the guy just had one long parade of catastrophes. I don't know that anybody died as a result of it, but it could easily have happened.

So anyway, the – this was an important, this was an important step, to find some way to put somebody into Level VI and get him accustomed to solo audit, and find out whether or not he could take it, without actually getting him into the middle of the reactive bank so that he couldn't be rescued.

And that process is R6EW, so you're going to see that around for a long time. And that is your bridge process. It's quite an amusing process in that you have cognitions like mad, but you finally get up to a point, when you run through R6EW-S in sixes and when you start getting the track plotted out – I got, I got the bulk of the track all – all in sequence. What – what will happen is, I'll tell you now the course of action, you – you get to a point finally where you – where you don't have to audit it to find out what it, it is. See? I mean, you get loose enough on the thing. I was very interested, not an hour ago, I felt cold, you know, and I was just hurrying around trying to get some things done and I just felt cold, and I was wondering why I felt cold. And I just took a look and there were about sixteen end words lying on it. And I said, "Well, what do you know? That's an awful lot of end words." I didn't bother to go over them, don't you see, I just whhhhhhhhhhhhhh, look at that mess, you know, not even auditing, you know, "I-feel-cold, wonder-what's-wrong, oh-well, look-at-that-mess-of-end-words, you-know, whwhwhhh, so on. It's those sixteen end words." And I didn't think anything more about it, it went on for another minute or so and I said, "Wow! I've been trying to solve the problem of one of these end words, another end word entirely, on which all the remaining sixteen were serving as locks." In other words, GPMs operating as locks on GPMs, which is pretty interesting.

Anyway, from that one could extrapolate rather easily that when a – a poor condition, let's say you didn't run out the bank, see, when a – when you found yourself in a poor condition if you went on a – with an elementary process like R6EW, carried it up to R6EW-S, carried it up to R6EW-P, you would very shortly find yourself in a position where it would be by inspection of the same nature as, "Boy, I got a problem." You're suddenly, you know, you
have a problem, you just know you've got a problem. Your car won't start so you know you have a problem. Well, you don't consider that auditing, where your bank becomes sufficiently confrontable and you're up to a point of where it is no more worry than this. And it's a little bit weird to me, to look back at a year ago when I could collide cross-wise with a couple of GPMs that were, get them wrong or something like this, and practically get the top of my head torn off or come down with a high fever or something of this sort, you know, of absolute catastrophe. You see now, that compares with, with, "Hmm, stomach feels cold, oh, I – hmhmhmhmhm that's about sixteen, about sixteen end words have gotten piled up there, what do you know," and go on doing what I'm doing. "Oh well, they're all serving as locks on any there, well what do you know," and go on with what I'm doing but not feeling cold. That's a bit of a different look, isn't it?

Because originally, it was a basis of, "We better not fool with that because that's too close a lock on a GPM." See? So your confront on these things comes right on up and the extrapolated – that is the, the predicted course of action or the predicted change of condition and so forth, does take place.

These things become more and more confrontable, you're more and more able to handle, and you get up to a point of where they're not worrying you. They're not worrying you to the degree that you look through and see the other side of the fence, you know, and so these, these… One, the condition is attainable of that, and the end product of OT is attainable, that becomes quite obvious on a practical basis. And the other thing is, weirdly enough, is attainable with the processes you've got in R6EW, R6EW-S and R6EW-P, regardless of running them, running the whole GPM. See, that's the other predicted condition. In other words, you can get to a point where, you get to a point where the bank is so thin, it's just blowing. I mean, inspection blows it. Not inspection of it is – is it the right word and does it fit in the right place, but you just notice it and it blows, don't you understand, I mean, the thing has got that much, it's that weakened in command value. The command value has become so weak as far as you're concerned that it can't concern you and it's aberrative value, of course, is proportionately weak.

And in addition to that, why, it's ability to do anything to you physically is proportionately weakened. I mean, you're becoming – you're becoming cause over a thing which before you were the total effect of. You see that happening while you're running R6EW, R6EW-S and so on. Very improbable that you will ever really have to run, or future auditors in training and so forth, will have to run R6EW-S or R6EW-P, because what we'll do is we'll find out if the guy's all right at the R6EW, you see, can he make it go and can he solo audit and is he okay, and then we'll just start opening up sections of the cabinet and show him the plot from the top down, all very accurately done.

Because the probability, by the way, of his colliding with the accurate plot is so negligible as to be neglectable. That's a weird thing to say, isn't it, but it's true. See, I've had people giving me what they thought the plot was here for about a year, and they're pretty wrong. You probably could attain all this, however, by running if you ran it long enough – this is a long route, R6EW, R6EW-S, R6EW-P – you probably could attain the final blowing of the bank.
But that's a long route, you see, now you're looking at a couple of years of auditing or something like that, if you're going at it.

Not very intensive auditing, a couple of years of the kind of auditing you – you get when you're not at St. Hill, you see, now and then sort of a thing, session a week maybe, if you're lucky, or something like that. Well, it'd still take you a couple of years to, to do this all the way, whereas, you're looking at in terms of running time and so forth, you're looking at about three months of auditing to a total clean OT. That's what you're looking at right now is about three months of hammer and tongs auditing to go on up the line to total OT.

When you get up to total OT, you find yourself still in this universe. Well, you're cause over matter, energy, space and time, that's absolutely true.

Perfect definition, you're cause over it, in this universe. And your causation is not anything absolute, don't you see, it's because you've still got, you've still got 8 Dynamics. And if you noticed that there are seven Dynamics flanking the 6th Dynamic. See? So Level VII in actual fact is – is – is an odd way to number it because you say it really, really it should be Level VIII if there are eight Dynamics in connection with it. It's very possibly true, but in actual fact, you'll find out that you're only really handling seven of them. You prove, I've got the other one squared away, but the rest of – it's just the MEST universe.

You've got a bank, don't you see, you've got a reactive bank. And what happens when you haven't got a reactive bank? Well, we've never assumed otherwise that that a person would be in the physical universe with no reactive bank. That's perfectly accurate, see? What happens then? His next bank, of course, is the physical universe. That is the next bank. The universe of trolley cars and buses and brick walls and Everest, what's that? Well, that's a universe. You could describe it as such and it is as such. I notice nobody gets out of it. I notice they leave and kick the bucket, and they're right back in the bank again.

Every once in a while, science fiction boys will worry about other universes and moving around in various universes, particularly after they've read Dianetics and Scientology textbooks. And, but factually, even Wells and so forth was running into, he – he never considered he would get outside the physical universe. It's only occasionally that some science fiction writer will mention going into another universe. And they speak then, that is sort of this universe, but there is this universe with a time warp in it, you know, or a space warp, or it's "this universe with a..." Well, they're off the string to the degree that it's not – you don't go from this universe to another universe, see, you have to, you don't move into another universe because you've moved out of this universe.

You see? And it's a very hard situation to grasp, you see, you feel your brains creak when you're trying, trying to grasp the thing originally, which is what was happening to me in trying to cognite on this thing. What was this all about? Well, when you – well, you don't have to have a bank, you see, you put it in this category – you don't have to have a bank. You don't have to every time you – you have some thought that you shouldn't have or something of the sort – that clobbers in the back of the neck with a somatic or something like this. You don't have to have a bank, you'd perfectly comfortable without one, and you can think much
better than the bank can, I assure you, particularly when you finally find out to your horror what is in the bank and what the basic motivation of Man is. Too incredible for words, it's all backwards to anything anybody would think, you see, "The thetan is basically good so he made a bad bank because everybody else was bad and then, if we all had this bad bank, then we wouldn't do all these bad things." Hey. Well, this bad bank proposition, well, a person would be much better off if he didn't have the bank and that's quite obvious, even on a short-term look. A fellow runs part of his bank out and he can now start functioning better, you know, he – he doesn't have asthma anymore and he can think and he doesn't get the jitters and start screaming just because a girl with nylon stockings walks through the room, you know, something like that.

So, he's getting along much better, he's much more effective and that sort of thing – no bank. Alright. That little section of the bank is gone, so he's more effective, you see? By extrapolation, if the whole bank's gone, he'd be terrifically effective. And true, he is, he never dreamed how effective he really is, see? Well now that's, that's perfectly observable, you see, because that's finite observation. Well, if you apply the same thoughts to the MEST universe, you've got it answered. Clearly, it's un... you know, the hard thing is that, "What would you do if you didn't have a MEST universe?"

You know? Well, psychiatrists and psychologists today think the same thing about a bank, "What would you do if you weren't neurotic?" See? "What would I do if I weren't crazy?" Well, so you can get into that same state of mind about a reactive bank that everybody is in about the physical universe, see, "What would I do without it?" What do you do without one? What the hell have you got one for? What, what you got to have a road for? You know? And you say, "Well, what are you, what are you talking about, what do you got to have a road for? You can walk on it, you can drive on it and you, it's a very useful road and it's a very nice road and it's a very nice thing to have a road." Yeah, it's a very nice thing to have a road and I don't really know why you have to have a road if all you have to do is have a road. You get the point? That seems to be much more interestingly direct, it seems to me you'd get into lots more interesting games in very peculiar ways if all you had to do to have a road was have a road. "Road!" you know? See a traffic cop running on your road, no road!.

You talk about a random, life would become very, very, very interesting. A guy would have to be in complete apathy to want things as dull as having an universe all laid out, predictable all the time. Every time you look at your watch, five – five minutes from the last time you looked at your watch, it's five minutes later. Crazy business, you know? Well, it's like a fellah in a cage, it's like, I guess, animals get in zoos. "At five o'clock, the keeper is going to come and feed us and that's – we have to have that." So nice and certain. "All we have to do is sit here in this cage and at five o'clock, the keeper will feed us. And if we weren't sitting in this cage, we wouldn't get fed at five o'clock." You see the logic? Well, that's actually the logic that a thetan uses to account for the MEST universe and so forth, and he's just security-happy, he's got to have security. He's in complete apathy about being able to do anything himself, so he, he's got to have all this total security and the least randomness drives him out of his mind. Don't you see?
Well, to give you an idea, what would happen if the sun started moving backwards? Without any phenom, without any geological cataclysm, see, but if just all of a sudden, you woke up one morning, the sun was over in the West and it was traveling to the East – or it got to noon and went into a spiral for a while. Do you realize what would happen out here in the streets? Can you envision the streets of London while that was going on? Boy, would the Catholic church make money! You can predict that, too. But now, that's, well, everybody'd go frantic. Well, why would they go so frantic? Well, because it's destroyed their un… their certainty and their predictability.

Well, why do they got to have this much predictability? Why shouldn't the sun move to ten o'clock and stay there till August? "Oh, Bill, Bill, you forgot to move the sun!" "Hey, that's your hat." "No it isn't. We changed hats last Tuesday." "We did not." "Yes, we did." "You forgot to fill up the ocean. Well, who's responsible for mocking up the ocean here this week?" "Oh, they don't need any ocean, we had to have a desert scene. The only place we could find for it was the middle of the Pacific Ocean." "What Pacific Ocean?" "Physical universe Pacific Ocean." "Oh, you want to look at the physical universe Pacific Ocean? Well, alright, go take a look at the physical universe Pacific Ocean." "I can't. I've run it out. I'm not crazy like that anymore." Then you say, "Well, what happened to it? If everybody else has got it mocked up, why, what happened to it?"

The truth of the matter is it never was there, it never is there and it never will be there. Just, everybody's got it there. So the end product of things look something along in that view, don't you see? You can – you can have it, you can have it, you can have it and you can go on seeing it and that sort of thing. And you can undoubtedly vary it or alter it to a considerable marked degree, but when you think of varying and altering, don't just think of the physical universe. If you're going to vary and alter MEST, why have you got to pick on the MEST of the physical universe to vary it and alter it. Vary and alter your own MEST. Joe and Bill have got a piece of MEST, so they vary it and alter it. I don't see why they have to vary and alter Gibraltar. They could vary and alter Gibraltar, you see, at the same time and it'd get varied and altered for other people, but it would get varied for people to the degree that they were aberrated by it, to the degree they were overwhelmed by the bank.

You wonder why 8-C works, well, oddly enough, 8-C of course is a cousin, not to Level VI, but is a cousin to Level VII. And you wonder why people suddenly have leaped out hospital beds on having read Dianetics, Evolution of a Science, or something of that sort. You were cheating out some little piece that they had in disarray at Level VII, not at Level VI. And then the reason you got gains on your subjective processes and so forth, is because you were doing things to Level VI. So you remember for years and years and years, we've had subjective and objective. Well, subjective – of course, Level VII is also subjective to the degree that it is your bank, don't you see, but you'll get over that because you – that – you have to do a weird little trick with logic to get that thing squared out.

In other words, the situation is simply that subjective processes, or think or figure processes or processes like, any of – practically any of your – your repetitive processes, ARC Straightwire, see, they were influencing Level VI and they were taking locks off Level VI. You following? They were straightening out the mental, purely mental masses. And so there-
fore, they were keying out bits of the reactive mind and that's what a subjective process was. And then, an objective process is a Level VII process, that familiarized and accustomed a person to his – the MEST universe bank, see, his, his other bank. And that's why you would very often find somebody that you could run and run and run and run and run and they wouldn't have a single comm-lag on level – on 8-C. You know, they could just run and you say, "Now look at that wall, walk over to that wall, go on and touch that wall..." The guy does it and does it and does it. When you finish up, he's no better. I know it's, it was seldom this happened but it did happen every once in a while. You'd get one pc out of about ten or fifteen in HGCs that you run them on 8-C and they... And we explained it on the basis you couldn't develop a comm-lag so the process was to high for them. How absolutely correct. We were trying to run them on a Level VII process. See? That, that was their, the harmonic, the lower harmonic of Level VII. We were making them touch walls, don't you see, and they were actually putting the universe back. You know, there are people around who had walls right up against their faces and all kinds of weird, because of course, nobody really knows how the MEST universe looks to anybody else. You see? And they had people who had different universes, they've got them in – they've got them in insane asylums all the time and it's not necessarily something subjectively wrong with them at all. That's objectively wrong with them. It isn't because their mind is giving them a wrong world, don't you see, their mind isn't giving them anything – their mind – as we would think of it or know it and that sort of thing, would be Level VI – there's nothing wrong with their mind. There is something wrong with their environment. They've just merely got an aberrated VII, see, it didn't have to be aberrated at VI at all.

See, this guy's got it fixed up so that all walls are 45 degree angles and he could even have it aberrated objectively to the point where he was dealing with some "when knighthoods were in flower" time warp, so dragons keep walking in through the front door, the dragons might walk in through the front door, they might even bite him, maybe he, or maybe not. You see, we describe it as delusion. But that, that says there's something wrong with his mind, you see, in here, see, an introverted error. No, it's an extroverted error. See, it isn't "in here" that's wrong with him, it's there that's wrong with him, you see, although he's influencing that, of course, and so forth. But dragons keep walking in that door, man, ohoooh. And you try to tell one of these fellows, "There's no bugs on you." The truth of the matter is, there is no bugs on the patient in the psychiatrist's view of Level VII. But in the patient's view of Level VII, there are bugs on the patient, so something has gone wrong with VII. So, if you can make the guy merely pay attention to what he is calling and mocking up the physical universe – locational processing, 8-C, where is the indicated object, such things as that – you find some remarkable things happen. You can also do this odd thing, you think you're running problems and you're not, you say, "Well let's, let's spot all the places where this fellow is having any trouble in his life, and let's just have him sort of indicate where they are." You're, you're not handling his Level VI difficulty with problems. What you're handling is, you're handling his Level VII difficulty with locations. See it's not, it's not the GPMs that have got him going, you follow me, it's, it's... See, he hasn't got, he hasn't got the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Factory four or five miles over that way where it belongs, he's in the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Factory while you are trying to audit him. And probably, your voice sounds peculiar to him, too, because trying to audit across a distance of four or five miles, it's difficult.
You know children, you say get the child into the classroom. Well, what if some of those children are actually still outside playing? And not anybody thinks they're outside playing, you see they're – the – the road which they have the viewpoint of, they don't have to be out there playing, you got the idea, they are where they are but they are outside playing because that's where they are although they are sitting in front of you and you're talking to them. You get the idea. Well, they've got, in essence, an aberration on the VIIth. Because of great desire to be outside, they actually put outside where they are, but really put it there, don't you see, but they don't put where they are there because they don't want to be there, don't you see, they're not putting up a 7th Dynamic. What the hell you going to do with them? They – they... you – you get read on the meter that they were outside playing, but that's – that's what they've got out there, but they really don't dare mock it up very boldly, you see, you're liable to see it, too. All kinds of, you see how it gets pretty weird when you start trying to pick your way through it in relative to – relation to. So, a child, we have said we had to get the child into the classroom before we could teach him, so therefore, locational processes or something like that, were very good.

Now, it was Level VI which ruined creative processing because creative processing really, although it touched VI slightly and would have alleviated VI slightly, creative processing in actual fact affected Level VII. It's the exercise by which he was actually putting up the physical universe. And that was old creative processing. Now, when you could get that working on somebody, it worked like a bomb. But what was wrong with it and why it got booby-trapped – the "Step 6 effect" we used to call it – what happened was, his bank would start getting more solid.

Well, he actually, because the bank GPMs is full of the word "create" strung from one end to the other, don't you see, his reactive mind would get in the road of his making the physical universe, you see, and you couldn't run the process because he was addressing it at Level VI and it wouldn't work unless it were addressed at Level VII.

Don't you see? So, Level VI booby-traps Level VII and keeps it from operating. So therefore, creative processing... I've had – I've had auditors come, "Why did you ever go off there, I had wonderful results with it," you know, "Oh, this and that and the other thing and so forth." Well, all he had to see was one guy go green when his bank started to get totally solid to say, "Well, if that happened [to] one pc out of a hundred, that would be too many times, so therefore, it's a very dangerous process, the devil with it!" Don't you see? And at the time it was released, I hadn't run into that hundredth guy, don't you see, although I had enough cases to make it look perfectly all right, ran all right on me and ran all right on anybody I audited, and then all of a sudden, started colliding with the person it didn't run all right on. He was about one out of a hundred or something like that, you see, so we found this stray. So right away, why, we threw it away and didn't use it any more and so forth, but it will make a Clear. Well, one of the reasons it'll make a Clear is because it moves so it sort of keys out VI and puts a person more solidly in VII, and he finds himself in a somewhat apparently Clear state in the physical universe, yes, the apparency, because what you've done is really straighten out the physical universe for him and it wasn't straightening out his mind at all. You were straightening out his view of the physical universe is what was being straightened out. It was not, then, a mental exercise, it was a full straight forward thetan exercise which corrected the
out-of-controlness of his making the physical universe. See, this was so badly out of control and so aberrated and so far adrift, so messed up, that he could no longer mock himself up a good physical universe. The walls came in on him, you know? And so, you give him some practice in mocking things up, and where it worked, it was impinging on the fact that he was moving the physical universe, getting rid of that automaticity to the degree that it would stabilize into his basic automaticity of making it, see, and you get rid of just his, the aberrated nature, the aberrated – the degree that he was aberrated on the subject of being aberrated. You, you follow that? In other words, he's already aberrated so that he was obsessively making a physical universe and then this had inverted. That word we use occasionally, which means that that aberration had become, in its turn, aberrated. You follow? So, he no longer – he no longer can do a clean job of this. Then, when you gave him a little practice in mocking things up or a lot of practice in mocking things up, you take the aberration off the basic aberration. The basic aberration, therefore, stayed the way it was and he felt fine. See, you've taken… He's still crazy, but now he was happy to be crazy. Well, that's a good comparison. The guy was unhappy about being crazy and with a little exercise of creativeness, why, he got happy about being crazy. But everything was better, yeah, that's right, it was better.

I think there was even a movie on it one time called "Harvey." Harvey, stage play, a guy saw a rabbit all the time. He had a very cheerful rabbit around with him all the time, and the doctor said he would get unhappy and mean if you took his rabbit away from him and they took his, they took his rabbit away from him and he became very unhappy. Happy-crazy and unhappy-crazy.

Anyhow, they are… So, so what in essence are you doing as you put the process line, from the lowest levels up to the highest level, a more educated look. You see the higher you get on these sort of things the more you know about the background. That was why after I wrapped up the new character nature of - all I hadn't done was to statisticize it thoroughly - knew the character nature of and the processes and how you address the GPMs of the reactive bank the core of the reactive bank. There it was it was taped.

Well, when I got that, then was able to go back and do some 0 to IV with great accuracy and knock out a lot of things and so forth. Well now, having come to grips here with VII and seen that it's there, you don't even have to have a release point, see, a guy can see it, figure out what's there. I've got to get, I've got to finish VI before I can tackle VII and that's very hard to do, by the way. And I sit down solo auditing feeling, "Why wait to go on VII, why don't I get rid of all those icepicks?" I don't know, well, we got, all of a sudden, I get horrible somatics, don't you say, and waaaah and vooo. Talk about trying to audit yourself over you're head, you know, it's very intriguing, so I have to suppress it. That isn't so good either, so I run the suppression off and get on with VI. [laughs] The net gain here has been to get another look and realize that there were, all the time, these two approaches to the bank, the subjective and the objective, the subjective process, the objective process. There were, there were two things you could do with the bank just like there are two things, significance and mass, those are the two things you address. Now, you can address those things in two ways, which is kind of weird, significance and mass, but you can handle them subjectively and you can handle them objectively. So, you get the significance and mass subjective, and the significance and the mass objective.
You say, "That is a door." Well, that is the significance and mass objective. You ask some little kid, "What's in the room?" and they will tell you there's a door and there's a ceiling and there's a floor and so forth.

Well, that's the mass and the significance, that's an objective process. Well, what it's actually treating is the penchant the thetan has to put in the physical universe out there, see, he's working on... Actually, I keep saying physical universe because mine keyed in and so forth. There's all eight Dynamics out there, not just the 6th. And, he's, well, when he sees flowers, don't you see, why, he's into the 5th and, and he's, but that's out there, and it's got a significance and a mass, you see, it's got a name, a form and an apparent purpose, a relationship to the physical universe let's – it's – or two other flowers or two gardeners or something like that, so that's the significance. And then there is the mass of the flower and of course, to have mass, you've got to have some space around it to separate the mass, but that's there, that is it. It isn't because something is wrong in here that makes that it, don't you see, any wrongness is right over there where it's it.

See, the guy, but there is a bank in here that gives you another set of values of the wildest and craziest sorts and directions and so forth, but that has to do with behavior of specific significance and mass that has to do with the behavior and attitude. A person's behavior and attitude is what is regulated on the type of subjective process, and his observation and, well, there's ability, and behavior and attitude as part of ability, too, but his perceivability as perception in the by and large, and whether or not he's got solid walls, and whether or not he can walk out of houses, you see this, those things depend on that other zone of aberration, see, which is the objective zone of aberration.

And if this guy can't walk out of houses, it isn't because something is in his mind saying, "I can't walk out of houses."

You follow that? It, it isn't something in the bank that says, "I can't walk out of houses" or "trouble is out there, house." See, it's nowhere else than where it is, in other words, is what I'm trying to say to you. The trouble with this fellah, he says, "I could never leave the house," well then, don't audit him on a subjective process.

Oddly enough, you'll run into GPMs that'll account for it. There's a whole series of six that account for getting stuck in houses. After you've run, after you've run these however, why, you find out that you still aren't as happy about going out and dashing around outside of houses as you'd like to be. And that's because, although there's a – there's a behavior, an attitude relationship to houses, there's also houses. And actually, he's lost the ability to mock up the outside of a house, over there. See, he no longer makes the outside of a house over there. He makes the inside of the house around here, so he can't leave a house. Do you follow? So, if you're a very clever auditor, you could add all this up in this way. Well, do we audit this pc subjectively or objectively, is he crazy objectively, is he crazy subjectively? A fellow had poltergeists you would never dream, you know, objects, and he goes skidding around and objects fly around the room where he is. We'd never dream now, what we know now, you see, and audit him on a subjective process. You audit him on an objective process. Well, what is an objective process? Well, there are tons of them, there were tons of them.
A crossroads, by the way, is because it's so thoroughly into Level VI and the reactive bank, is have. So havingness ran Level VI and Level VII simultaneously. It ran "out there" and "in there" too, and therefore, it's very workable on most people and a little bit steep for some, and some people it doesn't work on at all. And then you have to have all the special brands of havingness to try to get around this.

Well, they're just not capable of, they're just not capable of auditing two levels simultaneously, they're just not clever, it's too much for them, so just don't run it. That's easy. Run a pure objective or a pure subjective to straighten them out when you get your can squeeze going wrong. Can't get a can squeeze, well, you could probably correct the can squeeze subjectively or objectively, compared to whether the PC was aberrated on the subject of the physical universe because of attitude and behavior or aberrated on the subject of the – of the universe around him because he was – had an aberrated physical universe around him. You get the idea? Is his attitude toward the universe wrong, or has he got a wrong universe? Now, I think I've said it a little more comprehensive.

You understand, in talking to you about these things, I haven't actually had a chance to express them at all, I haven't written them up, these are your sole notes on all of this. Oh well, that's not true, there's about eight pages of reports on the subject, but it – it doesn't cover what I'm telling you, it just recovers the exact, precise, crisp findings. In other words, you – it gives you an insight, if you know this then this gives you this kind of an insight. PC's can squeeze is down. Well, it gives you the choice, then, of whether you get his can squeeze up by running off the locks of the session, which has been an introverted type session, see, and that would get his can squeeze up providing his can squeeze was down because of a subjective reason, a Level VI reason, a bank reason, a GPM reason. See? Suppress Prepchecking is totally subjective. Of course, you could prepcheck an exterior object, but it would have to be the object that is with you right this minute. You'd have to give the guy, "Be typewriter," or "A typewriter," and say, "Now, suppress that typewriter." You wouldn't be able to say, "Recall a time you have suppressed that typewriter," don't you see, you'd have to say, "Suppress the typewriter.

You do this with E-Meters all the time. Did you ever have something funny happen while you were doing reach and withdraw from an E-Meter? Well of course, you're not very aberrated on the subject of an E-Meter. But you get something around that would be really aberrative, don't you see? I know, get a fire, burn a fire, get a fire burning, little wood fire or something like that, and sit a PC down in front of it and exercise him on the subject of this fire. You say, "Reach the fire, withdraw from the…" "What?" "Mm-mm, just gonna run this little process, reach the fire, withdraw from the…" "[mumble] The hell with you!" "No now, come on now, well, how could we phrase this so that it's runnable?" "Well, you've given me a lose now and I wouldn't be able to run it at all." "Alright. Well, we'll start in on this thing on a gradient. Alright." Then, you get smart, don't you see, if you really know he's putting the physical universe there for himself and that is another bank, now you can get
very smart. And you say, "Alright. Heat up the fire. Good. Cool off the fire. Good. Heat up
the fire. Good." He'll say, "How am I supposed to do that?" "Well, just do it." "Well, I can
get the idea of..." "No no no no no, just, just you know, go nrrr-rrrr-rrrrrrrr, heat, and
nrrr-rrrr-rrrrrrrr, cold, and nrrr-rrrr-rrrrrrrr, that's the way you're supposed to do that." "Alright. If you
say so."

Now this is, this hasn't been done, don't you see, I've just given you, straight off the
cuff, these are theoretical abstractions as that might occur. You see?

And so, he does this for a while and he so he goes oooooo-ssn-mmmmmmm-mmmmmmm and
you know his fire is starting to flicker. And all of a sudden, he notices the fire, too. And you
say, alright, well let's, it, 'cause it did get a bit flat, why... This, by the way, would probably
register on the E-Meter too, because, you know, it's the physical universe but it would proba-
bly be the E-Meter registering back at the PC, don't you see, not the E-Meter registering to the
bank, or there'd be something crazy going on. I don't know exactly what would go on. I know
the E-Meter will register on the physical universe. The pc's reaction to the physical universe
causes a registry on the E-Meter as well as the bank reaction, apparently.

Now, you're next, you're next action, you see, of, is to tell this fellow, "Alright. Now,
reach toward the fire." "Well, it's gotten brighter." After a little while, you say "What's your…?", this is theoretical. "What are you telling me to do that for? What do you mean?
Why are you saying toward? Why don't – aren't you saying reach the fire, withdraw from the
fire, what's the matter? You changing the process on me? You squirrel or something?" And
you say, "Alright. Reach the fire. Withdraw from the fire." It's totally theoretical. You don't
say put your hand into the fire and take your hand away from the fire. But, you very possibly,
if this was exercised, it would be very possible if the fellow was up at, up at, he'd gone
through VI and was in VII, this would be a pipe, but I'm talking about a fellow that's still got
the human characteristics. And he'd be reaching into the fire and withdrawing from the fire
and reaching into the fire and withdrawing. If you got curious, say, "How can you do that?"
"Well," he'd say, "I never reach into a hot fire, man, I reach into a cold one." [laughter] Now,
just exactly what would happen if you put a thermometer in that fire, I wouldn't be prepared
to tell you. I don't know if it'd only be cold for him, don't you see, or if it'd be cold for every-
body. That's the point. These are little points of interesting speculation which, in due course,
one will get adequate subjective reality on this. Subjective reality is right over the hill, it's
very close, too.

But I myself have seen lamps move and have seen things happen in various types of
process that I never really competently understood before. I now know what it's all about. I
mean, I was doing at the time these things happened, an objective process. And of course,
spatial relationships of things change when you do it. I've often, I every now and then would
be auditing a pc and he'd find the distance to the wall has shifted. This is almost standard of
are they getting good reaction out of an objective process. By getting a good reaction out of it,
I mean, are they getting any improvement out of it, they going anyplace with this effective
process? Well, very often, they will make some remark like this but it's something mild and
you wouldn't, you really wouldn't be too alert because it sounds very mild when they say it.
"Well, the distance to the wall, the distance to the wall's good and the room has gotten larger,"
and so forth. And you've heard PCs say that and you've said to yourself, "Well alright, it just seems to him he's got an idea of this whole thing." And it never occurred to you the room had gotten larger, you know, the room was not, as far as he was concerned, two feet by three feet. The room is now eight feet by ten feet. Now, you could aberrate it in the other way around and get the room to get too large, and something might happen there.

But this, when you're going up through the levels, they are not – the processes in them, this was another datum I needed in order to make a final adjustment of any processes in there, although I consider them pretty final now at lower levels, but probably each one should have a little bit and a piece of an objective and a subjective. You see? We used to do this all the time, where everything was either, we had an objective and we had a subjective process for various things. We used to look out and look in. Now, this find three spots in your body, three spots in the room, is oddly enough an objective process, one hundred percent, because of course, the mind, the reactive bank, is not in the body. Just because you're looking into the body is no reason why you're inspecting the reactive bank. The reactive bank is a thing, it's got sort of mushy looking electronic masses and it's got pictures and locks and other things associated with this, it is a thing. Well, the physical universe and the remaining dynamics, of course, are themselves a thing. And that's what we mean when we say our universe and the other fellow's universe and everybody's universe, there were three universes, if you can remember rightly. Well, that apparently is very true, there are apparently three universes, but we were speaking of the reactive bank as meaning one of those universes where, as a matter of fact, that's a little bit of a curve in the line. It turns out that there was his universe, you know, his brick walls, and we're not sure right now whether or not they're his brick walls and everybody's brick walls or only his brick walls, or exactly what's the status of these brick walls, because we're right up a bunch, right up against the ability to disintegrate matter, all these various phenomena that... A yogi has been know as a good yogi if he could, you know, something or other, if he could levitate, you know, you've heard all these tricks and nonsense pieces and that sort of thing. This, this is a – this is, this is the level you're looking at. You see?

Now, exactly the extent and dimension and capability and if you do it, if it does it for everybody, and if we, if we blow up the rock of Gibraltar, is it also blown up for Spain or is it only blown up for England? A lot of interesting questions get asked there. And we can't, of course, at this instant give a final absolute exclamatory point answer, what is the condition of this stuff, and so forth. All the remaining Dynamics ask a question like what is a plant? Is a plant part of another thetan? Is it somebody who is keeping his eye on something or other which keeps it growing? You know, these are – these are all these very little interesting bric-a-brac type of questions that knock around in anybody's head. You're looking over this situation and, well, "I. What do I mean by I?" you see, and various questions. Well, they're your, your 7th Dynamic aspect and the bank as we see it is really not part of that. They're quite distinct.

There's an error in, a very small error, I like to call these things to your attention, there's an error in the early materials on Level VI that says you make – this has been consistently stated and it's now found to be incorrect, the bank is responsible for the physical universe. That is a felonious statement. The bank is responsible for the physical universe. No, the
thetan is responsible for the physical universe. The thetan is responsible for the physical universe and not via the reactive bank. Because he has walked up a GPM that has time in it is not then the reason why he had time.

Do you follow that? Well, it doesn't occur at Level VI, I had two levels together there. That occurs at Level VII and is a direct action, and the aberration itself is time and not a GPM about time. You follow that? That's a very subtle difference, nevertheless the other is a little bit too broad a generality and that, that have to be corrected to that degree. But the aberration is time, the aberration is not having a GPM that gives you time.

See? See? And then because you've got a GPM that gives you mud that makes mud aberrative when you fall into it, see, the aberration is mud.

Now, there is a state of mind and a set of agreements at Level VII which is not the GPM bank, and that state of mind keeps one fixed into the belief and keeps one, that there is a physical universe, and keeps one fixed also into the belief that everybody has one bank and one universe in common. That is the fixed belief. It looks like a first cousin to a GPM, but it's not GPM, but it looks like a first cousin to it. And that is what is at Level VII.

It's, it's the – the kinks in the thetan that bring about his belief in the oneness of everything and that kind of thing.

So anyhow, it's all very fascinating and you should distinguish between an objective, then, and a subjective process. And at any lower level, you could actually get clever enough to choose which one to run on the PC on the basis of what you've observed in the pc. This pc's car is a wreck. Well, we used to say if you straightened out various things, his car would be less of a wreck. Well, there's a more direct way you could do that. His approach to the world called car, see, is a 7th Dynamic thing and therefore if you did an objective process, it would straighten out faster, you don't have to worry about the think, you don't even have to worry about his, you see, the physical universe is not an experiential line and Level VII doesn't include the experiential line. You now escape engrams and experience and, and that sort of thing, they're not there, the experience. You see, one of the things you're stepping out of when you go from Level VI to Level VII, is you step totally out of the aberration because of past experience. That's gone, there isn't any. The aberration doesn't stay there because you've had the past experience. The past might be there but the aberration won't be there. You understand? So the basis of the whole idea, I know this is strange to you, you'd have, there'd no longer be a basic-basic to anything, don't you see, or anything like that because there wouldn't be a basic experience you have to trace forward like the first time you made any MEST.

That would not be the thing, actually the fact that you had made MEST at some prior moment and so forth, would have no bearing your having MEST now. Do you follow?

Well, the whole build up and the compounded nature of aberration vanishes at Level VI. You're no longer dealing with that at Level VII. Experience now will mean nothing. So you were in a train wreck yesterday? So what. It doesn't influence your condition today because you were in a train wreck yesterday. Do you follow that? You're not aberrated because your mother was mean to you anymore, don't you see, the whole aspect of that. As a matter of fact, at that point it appears to be that I would predict that it would be rather hard to grasp
how you could figure it out so that you could now be aberrated because then had had something happen to you. See? You can get that as the primary aberration that a person is facing all the time because of Level VI. I am the way I am because we – they dropped an atom bomb on my foot one day. See? Of course, that sounds perfectly logical to a human, but it would sound very illogical at Level VI. You're in bad shape because something happened? Why? Boy, how you connecting things up like that?

You crazy or something? You say you feel tired because you didn't have any sleep last night. Figure this out. You feel tired because you didn't have any sleep last night. Last night, oh, I get it. When do you feel tired? Oh, you feel tired now. Oh, I don't understand that, I can understand how you could feel tired last night. You know, it's last night and you're feeling tired. OK. That's a good game. You're, you're, as we talk, you're last night feeling tired. Yeah, that makes sense. OK. I got that so it's sense to me. I don't know why you're doing it. Flexercising or something?

Of course, it's up to you. You say that that isn't what you're doing, you feel tired now because you were up late last night. Hmmmm. How the hell are you doing that? Let's see. Well, you must be living in broadened time, is that what it is? Quite a game here, broadened time. Boy, you're going to get confused, if you do that. I wouldn't do that, if I were you.

And actually, from a rather sane viewpoint, that is more or less how it would look from Level VII when you try to make sense of what is humanoid obviousness, it doesn't make sense anymore. And you might, maybe you may run across some materials from Lord knows how long ago, you might have been there at the time, but during the period when I used to tell you, you couldn't be right and be human? Impossible to be right and be human. And that's absolutely true. It becomes incredible from a viewpoint of that upper level.

You couldn't be. If you were right to that degree, you would be at the upper level and you wouldn't be human. But to the amount of error that human obviousness looks like from these points of view, it's, it's just a brain-cracker, absolute brain-cracker. I can – I can bend my own wits around and see how it would look, you see, it'd look silly.

I already had a ball when I was going down the line adding this up, bangity-bangity-bangity-bang, and I was looking right straight at it, you know, and I was trying to keep my hair from standing on end and a few things like that, and just doing a competent job of observer, don't you see, which you have to. You can't go off and get a lot of case run while you're doing this. What ruins a lot of people in research is they get case advances. They don't maintain an objective viewpoint. They maintain an aberrated or subjective viewpoint which they don't need. And it was, it was quite interesting, I could see which way that was going and boy, you know, I had to drag myself away from that session with the crook on the neck or I would have gone right back and started running this stuff out and I'd probably cut my head off and had the ship sunk in the middle of the high seas, and Lord knows what all would have happened. But I had to lay it aside quietly and come home like a good boy. The "Now, I'll have at it. No no, I'm going to be a very good boy, I'm going to go ahead and finish the plot of, of the GPM because I've been taught by experience it isn't very likely to be turned out very accurately in a long period of time, so I better go ahead and finish that total plot up and then run them all like a good boy and, and..."
It's – a lot of it's done right now, I've got a stack of cards about that high. And then go on back on up to Level VII in an orderly progress. In other words, I will do exactly what I am advising everybody to do in general. [laughter] So, it's a matter of record here that Ron has for once taken his own advice. In other words, do as I do as well as I say.

So anyhow, that's about the extent of it. It shows that there's a – we're approaching, we're approaching, just to be unemotional about it and so forth, the point of all of the conundrums and all of this sort of thing, and they become very objectively shaken out, you don't have to be informed of them particularly, they just shake out. You, you get uncrazy on the subject of them and that's a very good thing. But it doesn't mean that you're not interested in participating and so forth, you can get more excited and, you know, more, more pleasure out of existence because it isn't kicking you in the head. And yet, I don't know, I've probably got 9/10ths of the bank in place and all of the physical universe sitting there staring at me and when I walk out of that door, I'm going to have to take hold of the knob.

So thank you very much.
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Thank you very much. I take that, that early applause you gotten there, who was that for, Mary Sue? Who was that for?

Audience: Mary Sue.

Mary Sue! Well, you want to be awfully careful – you want to be awfully careful how you encourage her! [laughter]

Ah, dear, she's having a ball. We've got a reorganization going and she's taking over the point of Staff Training Officer. That's where she is from a very high echelon. And we is about to go, organizationally, man – go, go, go. And frankly, I've had to clean everything off of my plate just so that I could turn out the materials necessary to carry it. And I found a bunch of natural laws in the field of economics which makes the subject of economics – all they had before was "supply and demand," you know. Kindergarten. They found out people – people exchange things, so that's economics, you see? [laughter]

The second I start doing VII materials – economies and organizations are a matter of the MEST universe. And let me give you a tip: If somebody around you or your organization is having trouble with organizational matters, you just processed them subjectively too long. It just doesn't matter how much you process them subjectively now, they're not going to go anyplace, the trouble with them is objective. See? And you want to give them objective-type processes, not subjective. And you'll find their eyesight will pick up and all kinds of wild perceptive things will occur, don't you see. And when I get back to this point of economic zing, why all we've got to do, all we got to – this isn't our main line of action, our main line of action remains Scientology.

All we've got to do is write this up. I've got these natural laws along this line, we'll write some textbooks up. And we formed up a course up at Telesurance to teach all these salesmen in the television industry. It's going over beautifully now after being in the run for a couple of years.

All that's very successful, all we have to do is use this, swell it up as a wave, get it a wider and wider carrier wave and next thing you know we'll be teaching every business executive who amounts to anything in the Anglo-American world. And as soon as we've got that channel being plowed open – of course we haven't got too much to do with that channel, you don't have to worry about that channel – the fellow will be asking all the time, "This stuff
works, this stuff works, this stuff works. Let's see, where's it come from? There's some obscure mentions of the subject called Scientology back of this damn thing." And they'll say, "Well, that's for me," don't you see?

And we'll put them on a demand basis of Scientology in the business world. That's where you come in. It doesn't mean that we'll be going into the business world, don't you see, you'll be going into – into the wider zones of society all this time on quite another, much larger channel. But this is just one of these little subsidiary channels, that's a leader. We've taken a couple, three years, now, to plow this little line, hasn't it? And then all of a sudden, why, we've got materials or product to put on this line of magnitude, it should go out with a crash.

But what's very interesting to us organizationally and much more important actually than its application in business, is the fact of having isolated these basic laws of promotion, organization and delivery – what are these things and how do you straighten up the lines and exactly what actions do you take along in this particular line.

Some years ago somebody came along and said well, we ought to be able to work out dissemination techniques out of the technology of Scientology. You've heard that often, I'm sure. Well, that's now being – that's been done and my plate is so doggone stacked up that trying to get it down into even its rudimentary form so that it can be issued is just a flat-out proposition. Ever since I come – came home my finger here from holding pens and that sort of thing is absolutely scarred and messed up to a fantastic degree. It's actually, you can feel it developing calluses all the way along the line. And – just trying to get the materials out.

Now, some of you have – well, this is the subject of the lecture. So let me finish off the footnote – the foreword on this. Your materials and so forth are coming to you with great rapidity, but this administrative material is right out – right out there in front because this will make Central Organizations. And I found all the points where they don't expand and all the things which make them not expand and things that automatically contract them and how organizations after they go through emergencies always shrink in size rather than increase in size – found all these various points.

So that in actual fact this technology is not the type of technology which you have in processing. It is the type of technology one should tell the janitor what the formula is – only this formula's applicable to a civilization – but you tell the janitor what the formula is and ask him to look that over with relationship to his job and follow it for a few days and he doesn't just sneer at you; it's very comprehensible to him. He says, "Hey! You know, that's true." And the next thing you know, why his lines are cleaning up like crazy and everything is going in all directions like crazy in the janitorial department.

His willingness to work was jammed by ignorance of the law which governed that work under its various conditions. That's interesting, isn't it? He was never really unwilling to work, but he was trying to handle his post or position in a rather ineffective and stupid way which would kill it off sooner or later, don't you see? Well, there was a right way for him to handle his post that he could follow, bang-bang-bang. Right now you could probably have a conversation, I don't think with what's-his-name, and I for – keep forgetting his name – the rest of the world has forgotten it almost, too. He's got some post up here in England, some kind or another, some kind of secretarial post.
And you could probably take one of his smarter ministers, and you could certainly take the opposition at the moment, and you could say, "Look, you're running formula one, or formula – yeah, you're running formula one backwards. Now, it goes in this sequence and not in this sequence, see? And you're running it in this sequence, and if you continue to run it in this sequence in England as you have for the last century, you will continue to get smaller as a nation. Now, all you've got to do is reverse these two in sequence. And instantly England will start expanding."

And he'd look that over and it's the same formula you gave the janitor, see? But the janitor understood, so for sure this guy will understand it. And even though he might louse up and do some weird things, as long as he followed this particular sequence and didn't reverse it or get it out or follow the wrong condition ... The guy's in a condition of poverty – this is not one of the conditions, but let's just give you an idea – he's in a condition of poverty and he applies the condition of affluence – the formula of affluence, you see. Well, he's going to – he's going to go appetite over tin cup. Of course that's a gross thing that anybody can see, but this other one is not quite as gross. But it's just as visible. All you've got to do is run one of these formulas backwards and you'll shrink, collapse, go bankrupt. It's villainous.

Now, you think I'm talking to you from a hidden standard basis, but I'm not. I'm merely announcing to you that the formulas do exist and that I am writing them down and you will have copies of the policy letters which have to do with that before the textbook is issued on this particular subject and that's about the value of what the material is. It means Scientology organizational expansion right on out, out, out, up, up, up, up. And our little subsidiary lines like an administrative line that plows into the business world and so forth, just readies you up a new market.

See, we can already reach it with just what we've got, don't you see? All right, let's get out into the business world and then all of a sudden create a future demand, so that after we've gone pretty distant in the present scope that we are operating in, we've developed a new scope. And after that, by that time, we will probably have some channel into government and we can then put in some little lines into government and then make those lines bigger and so forth, and there we go.

And you say "a world without war" and so forth; we'll have it, very soon. As long as they don't commit one before we make it. And that's the rush. And that's why I consider my plate so highly loaded, is we're operating against a schedule. We have, however, made all of our deadlines and there won't be anything happen in the immediately foreseeable future before we arrive now, which is very, very good news. I mean, it's no longer any question of our arriving before everything blows up because it's going to take about three years for China to complete its development to blow up things and by that time we'll be there.

So it was a nip and tuck proposition. The questionable periods are all behind us and that we can do something about it is rather fantastic. Now, you sit there and say, "Well, what could I do about this sort of thing." It's rather hard to see from a personal viewpoint. It's an operational organizational action that is required in order to utilize and channel your activities, and it requires a knowledge of the basic economic laws which apply to you and which make it possible for – do your post fitting inside a wider organizational structure which is
running right, don't you see? And those combinations are the combinations required. Organization is important to you, and – because only in that way can you build it on up to civilization level, don't you see?

So it goes from the individual to the single organization, from the single organization it goes to what you call all Scientology and it goes from all Scientology to civilization, see? And it's a gradient scale.

And just like – you are going to start out tomorrow and form personally without any assistance from anybody a new civilization. Well, of course, that just is like telling the pc, "All right, go ahead and run the GPMs," you see, and he's just in off the street – that looks impossible. But when you recognize that this would permit you to straighten out where you sit – right where you sit – as a person, straighten up your economic and organizational lines as a person and then move up a little bit higher than that. Permit you to straighten up the organizational and – activities and so forth from where you sit as a person – whether you're a field auditor or an organizational staff member, this doesn't matter. Your zone of influence in other words, small or large, you can straighten that up and all of a sudden it starts going zing, you see? You start going zing and then it starts going zing, then you realize that the component zings added together inside one Scientology organization and so forth would make it go zing and then the composite of those Scientology organizations all going zing, of course, makes Scientology go that way. You follow? And then no civilization could resist the impact.

And then your next – next action, of course, is a widening zone of influence, and your widening zone of influence goes out. In view of the fact that our intentions are good and are not based on anything reprehensible, why, we'll make it. If our intentions were entheta to some degree and so forth, don't you see, we wouldn't make it. We would have some success and then collapse.

But it's a foregone conclusion now – I can speak to you from the fact that it's now a foregone conclusion – that we will make it. This was still in doubt, let us say, January of last year, see. Would we make it in time? Well, we didn't have all of our technology and we didn't have this and we didn't have that and things were in question. Exactly what we would do was in question and so forth. Well, that picture has entirely changed now and there is no slightest doubt of our making it now. It's not even a question of how fast we will make it. It's a – it isn't a question of how fast we will make it, because as soon as the materials are in your hands you can't actually help but make it. It's unfortunate, you see? I mean, you've had it.

I know that here and there I will be smelling rubber as the brakes burn, don't you see? It won't do anybody a bit of good.

As I just say, it isn't the unwillingness to work on the part of the janitor, it's just he doesn't know which way to put the brooms, don't you see? What should he do as his first action in any given condition? Well, if he selects the long – wrong one – and the wrong selections he can make are almost infinite in an uninformed state – then what happens at a professional level of a professional in the intricacies of his decisions and so forth? Well, if there's a sorting-out formula which he applies to any given situation that carries him through right and he knows what he re... if he reverses a couple of these things he's going to go wrong, why, there isn't much doubt about his arrival, don't you see?
So this – we're back to the Chinese poet who was a very famous Chinese poet and is one of the greatest of Chinese poets even to this day, and every time he wrote a poem he would go down and talk to the old flower woman and read the poem to her. And if she didn't understand it, he'd tear it up. And if she did understand it, why, he'd publish it. And he to this day, thousands of years later, is the greatest Chinese poet.

Okay. This is what date?

_Audience:_ March 2nd.

Second? Second of March? Hmm! AD what?

_Audience:_ Fifteen.

I'll bet some of you thought "14." [laughter] March 2nd AD 15, and we've got our-selves a little lecture here about technology and hidden standards of technology and so forth.

You've got in the human race and in the mind, a barrier called a hidden standard. When anyone is critical, they are apparently criticizing against a hidden standard of behavior. They seldom tell you what the exact standard of behavior should be; they never spend much time on this. They just tell you what it shouldn't be. Your mama and your papa telling you that you were a bad girl or a bad boy very seldom defined for you what a "good girl" or a "good boy" was in – when they did, it was some – in some antipathetic definition that would have upset anyone to have tried to have been good that way, you see? Definition of a "good boy" is somebody who eats spinach. [laughter]

So, man doesn't even have a definition – well, he today doesn't have a definition of what a normal person is. Well, that's easy to see how he wouldn't have this because this character, "normal person," doesn't exist. Read a science fiction story recently in which some fellow was the normal average of the whole civilization, so they elected him president because they all wanted to relax or something and the civilization eventually collapsed. They – nobody knows what a normal person is, but... and that's easy to see why not. But nobody really knows what a good person is. A good person is something that isn't defined very actively.

Very few people write this up. The commies approached it recently in trying to write up what was a good communist. And they – it was very interesting; it was a Chinese effort. And he was apparently somebody who wanted no rewards, who wanted to be anonymous, who wanted no credit for anything he did and was totally anonymous and was missing as far as the society was concerned. I thought this was terribly interesting, knowing that if some-body isn't known to some slight degree, he gets no reward or anything else.

I can think of this, some poor guy in a Central Organization who has been working down there on the address machine or something like that and he's just been doing a bang-up job, don't you see, and somebody else comes along and is appointed Address In-Charge over his head and does a perfectly horrible job, you see, and gets an increase in pay and is moved on up through the line and so forth, and this guy keeps on running this little address machine and so forth. "Well," you say, "what's wrong with this bloke?" Well, there's something missing; he didn't make himself known. I mean, that's always part of work, you know? This anonymity, it gets somebody into awful lot of trouble, don't you see? Who's running the address machine? Well he is, that's all. And it's as crude as this – it's as crude as this: When he sees an
executive around the organization, much less the Org Sec and so forth, he should say, "I'm the fellow who does all of the address machine work," you know. Just as crude as that. Introduces himself.

In the business world this has become, in successful areas, a rather interesting action in that it's now courtesy for a fellow to announce his name whenever he is – meets somebody else for a conference, don't you see? Shakes somebody's hands, he always says his name. He doesn't wait to be introduced or something like this, he says, "John Jones. Glad to meet you, Mr. Smithers," which has just about gotten to be a standard courtesy among the more successful firms. So much so that Esquire has started to lampoon it and so forth, and it quotes one instance of saying, "Damn it, Bill, you don't have to keep saying 'Bill Smithers' to me. I'm your father, man!" [laughter, laughs]

But nevertheless, we must know it's a step in the right direction if Esquire's joking about it. Anyway, that's rather obscure, that joke, too. We have an index in Scientology of certain people fight things – they're almost test people – and if they fight certain things, then we know they're good so we do them. We know these people are instinctively trying to knock us in the head, so if they criticize certain actions which we undertake then we look these actions over very carefully for potentially successful actions. It isn't the sole reason we use, but oddly enough over the years it could have been. Do what your enemies protest. Always do what your enemies protest, and it's a crude test and it's not a perfect formula of success and it's not any natural law, but it nevertheless would get you through somehow when you had no other line of judgment.

For instance, the examination system – these little tests and systems are quite interesting as they weave through the society – the way they choose doctors to get top doctors, knowing well that the examination system just doesn't work in the field of medicine – the theoretical examination only with no practical application, don't you see, of course, doesn't work. In actual fact, appointments to major hospitals are usually measured on the fellow's position on the football team. Look it over for a minute. You talk about a wildly gone test, see? They have no other standard which is reliable, and if you think the standard over for a moment, as a medical doctor was telling me just last night, it's not too bad a standard. It's preferable to a weighted standard which doesn't turn out a result.

So, the standard that you could use in that particular instance: "Well, let's see, we don't know whether he was examined fairly or unfairly. We don't know whether he was good, bad or indifferent. We don't know whether we've got a fellow with initiative or no initiative. We don't know what kind of a fellow we've got. Well, what was his – what was his position in the realm of sports in the medical college and so forth? Oh, he was captain of the football team. Well, very good. That's the – out of these candidates, that's the man we want." Yet the fellow was supposed to be an orthopedic surgeon. This would be his qualification for an orthopedic surgeon, don't you see? Given the fact that he got through the medical college, they have then no other security on how to rate the man, so they merely take – he must have been popular, he must have been fairly well physically coordinated, he must have been able to get along somehow and he must be somewhat extroverted in order to be in this position.
But maybe he was – when we apply this to basketball, this would of course, in the United States, give us only surgeon generals in hospitals who were six feet seven. [laughter] So it's not a very good way to define it. And you'll find examination and selection of personnel gets into trouble continuously for lack of a standard; lack of a standard. There is no proper standard.

The hospital is blaming the university, but just as I found that some of our nonexpansion and so forth was traceable to the fact that my plate was too full – in other words, the non-expansion was traceable right there under my chin. And yours, too, don't you see – but nevertheless it was traceable to my chin. There it was, you know, and if I couldn't handle certain of these items – if I didn't have time to handle certain of these items – it would cripple expansion, don't you see? I had to make, then, way to do this. So, they blame – whereas I might have blamed the organizations or the field auditor, which I didn't – you know, say, "Well, the reason we're not expanding is he's not working," see – all the time, all the time holding on to the materials in front of me here that he needed vitally – There's troops on the front line – they've got neither guns nor ammunition, don't you see, or directions of how to load them if they did have, don't you see? Nobody's even pointed out the enemy and so on, and all of that directional action and coordinative action is stacked up on one plate not done, see? Not digested, there it is. So, of course, how could you expect him to do anything.

Well, the medical university is blamed, of course, then, by the big general hospitals for not making it plain which is the best student. Well, when we get down to this, this is another operation of the hidden standard. In other words, the medical hospital is running a hidden standard on the university because the medical hospital is not telling them what an optimum surgeon is.

Now, they'd have to have – before they could demand of the medical university what was a good doctor or a good surgeon, then they would have to have a complete map of this individual. And they'd say, "Now, you give me somebody who fits these characteristics, and he will be appointed at once to our staff." They would have to do this. But they don't do this. It's almost a human foible that they don't do this. It's general. They set up a hidden standard. They don't say, and then they say to somebody else, "deliver it." "I'm not going to tell you what boojum is," – remember the old joke from way back? "I'm not going to tell you what boojum is, but you've got to give me some." That's the hidden standard at work. And you'll find it all through.

Now, you've got, then – you've got this situation where the individual is not able to know what's – what he's supposed to deliver. If everybody stands around and says, "Give me some boojum," and then he doesn't know what boojum is and so on, why, he gets into a sort of a spinny, confused state. And the wife says, "Well, you're not a successful husband," and he goes around holding his head in his hands saying, "I'm not a successful husband." Well, it's very interesting because he hasn't got a clue what a successful husband would be. What was a husband?

You could probably handle all marital relations just with that datum of the fact that people run a hidden standard on others, and that you, to straighten up that situation, only need to demand to know the standard. You do this sometimes out of rancor and so forth in debate.
and so forth, "All right, well what is a good boy?" don't you see? But if you were to make a wife who objected to her husband – now, we know technically it's because she hasn't understood him and got overtts, but that's the mental aspect. We'll talk about the VIIth – the VIIth – you see, the physical universe aspect of here, the level VII. What exactly – the relationship of the spirit to the physical universe. What exactly is she demanding be out there in front of her? That – what is she demanding be out there in front of her? And you're liable to find all kinds of things.

Now, you run into this as a – oh, you could make her define it. And you'd straighten up all sorts of things. You'd find out it was supposed to be Cary Grant, don't you see? Or Rudolph Valentino, and he's been dead for years. Very hard to furnish. [laughter] So it's – it gives an apparent atmosphere of dissatisfaction. And people who are going around in a state of dissatisfaction – perfectly all right for people to be dissatisfied, there'd be no challenge in the environment unless they were. But if you wanted to do something about this and so forth, the thing to do was – would be to discover what they would be satisfied with. And there you're going to pull the longest comm lag in history on some people. They're going to sit there for hours, man. For hours! They can't tell you.

Now, we used to have processes that handled this sort of thing with auditors. Now you, as an auditor, come up against this very, very often. Very, very often. And you as an auditor have to face up to pcs who are running a hidden standard on you all the time. And you have somebody that say, "Only L. Ron Hubbard could audit me," – and you've run into this character, a large majority of you have – are actually looking at somebody who is running some kind of a hidden standard. But you never probably realized he was also running a hidden standard on me. See? Not only you, but me, too. And Lord knows – Lord knows what his standard for me is! And even more intimate to the situation is Lord knows what his standard for you is.

Now, you say, "Well, it's hardly worth dreaming up because it has something to do with Saint Peter or the Archangel Michael or something like this. You'd have to be the Virgin Mary to audit him, you know?" [laughter] You must realize that when you look at that situation you are not looking really at a standard, but a perversion. So you could be more specific and call it a "hidden perverted standard." But nevertheless, he does have a standard, so we could call it a standard, but it's hardly real enough to merit very serious acknowledgment on our parts. And we make a mistake when we don't rather seriously acknowledge this fact, because it's the unacknowledgment of the standard which he holds which has held it parked on the time track. Nobody's ever acknowledged this standard, you see?

She's always demanded that her husband – ba-ba-ba-ba-ba, and it's probably something silly. And – so that if she, in any lifetime – it's probably – you know, and the other thing is, is they carry these on for lifetimes. Even when they address you, the auditor. It's for years, they – oh, ages and ages and ages they've had this same standard that anybody who was going to do anything for them had to, don't you see, and then it's blank-blank-blank. And in this case the wife, you see, in order to have a husband that she could have any faith in, the husband would have to blank-blank-blank – well, whatever it is, don't you see. And if she announced this originally way back in Lord knows what lost eons to some fellow, he probably laughed at her. It's probably something silly, don't you see? You know?
It's like, "If you were really a husband, why, on Saturday morning at 9:30 you would bring me red roses." Of course he can't do it because he doesn't know this is what she requires. She has forgotten this, because the first time she ever announced it: "I would really realize you cared for me if every Saturday morning at 9:00 or 9:30 you brought in a vase full of red roses – and it must be in a green vase and so forth – and then I would know exactly where I stood with you. And when you stop doing this, I will realize that you've gotten tired of me, don't you see. And we will set this up as a code system."

Maybe it worked once or twice, you see, very successfully. And then all of a sudden she met some fellow and she said, "This is the code symbol," and of course it was rather silly – if it had much to do with love it would be silly. [laughter] I'd hate to replay some of my own very youthful conversations in this particular line. (When I say youthful, I mean way back on the track when I first got mixed up with humans.) I probably sounded very silly. It's sufficiently that today I always have a little bit of a hard time writing dialogue of that character in stories when I do write stories and so on. I have trouble with it, so it obviously is something that gets you in trouble.

Anyway, it was some silly standard of this particular character, and this bird laughed in her face. Didn't acknowledge it. Nonacknowledgment. So when you add up these various inventions and characteristics, you must realize that not one of them has ever been acknowledged if they are now still in existence. They've not been acknowledged. They have been refuted or protested. And so the standard is the collection of nonacknowledgments that the person holds in some zone, sphere or activity. It's this collection of nonacknowledgments.

Now, if you want – now this goes further than that. See, acknowledgment is quite a mechanism. If you want to end a cycle of action, you acknowledge. But let me show you something: that if you don't want to end a cycle of action, don't acknowledge. This has terrific application to auditing. There's such a thing as a half-acknowledgment which is actually a "continue," an encouragement. This has had part of our interest in our own technology. We use this, the half-acknowledgment, you see – the encouragement. The "Mm-hm, mm-hm, mm-hm..." And people who acknowledge that way very often wonder why on earth people talk to them forever. [laughter] They shouldn't blame the person talking to them forever, they just never have acknowledged what the person said. And they go on, "Mm-hm, mm-hm, well, hmm. Well, well. Mmm, mm-mm, mm, hmm..." [laughter] And next thing you know, the poor bloke talking to him and so forth finds he's got a dry throat and his head is starting to ache and just realizes suddenly he's not being received or acknowledged, don't you see? If he's not received he'll ARC break and if he's not acknowledged he'll go on talking. You see, to that degree, then, he is trapped in this cycle.

All right. Acknowledgment, a very full acknowledgment of any given cycle, ends it and a nonacknowledgment continues it. Hidden standards are merely a collection of nonacknowledged things. They've never been acknowledged. So therefore, they're kind of goofy. You see, if nobody ever agreed with them, never acknowledged them and so forth, why, naturally they'd be pretty nutty. So all these hidden standards are nutty. And they form some of the most interesting bric-a-brac that you ever saw disassociated on one sheet of paper, when you start writing them down. They just don't seem to bear any resemblance to anything, don't you see? Well, that's because they come from civilizations we know not what of anymore. That's
because they come from customs and peoples that we have no contact with. And the person himself has forgotten where it came from anyhow, don't you see, or who he was when he first collected it.

But the common denominator of all hidden standards is that it's nonacknowledged material. It's not that it's protested or suppressed, no, nothing violent about this, it's just that it's never acknowledged. Do you follow? That's why people tend to get uglier after a certain period than prettier. Nobody ever says, "My, how ugly you look today!" [laughter] Nobody ever does! "Goodness, I certainly see you've been putting on weight lately!" [laughter] "Thank you!" Don't you see? And one of the fixations into the form of a human body and so forth is because nobody ever says to him, "Well, I see you've become a man this lifetime, Gertie! Good for you!" If it was discovered early on the track it would have been on the basis of, "What? You're a man this lifetime?"

This – these nonacknowledgments as we come up the line. Now, this is very applicable to Registrars, very applicable to your handling of pcs, very applicable to handling of students and that sort of thing. It's really – it's really hot material. And this is a borderline on organizational material. This is just borderline, however. It's not one of the laws. If you acknowledge the person before he arrives in any way, shape or form, he won't arrive. And I discovered this in 1952, quite accidentally. On looking back over 1951, I found out – I was working on whole track research, and in 1951, on a study of a situation which I was making at that time, I found out that my own work had never prospered better and that things for a certain period of that time had never run better (this was true within limits, see; it was compounded by the fact that I wasn't on deck, too, and that messed it up) but – never answering procurement letters – if I never answer personal letters theyARC break with me, but procurement letters – nonanswering of procurement letters had resulted in more people coming in for auditing than when procurement letters were answered.

You say, "Well, there must have been a lot of silly answers." No, before that there just – nobody answered them very much, but there was an attempted mail line along this line in the early Foundations. But in that particular zone and period there was no attempt of any kind to answer any such letter as "I want some processing and I will be in next August." There was no slightest attempt. And more people came in. You explain it.

All right, well all these years later, there's the explanation, see? Thirteen years later, there's the explanation. Nobody ever acknowledged their intention and so as-ised it and so ended its cycle. Person intended to come in, they wrote to the organization and said so. Then if somebody there answered up and said, "Good! Thank you! Fine! All right! Oh, you're going to come in, well that's very good, thank you so much," it probably left him in a bit of a daze, and they never arrived.

But the person who said, "I'm going to come in for processing one of these days," who had received a letter, "Well, we've got a lot of auditors available at the beginning of the month; I hope to see you," they probably would arrive very expeditiously. And you'd never dare put an acknowledgment in a procurement letter. Just – or nobody will ever appear for training or processing. If you acknowledge too heavily you can just cut it down to nothing.
And that's something you'd better find out as an auditor. This guy says, "You know, I'd like some processing."

"Good for you! Fine!" That's the end of his auditing! [laughter] The right procedure is just severe – is very, very good courtesy. Tell him how much and where and that you hope to see him there. If anything, a little doubtfully. "Well, so many hours, that'll be – cost you about five hundred dollars and the usual auditing periods are in the afternoon and I will be available next week. Do you have any time next week?" Well, the person says, "Well, yes, yes, I do have." Don't say, "Good," see? Say, "All right, well, see you, probably – probably see you Monday morning, then, huh? I hope so." And the person will come on in and be audited. Do you follow that?

This applies also to such things as appointments. Let's take a military appointment. The laziest people in the world are military people. I know, I've been one. You in actual fact get the most action out of one when he's working toward being something and get the least action when he is it. So you commission them – and the military is peculiar, then, as being one of the laziest areas known to man, would then be investigatable from the standpoint of what makes it that way – that's because they issue commissions. The man is a lieutenant. He is a captain. He is a major. He's commissioned as a major. That finishes it. That's an acknowledgment. That finishes it right there. He doesn't have to work to be a major now. He doesn't have to keep going to run the company; he doesn't have to do anything else. He is a major. And of course these are the most cocky, overbearing, insufferable people with regard to rank you ever had anything to do with. That's all they've got – they've arrived. So you're dealing all the time...

Now, it sounds very funny and I won't try to phrase this expertly or usably or anything else, but their commission should read, "You have been a captain and thereby are qualified to work toward the rank of major." Isn't that fascinating? "You're qualified to work toward the rank of major." Now, this would thank him and wipe out all the monkey business and upsets and so forth of his captaincy and would be a very kind thing to do. And you've given him something to work toward on his next rank. Unfortunately, you're going to see this function of – a type of this sort of thing in organizations in their appointments and so forth. You'll see some shadow of this. But it operates like magic.

The old businessman who doesn't – he is, he is the general manager. Leaves him only thing – one thing to work for, man, and that's the next post up, which makes him, of course, a sort of a revolutionary bloke and overthrows the board and does various things, but he ceases to do that and one day he realizes that he's working toward retirement.

He's got to have something to work toward. So he can work toward a vacation or he can work toward retirement. Of course, when he's reached retirement he's had it because there is no rank higher than retirement. There's nothing to go forward to so there's nothing to attain so there is no future. And you could actually look over actual statistics on this, of the number of blokes who kick the bucket immediately after being retired and you can assign it to many things and you just better assign it to acknowledgment. That's where it belongs. Retirement is an acknowledgment of his total active life. A reward and acknowledgment for your total ac-
tive life. "You're an active human being, thank you," is what it's saying, see? Nobody's ever wished him any further longevity, see? That acknowledges that.

And that alone – of course there are many other contributing factors – but that's the central factor. An acknowledgment of his total active existence would finish him. An acknowledgment in the form of a military commission of a major, of course, makes a major. It doesn't have – the guy has no future and he has no place to go. Makes the military very conservative.

Now, you could say eventually he will become a lieutenant colonel, a light colonel, by the selection system. Or he will become something by the selection system, he hopes. And a lot of those boys are working on it on a career basis, but how many of them around are there who don't work on it on a career basis? It's a funny thing because it's an invitation to overthrow their superiors. You want to know why they have mutinies at sea and in armies and that sort of thing? Well, that's the basic reason.

Nobody ever said to anybody when he was advanced to lance corporal, "Thank you for having been a private. You are now entitled to work toward lance corporal, while wearing the chevrons and so forth of a lance corporal." Now, we – in organizations and so forth – we have to differentiate between the being and the hat. Probably not occurred to many people in organizations and so forth that there is a hat called D of T. And the only way that person can get in trouble is to be George Smith while he's pretending to be the D of T. No, the D of T is a set of beingnesses and lines and actions and policies all by itself, and that is the D of T. And then there's a being who runs the D of T hat. Now, the only way he can get in trouble is to be George Smith miscalling himself D of T. See, he's operating like George Smith one hundred percent of the time and never operates as anything but George Smith, don't you see? (Someday we'll have a D of T called George Smith – I can see it now.)

But don't you see, he's only George Smith. He has no familiarity or knowingness with regard to what this hat is, so of course he can't wear it. He's not studied it or something like this, you see? So he goes around operating as George Smith. He isn't even operating as, let us say, an HCA or an HPA either. He isn't wearing that hat either. Well, this would make a pretty random training department and I think you'd object to it and would be one of the first ones to object to this training department because the hat of D of T is the functioning hat there and it is not being worn.

Well, the funny part of it is it must be in the process of being attained, always. In order to get a hat on you must put it into the process of being attained. Very peculiar. Because the attainment is an acknowledgment, the second that you mention that it's been attained, why, that is the end of that. Do you follow? Now you've given the guy no future, you've cut off the finished cycle of action, he doesn't study it anymore, he sits back and relaxes and the hideous part of it is he may be sitting back and relaxing as the D of T.

Now, you have a hat, D of T, which is apparently being worn because you don't have George Smith. You can't really detect Smith-isms and yet the D of T hat isn't running. So you wonder what on earth has happened here and you get a condition of noncompliance. Not to go off into organizational matters, this all applies to a hidden standard.
Do you see that these mechanisms—the only thing I'm showing you is these mechanisms of acknowledgment have a great deal to do with life and existence. And there's some rather astonishing things to find out about that. You have to be very careful what you acknowledge as an auditor and very careful to acknowledge certain things. And therefore your acknowledgment can't always be "good" because it's sometimes insulting. Little Arthur tells me he's had a horrible day at school, I don't dare tell him "good." Do you see? Because he gets upset with me, I'm insufficiently sympathetic to be talked to, don't you see? And I say— I say something on—"Well," making sure that I did, "well, you had a horrible day at school, I'm sorry about that. I'm really sorry about that. Well, at least it's an ended day, isn't it?"

"Yes, that's right!" [laughter] He's already told me about it, I've received it and to that degree acknowledged it and it instantly goes onto the backtrack. In other words you as a person or you in an organization or you in civilization have the power to put somebody's past on the past track and to give them a future. And if you want to kill them dead and so forth, why, you never fail to acknowledge everything with a crash. And this, of course, gives them no future, no future, no future, no future. And you haven't got them stretched out on the track—you've got them stacked up on the track.

Supposing you always acknowledged, "Well, I'm awfully glad you're going to be a painter, that's fine. That's a very, very good career. That's—painting is a good career, thank you for being a painter." Or even, "Thank you for dreaming up the idea of being a painter." Guy would feel suddenly lost. He wouldn't quite know what happened to him. Well, you've cut his future out from underneath his feet. You could do this.

The thing to do is worry about how he's going to become a painter. And you'll find him take off in a steep spiral. They just go, zing, right on upstairs on the subject. You don't be doubtful about it. "Well, all right, you're going to be a painter, eh? That sounds—you're going to be a painter, you say. What—what—what's the best schooling or training for that kind of a career, you know? What's the best schooling or training?" And get involved in some deep argument about what would be the best schooling and what would be some style that would be best to master, or something of this character, and just keep on talking in that line. And then when you break it off of course, acknowledge the conversation, not the action. "Well, it was good talking to you!" See, that puts the conversation on the backtrack and doesn't leave him hanging with it, see? There's a fine art here involved with the handling of acknowledgment. And you could handle your environment quite markedly and quite remarkably with acknowledgment. It's something that needs quite a bit of study, but it is an interesting weapon. And it is a very interesting way to help and it has many, many uses and many ramifications and many complexions.

Now, recognize then that something that had quite a few uses and so forth would be very easily gang agley on the backtrack. Very, very easily go off into the wild blue yonder, very easily get perverted. Be—very easily get twisted. Very easily get messed up. When it gets messed up then you have a thing called a hidden standard—is one of the many things which arise out of the immediate result. Amnesia is one of the things that arises out of it. Guy's shot—that's too much of an acknowledgment for his former lifetime, so of course he forgets it. That's the basic mechanism behind not remembering a past life.
Now, things that aren't acknowledged because they were totally out of agreement, while good things that were in agreement were acknowledged, bring about a condition where everything disappears out of the person's past except the nonacknowledged things that people thought were silly or something of this sort or protested or were upset about. And so this gives you a decay of personality as the fellow moves along a time track.

Therefore, whether you had GPMs or not – and the GPMs account for it – I'm not talking to you about what you might call native aberration. A person would be subject to these things anyhow, but not to any vast degree and he would be able to recognize them and do them and undo them almost at will, don't you see. You couldn't do very much to a guy to hold him down, but he will nevertheless be prone to these things. If he didn't know these things, he could use these tools the wrong way to, you see. And get into a mess again – but not to the serious degree that he did, but he would find himself going downhill a little bit and so forth. Well, he should know some of these things. And one of them is, he would have a tendency to collect all those things which were never acknowledged.

Now that's because, of course, he has some dependency on the communication formula. When you've licked that why, of course, you've probably risen above this line. But I still think you will want to communicate with somebody. And as long as you have any desire to communicate with somebody or do communicate with somebody to any degree or are having an association with anybody, you will be liable to certain parts of the communication formula, one or another, and when they go awry, why something is really going to go awry, you see? That you don't retain this as aberration is the future state of affairs. You won't retain it as aberration, you see, it won't go on and on and on, and you won't be aberrated on it forever. But one could regulate his conduct and so forth by knowing what parts of the communication formula were good and what parts were bad, what parts would natively get him into trouble and wouldn't get him into trouble.

In other words, if you're going to – if you're going to associate with your fellow being – and we can assume jolly well that you will – if you're going to associate with your fellow being, why you are then going to have to use a communication formula. And you can work it out any way you want to, it's going to wind up as the communication formula. You could have it three-way and try to dream it up in seventeen different ways, but you would eventually come around to the same communication formula that you've got, which is cause, distance, effect, with intention and attention and so forth, and this can have certain things go wrong with it. Nothing's going to change about that. And therefore, the material I'm giving you now is native aberration rather than made-up or agreed-upon aberration, and so on. Well, the agree-upon aberration and so on, GPMs and so on, they have a tendency to hold enough foundation so that the bank tends to retain these minor aberrations which collect, you see? And you get a hidden standard.

Now basically, you're talking about what is insanity. Well, insanity could be two things. It could just be this collection of unacknowledged things or it could simply be the outright overt commands in the GPMs, you see, to be nuts, which exist, you see, in the GPMs. And you've got then a direct source of direct aberration – got a direct source of direct aberration – and then you've also got – that's the GPMs and the basic reactive mind, you see – and
you've got this other thing which could stem from a native condition of the being. He's liable to this type of aberration, see?

Now, when you get both of those things working together, the GPMs or the basic reactive bank can hold the collected aberrations or nonacknowledged things and so on, in firm position and make them assume tremendous importance and make them quite aberrative. So insanity actually could be defined at first surface glance, don't you see, as just that collection of things which have never been acknowledged and the person is not in agreement with the physical universe about. I refer you to many years ago; we've had many lectures on this subject.

Person is – if nobody agrees with anything a person does, of course he's crazy. They all brand him as crazy. Well, they don't acknowledge those things and they don't realize that what he is doing is the collection of things which have never been agreed with and therefore never been acknowledged. Now, knowing that about aberration – knowing that about aberration – you can actually take aberration apart bit by bit in almost anybody. Well, you know that he's going to run into aberration at the level of Level VI and Level VII and you're going to have this type of aberration appear which is just a collection of not-agreed-with things. In other words you've got two areas that you can work with here. It's either the areas which are from the fundamental bank and fundamental universe; those areas. And you've got another area which is the incidents of livingness. The accidents and incidents of livingness and what happens to him in the progress of life.

Of course this – there's no doubt about it that that's about eight billion to one. But the funny part of it is that it's eight billion volts worth of reactive bank, you see, and only one volt worth of accumulated locks. See, that would be the relative effective power of the thing to make him run crazy. You see, the bank is there, that is it. But there's this other, you see, there's this one volt proposition, too – it's also there. That's this native liability for the collection of aberration by the thing that nobody agrees with certain holdings and so on that he does. Nobody ever acknowledges these things and so on. Well, that's there.

Well of course, when an individual is very pinned down, you'll find that the reverse is what he thinks it is. You see, he thinks that it's the one volt worth which has got the billion volts of charge in it, and that the bank itself couldn't possibly be making him do anything like this. It must be life, it must be the fact that his mother denied him peanuts all during his youth that makes him crazy and so on. You've seen people around, they're always assigning their aberration to what they can confront. And they can't confront very much and so you listen to former schools of the mind and you'll get the rather interesting view of man is this little flimsy straw in the wind, you know? Corporal coughs unduly hard one night on night patrol and it frightens a person so much that he's been a shock case in a mental hospital ever since, you see? And you get an idea that man and beings are not hardy and that they can't stand up to certain kinds of mental shocks. Matter of fact they can.

But they've already stood up to too much shock just by the basis of having a reactive bank. Now, therefore you can take a human being apart or handle a human being, and so forth, in two different ways. You can unburden the charge of the reactive bank, which is to say clear off these locks, key them out – however you want to call this thing – but just detach
them from the reactive bank, get them sort of blown up and put into place and proximity and so on – and by doing this you tend to key out the reactive bank so that it's not immediate because these little locks make a connection between the individual and the bank, don't you see?

And so you could knock those out and you could sort of pat the bank back into place and the individual will feel pretty good and he'll tell you – he'll look pretty good and so forth, and of course, that's eight billion times what anybody has ever been able to do before for a human being. And this is so fantastic...

You know, many people don't realize that what's gone up is not the delivery. We've been delivering pretty well at the level which we were delivering. But what's gone up is what we could deliver. And this has gone up so high and the nomenclature that describes it is so unchanging, and the states which can be attained are so unimaginable and undreamed of, don't you see, that it looks like maybe we haven't delivered the lower states. Do you see how this could be?

There have been people cleared up of aberration since time immemorial which is all that Clear meant. Well, Clear would just be this matter of kicking out these little things, keying them out, disconnecting the fellow from his bank, giving him a better, more rational look at the existence, permitting him to perceive the physical universe around him. And after a while, why he considers he's pretty much a human being, compared to what he was before.

See, we leave out this comparative thing, we're now running, you see, the human standard on the – I mean the hidden standard on the person. You follow that? So nobody will then admit that you have reached any state because nobody has ever told you what state you were supposed to reach in the first place. That is to say, amongst your fellow human beings. What state were you supposed to reach? And then the hidden standard with regard to a state, people have a tendency to put the hidden standard in place of the actual standard.

If you want to know what a state of Clear is, it's just a free needle, with the tone arm at the male or female read. That's all the state of Clear is. There isn't any other standard connected to it. Not today. You see, this has been the test for Clear for many, many, many years. And if you keep rushing at it and plunging at it all the time and hammering at this individual and running processes over his head, of course his tone arm is going to go up and the needle's going to stick. If you keep trying to assign his aberration to the wrong areas and you don't just key out the thing, and so forth, why you're going to make his tone arm climb. He's going to feel worse. He's not going to be Clear. Do you follow?

So this kind of a cycle sets in: You finish him up in a session, he feels good, then he runs into the human race after the session. And they run a hidden standard on him and they make – try to make him prove that he's maybe now in a better state.

This medical doctor – I almost laughed in his face last night. I actually did. I sm... I smiled – I went on talking to him but I almost roared in his face. He had the cast-iron nerve to ask me to prove the workability of Scientology and actually my jaw dropped, you know? Now, of course these guys are in the dark on this sort of thing, and so forth, and all that, and we can understand all that. But nobody's done that to me for years. He set up – he wanted me to do some kind of an experiment and so forth, and I know why he wanted me to do an experiment: he's in trouble one way or the other 'cause he brings this up every time he talks to
me, he wants some auditing. Sooner or later I'm going to have to audit him. Or get somebody to.

But this bird, this bird was asking for proof. Well, the day passed a long time ago – long, long ago – about proof. And the public and so forth that suddenly starts telling you that you should prove to them it works and so forth, well, at least be up to a reality where you feel like laughing at them. Because it's what – all they deserve. Now, anything that's been in existence and been shot at this hard for a period of fourteen years must have been workable all the way along the line to some degree or another – must have been more workable than other areas and zones of work – so the comparison must have been pretty good; and anything that went up from a few hectograph copies of a little tiny book to organizations on every continent with comm lines that reach from here to the moon, certainly is not an unworkable activity.

If it were a totally fraudulent activity, the government would have shot us down long before. They still try, but they flub. They miss. They're missing all the time. They can't make it. We couldn't ever stand up to any attacks if we were that way. And yet we just stand up to them all and sooner or later they all blow over.

But the point here – the point here – is that we must have been better and we must have been furnishing more service and the funny thing I woke up to the other day is the fact that Scientology, done very wrong, is far better than anything man ever had before. That's something for you to wonder about. I mean, it could be alter-ised to a fantastic degree and still work, you know? Well, what it will do when it isn't alter-ised is fantastic, see? I mean it's exclamatory. And it really, in the public view, has never emerged into that state. But in the state it's been in it has built an empire of considerable size.

So somebody coming up to you and saying, "Well, prove that it works," start laughing. Because it's funny. It's funny. What proves that something works is demand. If it didn't work there wouldn't be any demand. I know I can do an awful fast sales talk. I know that. But believe me, people getting faster sales talks than I'm giving them right now and it's brought right into their home at vast expense by TV. The American Medical Association spends far more money blowing up the doctor, far, far more money advertising the doctor and so forth, than we ever dreamed of. And their sales talks are so fantastically greater than me at my highest points of optimism; face it. Really fantastic, the comparative line. And they're shrinking and we're growing. They're shrinking. And they're advertising an appeal budget and organizational setup – and the budgets and so forth they get from governments are utterly fabulous – and they're shrinking.

They're about to fall apart in England. Did you ever realize that this symptom of fall apart – they permitted themselves to be taken over by a government; now they want out, now they're striking. Striking against the government? What kind of a position... What are they, some mendicants or something or other? Carrying banners outside of parliament? "Pay us more money so we won't starve." That's a very, very shabby look for a professional organization. Frankly, they are going to pieces. You say, "Well, they couldn't possibly be," and so forth. Well, they never look better before they – just before they fall on their heads. They have decided to become a monopoly. They have decided all sorts of things. And all of these things backfire. They're not delivering.
If you go out amongst the public and count public noses, if you counted a Scientology group, counted noses, you'd find some small percentage in that group had not had delivery. See, it'd be a small percentage in the group. Let's just take a random group someplace or another. I don't -- wouldn't even venture what the figure was because I've never done it, see. Not like Gallup -- can't make it up according to which party pays me the most.

But I know if you went into the general public, which is the doctors' group right now, about healing and so forth, and counted noses, you'd get nothing but sour grapes, the figure would be fantastic. The percentage would be quite reversed. The number of successfuls would be our number of failures, and our number of successfuls would be their number of failures. You see, and the percentage would be just reverse. You've got to deliver. That's all there is to that.

Now, what is delivery? Well, delivery is tremendously interfered with with this idea of a hidden standard. You'll find out that a sales talk or what you've offered to the individual, has nothing to do with it. Being Clear, being a Release, being anything else has nothing whatsoever to do with it at all. This is all a pale shadow. There's no reason to talk to them about this because they're going to set up a hidden standard around this thing. To some people Clears are OTs; and to some people -- a guy, perfectly willing, golly, he doesn't have an excruciating pain across his eyes -- thank heaven he's now Clear, don't you see? Another bird, why, he'd have to be twice as tall as the Empire State Building, you see, and be able to do ballet on the top of a milk bottle -- there's all kinds of these things.

And you say, "What are all these definitions of Clear?" Well let me tell you frankly, you can't settle one down. It bucks straight up against the hidden standard, see? You can't settle this thing down. Because you've talked to a man basically about freedom and his optimum state that he envisions for himself. And that's different practically for every human being there is. He has to find his own optimum state. But you use this statement of Clear and it means what it is. It's an adding machine term. And you clear off certain aberrations and you clean off the reactive bank of the accumulated locks, which are also part of the bank, but connected intimately to the individual that key it in. You clean those things off, you had cleared those things one after the other, don't you see?

And when you've gone as far as you can go in that direction and this is pretty clean, and it will show on the meter as a floating needle, and -- I remember I was Clear as a bell, I don't know, several years ago. You didn't know I ever heard this -- but I was demonstrating the E-Meter during one of these lectures and so forth and I put myself on the E-Meter and Herbie was sitting over -- way over -- corner -- to the side where he could see the meter. Well, the needle was floating and it had been floating for some months, because I hadn't gone on with investigation in any other upper line. It was about the time I was taking off into the total investigation of reactive banks and goals, you see, which of course messed the tone arm read up. So he's sitting over there, he told Mary Sue afterwards, "Oh, there's something about this..." I forgot exactly what it was -- I overheard this -- first I heard his brain go snap [laughter] and I looked back at the meter quickly to see what he had seen, you see, and the needle was floating, you see, back and forth. Well, it'd been like that for a long time. I could probably put it back into that condition rather, rather easily, and so on. I'm just not particularly interested in... It is so variable on read, it all depends on exactly what I've been doing in the last
twenty-four hours with the reactive bank of what the meter reads. It'll read anything from 5 to 2.5, don't you see? And the needle practically – knocking on wood – just won't tighten up. That is very often very difficult to do – to get the needle so that it will read properly. I have to key something in to get a read.

All right, so that gives you a standard. You've got a standard. You've got a meter which will behave in a certain way, and you say, "All right, well, that's Clear." That's about the only thing you could say.

"Well, are you worried now about getting worse?"

"No, I'm not now worried about getting worse. Scientology works, I'm not worried about getting any worse."

"Good, you're a Release."

The only standard that you could have would be this type of standard. Now, you're going on up to VI and you're going on up to VII, and so forth. Those standards are very obvious. They're very, very apparent and they, of course, soar well above the hidden standard but take a long time to attain, because there's so darn much coal, as McPheeters was saying the other day, to shovel out of the way. And he just was trying to see a little distance between himself and the coal pile. Well, he's only been at it a month or so – guy's being a lousy optimist. You're going to see distance between yourself and the coal pile? How can you see distance between yourself and the coal pile? You have to rake the coal over to yourself so you can burn it up, you're the only flame around there.

Now, he's never looked on the other side of the coal pile. If he looked on the other side of the coal pile and he'd find that side was getting less distant. See, but he's always on this side of the coal pile, pulling it in toward him. And it's pretty arduous. And you go through various phases and so forth and you never went through so many changes of beingness in your life. And it's pretty arduous. And you can – you get – you get to battling around with this stuff.

It's very discouraging in some instances. Extremely discouraging because you can start – all of a sudden your eyes just start burning and burning and burning and burning and so forth and you feel terrible and you're all exhausted and so on. The only crime you can pull is not taking responsibility for your own case and picking up a meter and finding out what it's all about. Because you'll find it out. Sometimes it takes you two or three, four days to find out. Sometimes it takes you a couple of weeks to find out what the devil. You straighten that out and then because you're now in an erasure... See, this is an erasure condition, negative gain. You're always experiencing negative gain. You never realize how much better you are than yesterday because you're experiencing negative gain. That's no longer wrong with you, so of course, you are not now worrying about it. And you're aware of the fact, dimly, and all of a sudden you'll hit something where the gradient goes up suddenly a little steeper. And you become aware of the fact that you've made a sudden gain. Or one day it'll suddenly occur to you that you no longer have a hole through the back of your spine, you see? You say, "Hey! There's no hole in the back... Well, that's very interesting. Now, as you were saying about politics... You were talking about..." I mean, just have no more concern to you than that.
See, things are only of a concern to you when they're — when they are pushing at you or having an effect on you. Things are not of a concern to you if they are not having any effect on you and particularly if they never again will have any effect on you ever. And believe me — that you become very disinterested in. [laughter]

You see, there was only misery there to remember, so when the misery is all gone, there isn't even anything to forget. Fantastic situation.

But hidden standards operate as to who you are going to be in order to audit them. Hidden standards exist with regard to what condition they should be in in order to have had a case gain. Hidden standards exist for any condition you have described to them as a better condition in Scientology and a hidden standard exists for known standards. Now, take it up to there. Because the individual becomes so aberrated about this or another type of condition that after you've said, "It is a pink sheet, that is the standard which we require, a pink sheet," they keep bringing you in green ones. They say, "Is this what you wanted?" Send something off to a printer someplace and get the chit-chat back and forth between you and the printer of what you want. You've described to them cleanly and clearly that you want a paperback of certain dimensions and so forth. Well, usually they can encompass this. But you say heavy paper and they give you light. And you say big type and they give you small. And you do that — there's always some wild point here.

Well, they're altering your standard. Well, they don't know they're doing it. Well, that's with a visible mest object that they're doing this. So think of how much more easy it is to do for an actual standard to exist out here someplace, to be totally misunderstood and misapplied. Well, that's because the individual with his concatenation — his string of nonacknowledged ideas — adds up to a nonobservational point. He can't observe from this point. He can't tell how he is, he doesn't know what you're saying to him as to how he should be and he's just all mixed up and he's just like a fire drill in the Swiss Navy, see. Mess completely.

Now, what would he do? What would he do? Well, he will do one thing: He will keep on trying to bail himself out, providing he's — can see — he isn't overwhelmed by that he is asked to bail or providing you don't give him nothing to bail. In other words, if you don't give him too much to bail out of the rowboat at a time and if you don't give him too — well, nothing to bail out of the rowboat at all, that's no auditing; then you get to the happy condition of he will continue to bail within the realm of his understanding and ability to confront. And if you don't exceed that amount of bailing required he will eventually float. That's all you have to remember. It's just no bailing at all, that's verboten, too much bailing demanded all at once — can't confront it, doesn't even see that it's there, and so forth, up to his neck in water and he says — or you say, "All right, now just get a bucket from someplace and take all the water and throw it over your shoulder and get rid of it." And he's up to his neck in water and he says, "Well I — over my shoulder? I can't do that."

In that way, you don't even Q and A with his hidden standards. Now, very often when an individual sits down and tells you that this has got to be run and that's got to be run and something else's got to be — the pc — and this has got to be run and I can't make any advance unless this is run or that's run or something else is run, and so forth. All you're doing, all you're doing is trying to match up to some unimaginable hidden standard that he himself can't
even grasp. And the guy who sits down and sets as his session goal – you're going to do an assist, you see, he's hurt his foot – and he sets as his session goal, he just gratuitously sets a session goal, and he says, "Well," he says, "I want to make OT in this session."

Well of course, he's just gone crazy on the subject which is just another – another variation of hidden standards. So the only thing you can do is to assign a very exact action which is to be done in order to attain an acknowledgment. And that goes in a little cycle and it goes in a big cycle. In other words, it goes in a process cycle. You've started this process and you assign this action and then you now tell him that that process is complete when it is complete. The tone arm's gone out of it, it's complete. All right, Level 0, why, he's no longer getting comm lags and he can answer and do these things easily. That's complete, so you say that process is complete.

You can do that, you see. He was able to do it and he did it until he was able to do it very, very well, and if you carried it on much further he'd be bailing nothing, don't you see? And you give him too high level a process and of course he's given too much to bail too suddenly. And he's got himself a condition now where he can work, see? Well, you run this process. This is the process we run. This is the next process we run. All right, this is the next process we run, and then now you've run all of the processes of this level and we give him a certificate to that effect; a certificate to that effect.

"You've done all the processes of Level 0, all right. We now hereby certify that he has run – big letters: LEVEL 0 – and is all ready to attack Level I." And acknowledge it. You'll be surprised how much that will also kick out on the backtrack. See? That knocks out the sessions, the auditing, it keys out the whole lot. You've just acknowledged the whole lot, good, bad or indifferent. You say he didn't do it well, he didn't do it completely, he didn't do it thoroughly. You say, "You did it – thank you very much." You've acknowledged everything that's happened during that period of time. That's that. So he's still got the gain. Nothing can take that away from him in Scientology. Anything that wasn't a gain you've also acknowledged, so you haven't set up a hidden standard of auditing. Tends to wipe that out. He's – never afterwards will have to have the same kind of an auditor under the same conditions, don't you see, in order to say that he has a gain. Because you can set up auditing conditions.

I've seen a pc get a resounding win with some auditor and ever afterwards be pestering a D of P or somebody to get that auditor back and insist on running that process! My God, the process was flat in 1951. But he's got to run it. Why? It's the hidden standard of what is auditing. So you can't Q and A with these hidden standards. You can make it easier for the person. You can do whatever you can. You can acknowledge what kind of an auditor would have to be able to audit him. You can patch this thing up one way or the other in numerous ways. You can just get him to announce, "Who would I have to be to audit you?" Remember that old process? And acknowledge the living God out of every answer, see. Phew! See, just acknowledge that, see. "Well, good! Hey, that's pretty good. All right, that's fine. I'd have to be a voodoo priest. Very good." Repeat his answer even. [laughter]

Now, if you acknowledged that properly and you were doing that thing very smoothly, it would have a resounding gain because you are operating and working right in the field of major therapeutic beingness, see? Big, big gain, big gain. Various ways of handling this par-
ticular aspect. But the only safe way to evaluate case progress is a mechanical method such as a meter – that's because of hidden standards – and a completed cycle of processes. He's completed them.

Now, it so happens – it so happens that if he does complete this cycle of processes he will reach a better case state. And it so happens that this can be strung out along the line of levels, now, to such a degree, and sufficiently accurately, that you don't have PCs that are different. I mean, you've got such basic and fundamental processes strung out along this line now that you're not getting different PCs all the time. So he's working to complete a level. Well, if you get him interested in completing a level you're all set. That's all he has to be interested in. Well, you just complete this level. "Yeah, I – oh, you've had bad headaches lately. Well, that's too bad. Bad headaches, huh? Oh, that's pretty bad. I'm sorry you have headaches. Well, you've had bad headaches. All right." Not, "Well, I'll see what I can do about that." That's a fatal remark, you've now continued the headache.

The only safe thing to do is just to go on and audit them up the line level by level, and let them take those processes and not go steaming and snoring and shouting and saying, "I'm not clear and I'm not a Release," or "I'm not..." He is a Level I PC who is working to become a Level II. That's what he is. And that's a state of beingness that any fool could figure out. And it's a state of beingness that he doesn't have to be a wise man to see, but he doesn't also have to be a fool to see, because he sees he's making some progress. And he would make progress.

Now, this is basically the use to which levels are put today and this is basically what's going to happen. Now, on the subject of hidden standards you very often feel that there is a hidden technical standard that you don't know what it is, and so forth. Well, that comes from an alter-is. When you get an alter-is of the technical standard, you see, then you must believe that there is something back of this that is being alter-ised. But let me tell you what your hidden standard is right now technically. I'll tell you exactly what it is technically and so forth. It's not very hidden. It's not hidden at all. It just isn't totally released. And the reason it isn't totally released is there is so much work on my plate and my finger can develop just so many calluses and I'm getting it to you as fast as I can. So to that degree, it is hidden. Do you follow that? That's all there is to that.

There is probably two or three more paragraphs to write on the subject of Level 0. Boy, you've got a lot of stuff that the public could be taught, and that sort of thing. But there's just as far as the technology of Level 0 is concerned I'd say two or three paragraphs. Nothing. And there's, however, the rack-up of the remaining levels and the exact processes which fit at the level and the exact condition the PC's supposed to reach, I haven't written that. I'm going to make a rough draft, write-up of that and issue it to you so it'll no longer be hidden.

Anyway, get a difference between an non-issued standard, which somebody knows about – and it's merely slow coming on the lines – and a hidden standard. Because nobody's trying to hide any technology. But there's tremendous numbers of hidden standards which you confront as an auditor. I just threw the other one in for an example. Tremendous numbers of hidden standards you're going up against, and the thing to do is not Q and A with them.
Not go in a spin about them. Just hold a very standard technology, that is your best answer to all of these things. Hold it very standard, when you've got it, you see, and then run processes in just that sequence, finish them off, issue the guy a certificate and run your next level, and the fellow is going to make it willy-nilly in the end. It's very simple to do today because we have the answers. We are in that enviable position.

Thank you very much.
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Thank you.

Well, I'm glad to see you all today. I don't have a thing to talk to you about. Don't even know why I'm here. You would probably be much better off in class someplace studying something. And I probably ought to cut and run after turning the whole course upside down. See, I see a head nodding. [laughter] Bitter.

But – what's the date?

Audience: March 9th.

March 9th, AD 15. All right. Very good.

I've been having a ball, an absolute ball. Worked during a lot of my vacation trying to put together things, but this is the year of the big put-together.

We've got a very small amount of breathing time, very, very small amount of breathing time (and unfortunately at this particular stage of the game there is some necessity to breathe) – and having a small amount of breathing time before the push starts biting. And we've got that period of time – a few months, don't you see, at the least; we've at least got a few months – to get all the organization in shape and everything understood and everything grooved in. See?

So it doesn't have any loopholes in it, because as soon as a wide push, thrust, boom begins, this law applies: On an expansion, every smallest weak chink in your communication systems or systems or organizational pattern will be found out and the big ones will be found out with violence. In other words, all your weaknesses show up and that's why lots of people fear expansion. They're terrified of it because their weaknesses show up. And in those weaknesses they have – they get totally interiorized and confused and spun. Don't you see?

I'll give you an example. You got a Registrar and she does not have the proper lines or alignment in the organization. They're almost right, you see? On a small organization nobody ever noticed they were sour, see? Nobody ever noticed this because there wasn't enough traffic over them, you know? And somebody could kind of think his way around this little point, see, and it just became usual, you see, to sort of think your way around this corner. And it carried quite ably, oh, forty-five interviews a week. See? It was easy. There was nothing to it. Now she has to handle a hundred and fifty. Well, it isn't that she can't handle a hundred and
fifty. That little kink that everybody thought his way around every time, all of a sudden becomes a deep, wide abyss and all of her pcs and students trying to enroll fall into it. Don't you see?

Expansion, actually, is like turning a magnifying glass on something. It looked perfectly all right drawn here in small scale. I mean – see, drawn there you see it. Nothing much to it. But now we're going to make it big. Only it isn't just putting a magnifying glass on it and looking it up. That's what I have to do in straightening it up, you see? You make this thing big, start to stretch this thing out, and you find out a lot of these lines and things don't connect. They look like they connected, but they don't connect.

So that a pattern, to be a near perfect pattern, should be the – a basic pattern, you see, which could expand and expand and expand. Well now, you get a fairly decent pattern up at the top – you can test it to find out whether or not it's a decent pattern by seeing if you can reduce it down again.

Now, I'll give you an idea. Once upon a time there was an auditor and his name was Hubbard and he lived at Bay Head, New Jersey. And he had a little hectograph book, and people keep getting copies of this book and reprinting it for themselves and giving it to their friends. And the mailbags kept getting bigger and bigger. And this auditor couldn't handle the pcs because they multiplied from one to about fifteen. Now, if you have ever tried to audit fifteen pcs about five hours a week each – you see, it's within the finite limits – and then try to do everything else, too, you begin to realize that there's a little too much on your plate.

At that particular time, it was unfortunate, but a group came along and said, "We want to make an organization out of this for you. Now you can get on with it." And I said, "Well, all right." And then the fun began. Then the fun began. In fact, all hell broke loose. Because there was too rapid an expansion in process of no organizational fundamental, and I wasn't even developing the organizational background or fundamental at that particular time.

You had such crazy things happening as – we had thirty-six hour intensives in a week in those days – you had such crazy things happening as my writing up completely, out of my own very intimate experience, exactly how to do a thirty-six hour intensive, and then it being parked in the General Manager's desk – in his safe actually – because it was too valuable to release. Isn't that marvelous? And I kept getting communications for the next year. And I couldn't figure out what was the matter with auditors; they all gone stupid or something of the sort. They were all asking me personally how you did a thirty-six hour intensive. Nobody ever seemed to be able to get one done.

So finally one day I said, "This must be something missing here someplace." So I instituted an inquiry: "Where the devil? Had anybody ever seen this?" And nobody had ever seen it. It was a great revelation to me. I was going on the basis they'd all studied it, and they were going on the basis that I'd never written it. [laughter] And there sat the manuscript in its original form and beautifully typed on very, very expensive bond paper in a very big safe, because it was too valuable to release.

The lines all broke down everywhere. Well, the missing line there was Val Doc – valuable documents – you see, the line to valuable documents, definition of valuable documents,
what are valuable documents, mimeograph publications missing, HCO Area Secretaries were missing, HCOs were missing. There were a few things missing. Do you see?

That immediately pointed up there are a lot of lines and units and parts missing in the machine, see? Well, it couldn't run, of course, because everybody had to wear all the hats individually, and there was no policy on which anybody could agree, so there were no routes that went any particular directions. And when these guys got too hungry for money and that sort of thing and started kicking me in the head – I had no control of the organization – I got tired of just using my personality and phzzzzzt alone to control the organization, so I said to hell with you and it all went boom!

So I sat down and I said, "Well now, let's start this over again properly." That was 1952 and we've been going well ever since, don't you see?

So I've been taught the lesson, see, quite obviously, that you can enter a boom and enter an expansion, and that if you shove – try to shove the lines – if this is kicking back hard against the people that are with you in this and they haven't got everything straight on their plates – all it looks like to them is a tremendous lot of overwork. And although they're perfectly willing to have things boom – actually the reason they don't boom is because their own plates are too full and the lines are zigged where they should be zagged, don't you see. And it can't boom, because it starts to go on out ... And if it does boom, if it's promoted too hard without organizational lines straightened up behind it, why, it just blows up everything.

In other words, that rock can start rolling downhill at such a speed it starts an avalanche, and then there's no stopping the avalanche. You could have stopped the rock but not the avalanche. We're at that point of the game right now where it's very easy to halt and change the direction of the rock, don't you see?

So that my concentration on the matter is simply, when things start entering in the various perimeters of the organization or individual auditors and so forth, that they have the data and the routes in order to handle it. And fortunately, I've been able to – to get the – and pretest the organizational patterns, and so forth, which will be used. There's not much change in the character of departments but there's a slight difference of alignment in departments. It's under what does which come? And that takes out a lot of zigs and zags and so forth.

What I've mainly been having a ball with is... To write up this required the development of the philosophy of administration. That's never been developed. That's a totally missing segment in the area of man – the philosophy of administration. There are a lot of administrative procedures; there are a lot of management associations; there are all kinds of oddball characters: "Well, I'm a self-made man. This is the way I run my business." You know? I don't wince like that. Nothing personal in that. And... "And this is the way it is, and that's it, and nothing is going to change this in any way whatsoever, see? Blay-raoo." There's a lot of that kind of thing, don't you see?

But the philosophy is what he's doing. The philosophy of what he's actually doing is not there. There's a policy or an idea of what he's doing, such as – like: He is being successful, see? Well, that'd be pretty broad if it were the definition, you see? Or things are on the upgrade, the charts all show an upclimb, so therefore – that is the full philosophy of it. And apparently he – they don't even go as far as to say, "Is this successful?" They don't even get this
elementary. A successful business is one which has its charts on a steady, slight or great increase. See? You know? Everybody knows, you see?

It's just full of these "everybody knows." "Everybody knows" that the business chart on the wall should have a -- show a little bit of an increase in order to consider the business fairly healthy. See, population is increasing, and traffic's increasing generally in a society, so it should match that. Everybody knows that. But who has said -- you see, who has said, "A graph on a wall --" (what I just said), "A graph on a wall should show a very slight increase in order to indicate the healthiness of the business." No, no, they're at this echelon: "This is the graph!"

And I bet they've got people sitting all over the place staring at what they've just offered them saying, "Graph? Why?" Completely -- don't see any -- any connection whatsoever between the graph and anything that is going on. So they say, "Well, there's a lot of charts around here." You've heard it in offices, you know? "Well, there's a lot of charts around here, ha-ha." [laughter]

Somebody instinctively feels there ought to be some charts. But how you use them and what you do with them or even the definition of what they are, is really not given in the business texts, don't you see? So you could say that man is sort of working on instincts. And -- in the field of administration, he's at the level of the dog turning around three times before he lies down. And the dog who turns around three times before he lies down, of course, is really looking to find out whether or not there are any snakes in his bed. And it's been a survival policy with dogs for a long time. But the dog himself, in turning around three times, doesn't even know what he's looking for. In fact, I've never had a single dog tell me "Well, there are no snakes there now," and lie down. See?

It's a whole bunch of I'm-supposed-to's, you see? Administration is just a bunch of not understood supposed-to's.

You take congresses, parliaments -- you talk about the administration of a state. Oooh! You yourself look at this sort of thing, you know there's something wrong with what they're doing. And you say, "Well, it's sort of unreasonable what they're doing," and so forth. But actually nobody says, "What they're doing is buzzt-bzzt-bzzt, and what they're not doing is buzzt-bzzt-bzzt, and therefore we're going to fall on our heads."

And the funny part of it is, laying out this material in front of somebody... Or you can go too high with this material very quickly -- you know, just go right over their heads like you do with a pc -- but in laying this material out in front of somebody who has any experience along this line at all -- he says, "Oh, yes," you know, "of course, of course, of course." It's like talking into a steady cognition. See? "Yes, yes, of course. Well, right, yeah!" Voom! You know. Bang!

It's been necessary to dig up the actual philosophy that underlies all these things. Not the ideas man has had concerning this sort of thing but what are the formulas which prompt him? What are the actual formulas?

Well, you can very easily go upstairs too high. You can say, "The formula of success in the modern world is..." And you can say, "Well, you get so you know what it's all about,
and you get yourself a label that means something, and then you apply it and keep your nose clean and you'll probably make it, son."

Well, I don't think anybody has said that to anybody really since about 1890. But you've given some sound advice to some young hopeful and had him sit there and look at you with a completely dull eye.

You tell a writer, for instance... I told a whole – I blew up a whole writing class one time. It's a wonder they all didn't leave school. Actually, I – they relegated it to sort of getting the professor to reprimand me. It was the short story class of Harvard. I – excuse me – "Hahved." And they – they made the mistake of having a series of lectures from successful writers. And each one of these gave them a short series of lectures. And all of these people were in a class called Creative Writing. And they were very nicely dressed children. And so my lectures were very well received, and so forth, right up to a point. And on this point it all went over, appetite over tin cup and into a deep grave, and after that I was really non persona grata at – in Harvard literature. They probably will never even mention my name as revenge.

Because what I told the class that caused them to completely blow up was – I said, "Well," I said, "when you – when you've written a few hundred thousand words, why, then you've got a style. And it's taken me about I think, about a hundred thousand words before I had any inkling of any kind of a style." And I suddenly noticed – I looked around – I had a – I had a class in front of me that was in a state of shock! They had not just awakened; they had awakened and gone into a cataleptic fit and they were sitting there as though I had shot them with a ray gun in the middle of their chest, don't you see? Completely frozen.

And I was alert at this point and I said, "Well, what's the matter?" I said, "I only said a hundred thousand words." You know, I got the idea quantity was wrong. "I only said, well, you have to write about a hundred thousand words at least before you have any idea of having a style." Nhaaa! Dlu-bub-blub-udle-budl-bdul-dt-dt-dt. They talked to each other and talked to the professor and told that to him and walked off to the back of the room. It had never occurred to those damned fools or that professor that writers write! And this had nothing whatsoever to do with their education.

I know that's an unbelievable experience. It left me in a state of shock. "Well, Hubbard's an awful bad fellow." Never forgave me. I was probably used as a horrible example in that school for years. I had given them a data which was just too confounded, far over their heads. They had never come up in any gradient to writing. I think that class was supposed to turn in a story at the end of the year. And their idea of a story was maybe a thousand words, which they had been assiduously [assiduously] working on for the last nine months. And one of those stories, of course, was the equivalent of a career. You think I'm just being sarcastic. No. It's the reason the short short stories ... You can find short short stories all over the place. Everybody has got a trunk full of short short stories that ever even dreamed of writing. You count them up, and you find out they'll go to a thousand or fifteen hundred words. Well, a short story in actual fact, by definition, is five to six thousand words. That's several short shorts. It's very interesting.

I had launched the datum that in order to be a writer you have to write. And the appalling concept which they couldn't confront was sitting down at a table or a typewriter and
pounding out a hundred thousand words. And this just seemed so insurmountable and so in-
credible that they absolutely revolted against the whole idea. And yet in that day and age – in
that day and age and so forth – a writer was very often called on to get out a hundred thou-
sand words in a quarter of a year. That was quite common. And your top headliners were roll-
ing at the rate of about eighty thousand words a month.

So I was talking to them about – about a month's production as far as I was concerned,
and this didn't seem like anything to me, you see? Well, a hundred and twenty – five words a
minute or a hundred and fifty a minute typing speed – composition speed ninety-four words a
minute – count it up. A hundred thousand words – that's nothing, see?

You worked three hours a day, about three days a week and spent the rest of the time
standing down on the corner whistling. See? It wasn't even hard work, you know? Or you
wrapped both hands around a dictaphone and there it was. But you didn't have that barrier.
You weren't up against this other barrier of "Oh, no!" you see?

So they hadn't been led into any kind of a gradient scale of what a writer would do or
what was expected or – or what the basic definition of writing was, which is of course, writ-
ing. This is pretty idiotic, see, that if you're a writer, you write. This had never occurred to
them. I think they were in the stage of "being" a writer sort of synthetically without even any
concept of what a writer did. Do you follow that?

Just like there's many business executives around sitting in a big chair in a big office
with no slightest concept of what they're supposed to do. And if you walked in and said,
"Your job is brrr-brrr-brrr. A business executive is supposed to business exec, and this is
how you business exec," they would go "Waaah! Get out of here! Throw the bum out!
Ooooo! Nothing could be worse! Oooh!" Leave you in a state of shock.

You say, what's the matter with the fool? What's the matter with the fool is he's being
without doing and he is engaged in an activity which has not been defined. He's administ-
ring. And when you realize that one out of nineteen businesses established fail in their first
year. Nobody has ever added up how many fail in the second. You mustn't assume that be-
cause they've lived two that they'd live for – one that they'd live forever. They don't.

At a time when we see states and civilizations shrinking and perishing and so forth,
administration is some kind of a – an odd art. You're an administrator if you've gone to Har-
vard or Yale, or if you've been with the firm for a long time, or if you've got a pretty wife, or
if your taste in ties agrees with the managing editor's or the managing director's drawing room
furniture, so that you always look nice to the old lady. Do you see? And this is running a civi-
lization.

So you see once more we're catching man out. There is a lot of technology around and
today there's far more technology than there used to be. (This will amuse you very much.)
There's a lot more technology about business administration in existence today. In universi-
ties, by the way, I must interject one – the only class notorious in universities for cheating in
examinations and so forth is the Business Administration School. They're notorious. And here
we – where we've caught man out to this degree... And as I say, there's more, more material
available today in the field of business administration than there was, let us say, fifteen years
ago.
And the reason for this is the American Management Association copies everything we have they can get their hands on. Everything! Oh, that sounds funny and they'd go in and they'd be the first people to deny it but then you're seldom given their little books. But they'll take some kind of a sentence out of something or other and they'll expand it out to a whole magazine. I checked up on this. It was very hard to check up on. I – we found them on our – on our – on our lines here and there. And the clincher was when they issued us the program of their New York congress which was drawn up in exactly the same size, format, type, titles, seminars, that we used in Washington. It was a duplicate program: It was lecture one, lecture two, the seminar times were the same; it was the same number of days; it was absolute carbon copying.

Old Nile Adams over in the States says, "Well, you can pretty well tell what they'll do" – when he was speaking of general course of – of forward policy and so forth – "You can pretty well tell what they'll do: They copy you."

This was what he was using to predict with in the field of business. That sooner or later they would copy something we were doing. It hasn't – it hasn't just started yesterday, you see?

I know this sounds awfully cheeky. But when you realize the degree of alter-is to which these people are capable, it's a wonder you can recognize your stuff at all. It's like a novelist after he sees his play or story on the screen. "That's mine?" Even worse than that, see?

Now, we've developed quite a few things. And as a matter of fact, several chaps who have gone through our organizations and so forth are now holding down big brass in some very interesting corporations. So it's no wonder that this sort of thing follows. But it's still been without any basic philosophy of what's administration.

But the ball which I'm having is: In order to put together the philosophy of administration, you've got to put together the anatomy of organizations and what is basically the anatomy of organizations. And this required, this afternoon, that I find the definition – the formula of life. Now, people have been ... Naturally! This is what it led back to. Organization is usually dedicated to the forward of – forwarding of livingness or ending somebody else's livingness. And you run square into this sooner or later as you go plowing around on this thing that you need – just to write up what you're doing – you actually have to have the formula – the formula; not the definition, as I started to say – the formula of life. Vital. Absolutely vital that you have to have that formula.

Well, let's see. The Hindus looked for it for fa-fa and the Persians looked for it and every religion we've got is some synthesis of expressing it and it's been on its way for a long time. Practically every novel that is ever written mentions in some snide or twisted way the fact the fellow is looking for the purpose of existence, you see? And I remember one great bestseller that finally dragged out a Persian carpet in the last paragraph and pointed it out to somebody that there was no purpose whatsoever in the pattern of the carpet and that explained life.

Man has run the gamut on this thing. He's invented more formulas, and he's invented more things. But actually he really never got up to even calling it a formula. What's the for-
mula of life? And when you get at that level and tell somebody what the formula of life is, then you do get a blank look on their faces because it just doesn't make any sense at all. They don't blow out the door on you; they just quit. They say, "Well, yeah. I grant that. Yeah."

You tell somebody on the street this and that'd be: "Yeah, oh yeah. Everybody knows that, and so on. There's nothing to it."

They don't think you've told them anything. And they can't grasp it and they feel a little bit odd, and it must have been what they had for lunch. See, it just would go sailing across the top of their heads. You haven't said anything. It wouldn't be significant if you did say it. They wouldn't make anything out of it. Except you actually can take this thing and redesign all there is to organizations, organisms, races, species, everything else under the sun, moon and stars.

I'll tell it to you. I won't keep you on tenterhooks and so forth. And some of you are just going to say, "Oh, yes, of course."

But it's simply: Living is having and following a purpose. That's all of it. That's the formula of life – have and follow a purpose. That's it. If you do it, you're living, and if you don't do it, you're not living. And that's all there is to it. I've now given you the basic fundamental of existence and that really is it.

Here we had an operating principle of existence or a common denominator to existence, and we had that sort of thing. Told us what it was doing. But remember, that was what it was doing. Well, this is the formula which underlies the doingness, and it is just that, and that's all it is. It's just having and following a purpose. And when you start to write this up of all the steps and ramifications and the anatomy of doing this, you suddenly find that you are looking at one of these schemas that the Germans are so fond of.

Did you ever see one of these German schemas? They put one little point down here, and then that becomes two points, and then the two points square and become four points, and then the – you know? And it's the way they dream up their military command, see? Commanding General – two, four, six, and you got a rack here that doubles, or something like that, every time. It's the pattern of an old German panzer division or something like that. They call them a schema – probably mispronounced. But I'm not giving it in German.

Now, you find yourself dealing with one of those things. And you say, "Wow!" You say, "What am I looking at? I'm looking at the species called dog. This is what? This is – this is rats, see? This is that; this is that; this is organisms; these are organizations; these are civilizations; these are states; these are – are this or that or the other thing," and so forth.

And then you come back and look at it again, you realize you can look over any state or organization, so forth, and look over these various parts, find out the parts that are missing and estimate at once the degree of weakness or chaos which exists internally. Then you can estimate whether or not people are happy or unhappy in that state. And then you actually could reform the state if it wasn't too late – it's mostly too late right now with most of these civilizations – by taking certain steps, buzz-buzz-buzz-buzz-buzz, and all of a sudden everybody would be happy. As I say, I've been having a ball. I kept landing into lower and lower echelons to this. This is all Level VII stuff I'm giving you actually. But doesn't matter much,
because you're falling straight into it whether you like it or not. You'll suffer from it or benefit from it, and so forth, to the degree that it's correctly followed, because these are the formulas – the formulas, if you please.

Now, there are certain formulas – down a couple of echelons further, there are – there are certain formulas which – from which you draw up the actions necessary to produce results which are beneficial or detrimental. Don't you see? There's a whole bunch of little formulas that follow out from this. And of course, you cut in along this line someplace and you look like you're dealing with a fundamental. You're staring at it, man.

I'll give you an idea. You – staff auditor goes out and he looks at the purpose of the – on the org board of a – the HGC. A subpurpose is what it really is. It's a subpurpose. And he goes out and he looks at it. This is not it, but it says something like: to make pcs happy and able, or to make the able more able – something like that. Or to audit pcs to the highest case gain possible, or something like this. Whatever he does, he looks at that thing: "Yes, sir!" Well, that's good enough, see? That's good enough for him, and he goes on working at this, and this is fine.

What's the purpose that lies immediately above it? Well, he actually could guess at this purpose if he looked at the subpurposes of the sections or units around him or the immediately adjacent departments. And he could guess what probably would be up there, see? After he'd spotted what was up there, then he could guess about where it was going back there, don't you see? See, he could probably trace one of these things back.

Well, as a matter of fact, people are usually quite content to ride at that point which was a good thing because there's no particular reason to do otherwise.

Now, this has a negative proof, this thing. At the lower levels, we examined the reactive bank very carefully, and we find that the reactive bank has nothing under God's green earth in it but booby-trapped purposes, and that's all it's got in it. It's booby-trapped purposes and their locks. See, it – really, it's the booby-trapped purpose fixed up so it won't work, or it's a backwards purpose so the guy can't have a good purpose, see, which is then – caused a jam-up of subpurposes (locks, you see), which has caused a mess-up of his courses or policies or decisions in life, which has then recorded the catastrophes which have ensued for having done so, and those are the engrams, of course. That's really all there is in the entirety of the reactive mind. But it's negative proof because you get on down, plumbing to the very bottom of the reactive mind and you find out there is nothing there but cockeyed and thwarted purposes. It's so constructed as to do just one thing excellently well, and that's thwart a purpose. See, it first gives a lousy purpose and then thwarts it. That's the double switcheroo of R6.

Well, there might have been lots of other ways one could have accumulated a reactive bank. There might have been a lot of other things that could have happened to the reactive bank, but if so, they never bit. See, there might have been a lot of other things that one might of had in his reactive bank but they're not there. That's because they weren't effective in holding anybody down or aberrating him, and so it went out of style. It isn't there; there isn't even a ghost of it on the track. You wouldn't even find them if you looked for them. Do you see?

So actually, the successful way of not living is to have purposes booby-trapped and unfollowable. So if you wanted to fix up somebody so he wouldn't live, why, you'd just give
him crossed-up purposes and make it impossible for him to follow those and then, of course, barrier out any possibility of following a good purpose, and you would just have him in a trap. And if you want to know how is a living being trapped, that is the full description of the furthest reaches and ramifications of a trap. Whatever else the trap consists of, it has that as its elements.

All of which is very fascinating. Because it tells us at once why you have an unhappy civilization. It tells you what – how many people are in the mental hospitals. It tells you why this has been a very unhappy universe ever since people started accumulating reactive banks of this particular character and answers an awful lot of questions in an awful hurry.

But at the same time it makes it possible, on a more mundane and less esoteric and ivory-towered level, to simply draw up the patterns of our organizations. You see, we've been doing it right so far and – instinctively, like turning around three times to find out if there are any snakes in the bed. But exactly what were we doing? And that is the immediate study under hand.

And I – I tell you since I got home, I have worn out more ballpoints and Japanese sign pens than you can shake a stick at. I mean, they – every little while clunk, clunk, one goes into the wastebasket. It's empty, you know? Takes a long time to wear them out. They're supposed to wear out for – they were – they were originally released to wear forever, you know? And I've driven everybody half mad trying to dig up all the white long paper in the place and so forth, and just keeps – drawers keep getting empty of it and... They were down to I think two reams a couple of days, three days ago.

The poor Mimeograph Department is of course going mad because I'm not taking any chance on drawing all this up in manuscript form, you see? That's for a little bit later, but drawing it all up in manuscript form and getting it well typed so it can sit on some shelf or sit on some printer's desk, you see. We need it desperately but somebody up in – in Essex-on-Kent, you know, has – he's got this – he's got this, and he's got the best intentions of the world to turn it out next year, you know? [laughter] So what I'm doing is that I put a lot of this stuff on the General Non-Remimeo line which is – what's called the General Non-Remimeo line – that is to say, key personnel and orgs get copies of it – so that the technology does exist, see? And that lets, of course, Mimeo here simply type them out from the written notes, type them directly onto a stencil, run them off, don't you see, and make this limited number of copies and so forth and distribute them.

But ever since I got – have gotten home, why, their – their line is just jammed like that, and I heard them in HCO the other day: "Ever since you've been home I've hardly had time to catch my breath." Little Valerie up in London, bless her. Tongue hanging out, you know? And of course, they'll all try to get this in as quick as possible. It'll make quite a stir, so therefore, I'm trying to issue it in such a way that it won't make much of a stir. But oddly enough they're pretty good at handling this sort of thing. They're accustomed to it.

And the change – organizational pattern change which we put in, in midsummer – I tested it at Saint Hill and so forth and finally sent it out to them – income started going up at a...
You didn't check that as a factor on following up the raw data of that organization. When did they receive that new pattern? Anyway... [laughter] yeah, I – we were trying to trace down the reason for a resurgence in order to reorganize a certain org. Ha-ha – how interesting! We didn't – we didn't take that into account.

Anyhow, this is the – after that reorganization, we have now had the first booms. This was just the reorganization, see? And it wasn't complete reorganization. Well, we've had the first booms and the first record breakers in terms of weeks in expansion that we'd had for about three years. There were a lot of factors could have entered into this, don't you see? But that change or smoothing out an organization instead of damming it up and confusing it, don't you see, let the lines flow faster and better.

That was obvious that this had done so. And of course we've got the rest of the little changes, because I just changed them far enough to take some major kinks out at the level they were operating on, and then we've got the other cling-cling-cling that goes in right behind it that organizes it from the top to the bottom.

Now, we come to the basic test. When you start out at the bottom and start organizing upward, you can reach a point in greater complexity where you have to look back at the bottom and find out if the bottom could be in any way reorganized to fit the top. And when you find out that the – the smallest unit of your activity (that is, the smallest group or the smallest organization) is unable to fit in by reducing again your big organization, you realize there's a lot of kinks in the line.

You understand. Could we take a Central Organization – one of the big – bigger ones, you see – take a Central Organization and take its pattern just as we've got it and reduce it down as of this minute and wind up with a very smoothly running city office? Could we do that? Could we reduce the size of it? And the answer is no. It would look very silly because you'd have somebody ... Got a laugh out of some executives. The other day, I said, "Well, I –" I said, "We don't want to make this look like a city office org board." Well, it wouldn't be much of a joke to you unless you'd ever seen a city office organization org board in its earlier stages. It's a very ridiculous affair – it's been in the past – because it's got a full organizational chart there, don't you see. And it's got all of the posts but there are only about three names that repeat back and forth on all these posts, don't you see? [laughter] And if you looked at it at a distance, from eight or nine feet, it would look like they had quite an organization, you see? Well, of course, they're running quite different than that org board. They couldn't possibly run in accordance to the org board, and they're trying to make do.

Well, that is – gives you immediate clue as to whether or not you're on the ball in your big organizational pattern, because if your big organizational pattern doesn't smoothly reduce, it won't smoothly expand. You see, you can take a – you could take a backwards look at all this. If it doesn't – if you can't reduce it down without a catastrophe occurring, well you, of course, won't expand it without a catastrophe. So, something that can be reduced or expanded and so forth must be a pretty smooth, fundamental setup. And that's what we've done right now. We've already got this. And I'm trying to write up the various ramifications and exploring the philosophy of this to see whether or not it fits and doesn't fit. And actually it does. It goes right down to the bottom to a city office and an organizational pattern.
Now, whether it fits an individual or not that's a – that's another question. See, so maybe it isn't perfect yet. But that's pretty good. We've never before been able to get it down to a city office.

I'll tell you what it is. I'll give you a very brief – very, very brief résumé here of organizational structure. There's Divisions 1, 2 and 3. This is the new divisional structure. Now, heretofore we have had two divisions. Division was HCO and the Central Org. This is the way we referred to them. So it was HCO and the Central Org, you see? And HCO was covered by the HCO Secretary and the Central Org was covered by the Association or Organization Secretary. There were two zones and there were actually two heads of this organization. But they had different functions.

All right. Well, this is expanded now. Because in trying to fix up the org charts, why, there were two functions which didn't fit smoothly under either one, and one function which was entirely adrift. The two functions which didn't fit smoothly on the international – I mean on big organization boards were materiel and accounts. And these didn't fit smoothly under either HCO or the Organization or Association Secretary. They were always worrying the Org Sec. He was always getting onto accounts, and he was always getting into materiel, and he was always getting here and there and the other thing. So obviously there was something adrift because he was wearing another hat there very strongly, and yet apparently he had a Materiel Unit and he apparently had an Accounts Unit but somehow or another he was always wearing these hats.

Well, rather than blame all the personnel in sight, well, let's just not see if the lines are a little bit in error and sure enough they are. This is not intended to be a very authoritative rundown on the situation, but I'll just tell you what it's all about.

Division 1 is HCO, which issues the data and policy – HCO. That's Division 1, see? And then there's Division 2 and Division 2 – all they do is apply and service, deliver, you see, with training and processing, see? And you could say, all right, well, the technology is issued by HCO and the training and processing are done by Division 2. See, Division 1 issues it and Division 2 uses it. And you get down to Division 3, and Division 3 collects the money and the mest. It takes care of the mest, see?

So you, in actual fact, have a very smooth gradient. You've got the idea and the management and the pickup and the police of this thing, see, moving over into – here into the use of the thing, moving over here into the care and preservation of the thing, see, which gives you three divisions.

And those three divisions are expressed at board level. And there's an International Board – regardless of how many Scientology corporations there are, this International Board controls all of them anyhow, so it doesn't matter. And the International Board has three divisions. And each board member is the head of each division.

There are three board members, and those three board members are, of course: I'm HCO. Always have been, so that's no change. Mary Sue (always in very close communication, and so forth, with secretarial aspects and training and processing; she's always been working in that particular field), Org Sec. And then the third one – Marilyn with – working
into the area of accounts and materiel with all of the mest and so forth along that line. That's three divisions.

And then you've got an echelon which exactly matches that one, below it, and then you've got an echelon which exactly matches that in every continent, and then you've got an echelon that matches that in every organization – every Central Organization, city office. In other words, this is a repeating action if you think of it as the board level. All right, board level, except these others are assistant boards. See? So, there's the International Board, and then there's assistant boards from there on through. And they're all composed of Division 1, Division 2, Division 3, which is answerable to the next board immediately above them, which makes a perfectly smooth three-way channel all the way down.

Now, these three functions are tremendously interlocked. They're interlocked on purpose, don't you see, so they won't separate and so forth. Now, of course, HCO doesn't own its mest. You see, that's actually owned by Division 3. Same way with Division 2; it doesn't own its mest. That's owned by Division 3. It can have its label on mest but it doesn't own it. It can't sell it; it can't buy it. It had damn better well take care of it. But HCO handles everybody's communications. And it doesn't matter what those communications are, if there's any communications anyplace, anywhere, why, they're carried by HCO. And the third division, in trying to get money in from the mailbox into the Accounts office, or from the Registrar to the Accounts office and so forth, is dependent on HCO keeping the line in there, see, and laying it in. Of course, they supervise it and make sure that it stays in. But HCO makes sure that it stays in on the basis of communication policy. HCOs always manage to do this very well. They do a good job of this.

They sometimes get busy in some other quarters and that sort of thing, neglect it for a while, but you'll normally see somebody all of a sudden perking up and alerting up and finding the lines aren't running someplace or another and saying "Aaahr," and "What's that full in-basket? You know I've seen a full in-basket there for days and days and days and days and days. What is this?" You know, wake up and straighten it up. These are functions by the way which they've always performed oddly enough, see? So there's really nothing very new in this. It's the smooth channel of it all.

And then everybody and everything is trained or processed in Division 2. There are no staff training courses which are run outside of the Academy and HGC, see? In other words, the D of T – if there's a training course around, why, that's his baby, you see? It doesn't matter if it's an administrative course, and it doesn't matter if it's a technical course, and it doesn't matter what kind of a course it is, if it's training, that's his baby – in Division 2, see? If it's done in that field, he does it. And if there's any processing around – it doesn't matter if that's an assist by some field auditor sitting on the front doorstep and fixing up the local errand boy with a Touch Assist, man, that's the D of P's. See? Anywhere, anywhere in that zone, anywhere. Field auditors auditing pcs, students auditing students in the Academy or anywhere else, if there's – if there's any auditing being done, it's the Director of Processing. That's it, see? This is now talking about a Central Organization.

That makes this course a little bit different because there's no HGC at Saint Hill. It's the only thing missing around here. So processing then tends to fall back onto the course or its
Instructors and it's a little hat that I've noticed everybody including me tends to wear from time to time. Where's somebody that really takes care of the case? You know? Well, in Central Orgs and so forth, well, we have somebody that takes care of the cases and that's the D of P. So that type and – of activity, then, of any kind, that is, processing that's ordered for any reason or done for any reason and so forth is done in the HGC.

Now, of course, Academies will be very jealous and safeguard this sort of thing from HGCs interfering or getting too deep into the Academy and telling students how they must audit, that sort of thing, and so forth. But in actual fact they are both members of the same division, and that's one of these close things that they can work out. So therefore, if you had somebody who was supervising cases or marking folders or doing something like that in the Academy, he would do it slightly under an HGC hat, don't you see? This would be the way. Well, we find out that Academies don't mark folders very well so there's been something wrong with that line, you see? We find HGCs do a fine job of testing and marking folders, you see? But Academies don't. So worked that way, why that line can be settled out there, because that's in the division.

So therefore, HCO personnel is trained by Division 2 and so is Division 3 personnel. They're once more trained by Division 2, see. There's a checksheet, it's done by Division 2. So you got your interlock of 1, 2, 3, and there are no functions outside these things.

Now, this is an assistant board I'm talking about. Well, of course, that's a new term. There is no such thing anywhere in the world as an assistant board. What's an assistant board? Well, it's an assistant board; that's what it is. No mysterious ramifications read into it. It just is that. And, of course, it has, of course, assistant board members. Well, what's an assistant board member? What's an assistant board? Well, assistant board could obviously assist a board in recommending a resolution, or it could recommend some action be taken of a board nature someplace and send it to the board and get it taken, don't you see? And it could also be composed of assistant board members who help the board members wear their hats.

The board then consists of a Chairman, a Secretary, and a Treasurer on the International Board – Chairman, being HCO, Division 1; Secretaries, being Training and Processing, Division 2; Treasurer being Materiel and Accounts, Division 3. Very elementary. So of course, the chap who is in charge – well, the fellow in charge of the board in the continent of Zec, the fellow in charge of Zec's Assistant Board, don't you see, would be the Assistant Chairman. He has no authority in his own right. His authority is delegated to him. So he's the Assistant Chairman and he heads up Division 1, and the other title the person would have – it's very odd that it'd be Chairman because it would be an HCO Area Secretary, see? The person would have another title. And Secretary – Organization Secretary or Association Secretary, would be Division 2, don't you see, but he would be an Assistant Secretary, in actual fact. That would be his – and he'd be an Assistant Board Member. These titles he would all have, don't you see? And then the – the third board member would be, of course, the Assistant Treasurer and that person would also be an Assistant Board Member, do you see? And that person might accumulate some other title like Accounts Executive or something like that, you see – which hasn't been specified by the way; the others have been. But Assistant Treasurer is so good that that's fine. Everybody was very happy with that one.
So that reflects and gives you an assistant board. Well, the assistant board, of course, doesn't have any power to make a resolution, but it has the power to recommend one. And of course in their own right, on delegated authority, they have the right to run their own – their own area divisions, you see? Well, so the – that's your board structure and it goes all the way to the bottom. Now, any city office would have this same structure.

Now, the reason why this isn't all done... The – well – now, man's frailty in running things with boards has been the lack of a certain thing. He was always trying to decide before the fact on things on which two of the members were not informed. So you actually always had a dizzy situation where nobody who was specialized in the area could make up his mind anyway, and they just got into a sort of a rubber-stamp situation. Or they all had to study each other's despatch lines, and they were all duplicate personnel that had to read all the despatches that related to anybody, you see, and it was just an overwork situation. So you either sat there for two or three days a week holding board meetings and getting nothing done and really, in the end, really just rubber stamping them, or you got on with your job and didn't hold any board meetings at all. Which is the usual way we have solved it in Scientology. We have to – have to take that out, you see...

But what we've actually done in reorganizational patterns – what I've actually done is simply try, really, to codify and straighten out what we actually are doing and what we have done successfully. It's not a brand-new structure. It's a structure which is based simply on what we have been doing and trying to get it represented with some reality on the actual org boards.

So, you, of course, then have two departments under HCO, and you've got two departments under Training and Processing, and you've got two units – because they are not production status – under the Assistant Treasurer, which gives you a six unit/department activity. In other words, there are six parts to a Central Organization and the seventh part is its executive board level so there are only seven basic hats. There's the departmental hats and the board hats, see? That's roughly adding them up.

So there are six of them and what are the two of HCO? Well, you've seen those around all the time except the poor blokes have gotten scattered here and there and the other place and so forth. Well, HCO simply takes over all of the mimeograph machinery and the publication machinery and Central Files and anything that had anything to do with communications or communication records – communications, communication equipment, communication records. That's the mimeograph machine, that's the Central Files, that's anything! Anything related, see? And that, of course, is used by the Registrar and the Letter Registrar and that's all germane to that particular section and so forth. So that's Prom-Reg, Department of Promotion and Registration, and that's all one department under HCO. It swings right on down from the HCO Area Secretary straight into this department. Because HCO is on this line this way.

It works – there's another formula as it go – you go across parallel. HCO promotes, the service departments deliver and the materiel/accounts people collect, see? Pdrum-pow-pow, see? So that lines up across on a parallel.

So, of course, all promotion comes under HCO. This, by the way, is what's been going on for years. I mean, I do all the promotion and HCO Secretary does promotion. They do the
magazine. Must have been an awful strain sometimes having the Registrar distant from this point and not being able to coordinate the Registrar's activities with the current campaigning and it must have been a stretch. I can imagine there have been such creaks. That's one of these little points I say that – you know, that you look around them real quick, and everybody has been looking around that curve and not really seeing what a curve it is.

So that's the Department of Promotion and Registration under HCO and of course HCO has – has – is, above this and below it, a communications unit for the whole organization, you see? So that communications function runs through there, so there's a person called an HCO Communicator who handles this sort of thing and then there is the Book Department, and so forth.

I, by the way, put the Mimeo – I said – remember I said Mimeo went under HCO. It doesn't go under Prom-Reg. It goes under Books. All publications, magazines, hats, bulletins, everything – that's all publications. That's all issued by the Publications Department. You want to know where the hats are kept in the organization – not in the HCO Area Secretary's desk. They're kept down in the Book Storage Department with all the rest of the books, see, and they're issued the same way, except they're issued to certain people and that sort of thing. And there's – that's – that book system we put onto that line... Well, where do you get your bulletins? And where are bulletins issued? And who issues the bulletins, and that sort of thing? Well, they're issued by the Book Department, of course, under the direction of the HCO Secretary.

Yeah, it's an elementary line which actually gives these people some more personnel to – to work with because it lets these personnel double ... Apparently two functions that have been spread this way have been brought together again without releasing or dismissing any personnel. So that ought to work better.

And you naturally got – in the middle of this line you've got the HGC, and you've got the Academy. The Academy and HGC is the seniority, by the way. And you've got the HGC processing all the pcs, and you've got the Academy training all the students. But you also have the HGC supervising and handling and issuing and ordering any and all processing that happens there. And that, by the way, was a step of many, many... Oh, I don't know, maybe a year or two ago, I said the D of P owned all of the folders in an entire area, and he had all the cases, and they were his. Well, that's an extension of that thing.

So the HGC – it doesn't matter – clear out to the borders of the zone or area of the activity (you know, of the Central Organization, wherever it reaches to, and so forth), any case in that belongs to the – to the HGC, see, the D of P – any regulation of it. So an HCO Area Secretary talking to somebody and trying to settle up this beef on the promotional line, don't you see and so forth, is in actual fact only doing an advisory thing. Whether or not this person gets any actual processing or what process is run on the person or that sort of thing would actually be decided by the HGC. Do you see that? So somebody comes in, wonders about this – well, that's referred to the HGC.

Now, the final two points there, are very easy to figure out. All purchasing... Purchasing is always getting knocked into the Accounts Department and out of it and into it, and they're always trying to fool around with this. And Materiel's had an awful time. It always is
just trying to get something. Sometimes it handles purchasing; sometimes Accounts handles the purchasing; sometimes they mix up one way or the other. And they obviously are hand in glove.

So they are two units and there's of course the personnel in charge of each one of those two units of simply, Materiel – and that's supplies of any kind whatsoever: office supplies, HCO's office supplies, everybody's office supplies – are handled by Materiel. And HCO gets cleaned by Materiel, and janitors and so forth all function under Materiel. And anything like grounds or buildings, or anything like buying or selling buildings or anything that has anything to do with buildings, tools, anything else, inventories and all that sort of thing, my God, endlessly, you see – that's all under Materiel and so forth.

And Accounts: well, that has to do with money, and it has to do with contracts, and it has to do with exterior legal which is where that finally wound up – exterior legal. And exterior legal means anybody suing you or your suing anybody else or so forth. Well, they've got a lot of exterior legal. But internal legal is HCO, of course. Of course that's – because that's on the policy line.

Now, HCO has a lot of other interrelationships in the organization but they are all very quickly and very easily defined under the headings that I have just given you, see? There's a lot of little bits and pieces, don't you see? But those bits and pieces, you find out, snap into place very quickly and very easily, see – click, click! Well, like here at Saint Hill. You always find Reception is the person who goes around – in times when there's lots of personnel around, it's usually Reception that takes around the tea to personnel. Well, Reception is under HCO, see; Telephone is under HCO, you see?

That all falls together. Bodies walking in and out, as long as they're on lines, belong to HCO, don't you see? Doing anything with it, it hasn't anything to do with that, see? Just like a despatch. As long as the despatch is on the line – route to a basket, why, it belongs to HCO and the second it's in the basket, why, somebody else is doing something with that, don't you see? The basket, however, belongs to Materiel. So that's the interlock, and I think you'll find that a very smooth-working interlock.

Well now, we've had difficulty. Several diff... things have been difficult and one of them is getting from echelon to echelon. That is to say, how do you get from the echelon of continental to Saint Hill? Well, you get another post – and we haven't yet decided exactly what this post is called but we'll call it for the moment one that we're familiar with, this is Executive Director. And we theoretically would have Assistant Executive Directors below each post – each – each assistant board. He doesn't run things but he's the liaison for the adjacent boards above, below or parallel.

I found out one of the reasons Scientology had trouble expanding is you can't write to a board, and people at – at the level, don't you see, of an assistant board... Well, take – let's take Melbourne. All right, there are three people in Melbourne. There's – there'd be – there'd be your HCO Area Sec, which we've got, the Association Sec and there would be an Assistant Treasurer. All right, they're all in a line there. And they have an awful time with Perth. And finally it has to go to top dog status, you see, to have anything happen in Perth and so on. Well, what is the line into that board? Well, you make a person, you call him Assistant Ex-
executive Director Melbourne – this probably is not the term we'll use; I'm just using the familiar one – and he's the guy that you route anything to, above, below, down, around, but not to the organization.

Here's a board here at Saint Hill but it has – it has a board under it. Well, the Saint Hill board really messes everything up like mad if it addresses the Saint Hill organization. Do you see? But it has – if it has an Executive Director, if the International Board has an Executive Director and the Saint Hill assistant board has an Assistant Director – Executive Director, then those two boards can communicate. Otherwise they can't because they are multiple things and of course a ... See, those two echelons can't communicate unless there's a channel through which they communicate. So you have an Assistant Executive Director Saint Hill who has no orders over the Saint Hill staff to amount to anything because that's – that's your – that's your boards, see, that's your councils, you might say. They go back, forth, up, down, parallel, and so forth, through that post.

Well, it'd be the Assistant Executive Director Cape Town who would be the one who you communicated to and through when you wanted to get to the board or when it wanted to attach – its – it wanted to get something settled with Durban. And it would get in touch with the Assistant Executive Director Durban, don't you see? It's probably just a Board Officer is what it really is, and it's an Assistant Board Officer, that's all, and it just passes these lines, but doesn't work like man works.

Now, here's the main principle that's been discovered here, is that if you monkey around in a board meeting to get everybody's agreement, you're governing by agreement and, by God, there's nothing more dangerous in the human race that you ever had anything to do with it. Because the thing that is mainly there to get agreed with is the reactive bank, and if everybody has got the same bank you know very well what they will eventually develop. They'll develop Earth. Nothing more need be said.

You don't want this. What you want... This is a board action – this is a board or committee action: That it has members who have functions, and they are perfectly free to do what they please with full board or assistant board permission until checked or stopped by the assistant board action. And that's true of each member of the board or assistant board.

In other words, he's perfectly free to run his job and to run his division. He's perfectly free to run his departments and to decide and have his decision ... He can't – he's not perfectly free, don't you see – HCO isn't perfectly free to run Division 2. They can kick Division 2 around if it isn't following along certain HCO lines, but they're not free – the board member, you see, of Division 1 really isn't free to upset the staff of Division 2, don't you see? That's – vuuuuh – that's what you get when you have all these board meetings. You see, you got every board member is trying to wear every hat. No, no, no, no.

A division – you got an assistant board member who is Division 1. That's the HCO Area Secretary. She got two departments and she runs them, and she runs them any damn way she pleases and makes any decision she pleases as long as it's successful and forwards the basic purpose of the organization and Scientology and the departments, you see? Fine! Right up to the moment when there is a – an assistant board meeting and the two members say, "You must not." Do you understand?
It's tacit approval of everything everybody does except they see them doing something they don't like and then they can, by majority vote, knock them in the head. But they can't cancel it if it's referred. In other words, the HCO Area Secretary of Division 1 has got recourse because it's not unanimous. So it goes to the next upper board for decision – next upper assistant board for decision – through its Assistant Executive Director.

So, in actual fact, the top dog of each lower assistant board is actually the Assistant Executive Director of an upper board. If you look that over very carefully, you will see that's very tricky and trying to get it through your head exactly how that works out may give you a headache. But it's very simple when you see it on an org board and you really had – ought to plot it on an org board. Because, actually, it means that the person who is the Assistant Executive Director of the Continental Assistant Board of Australia, and the person who says – who would ordinarily be looked to, to tell that assistant board to get in line, happens to be at Saint Hill. And the person who tells the Perth Assistant Board to get in line is actually located at the Continental Assistant Board and is the Assistant Executive Director on that board. Maybe miles and miles away. And boy, that's a good thing! [laughter] Because it gives a totally dispassionate view of the situation without an embroilment in local personalities.

And then we lay down this: That he can only go on raw statistics; he can't go on rumors, he can't go on any of that stuff. Raw data – that's all he wants, that's all he wants. He doesn't want anybody's opinion. "Oh, you say, HCO is doing an awful bad job out in Perth, huh? Well, well, well, all right. This is maybe too hot to handle. I don't want to handle this because I can't remove one or all of them but I won't – I'll look this over and see if I recommend that something be done to that person, you know?" And this is the only thing he's permitted to judge on: What's the statistics? Not "Is she a nice girl?" Not "Is Bessie Ann in Accounts mad at her?" Not "Has somebody who is the Assistant Gardener written a vicious letter to Ron concerning her?" That has nothing to do with it; nothing to do with it. It's just – what are the statistics of Division 1 Perth.

So many Committees of Evidence requested, so many given. So many bulletins received and issued, so many flubbed. So many books sold, so many books not sold. You got the idea? How much traffic has been driven around – in on the organization? What promotion campaigns? What is the proportional sign-up of the Registrar? Registrar has forty-five interviews a week; signed up twelve people on an average. Is that good or bad? You get the idea? Seems to have spent a tremendous number – amount of money on books and hasn't sold many. Let's look it over. In other words, we've got the raw statistics of that department sitting right there under our nose, because it's got two production departments and very easy to evaluate, see? Is it running or isn't it running?

And the moment that you trust interpersonal relations into the upset or handling or managing of the peace here in the absence of fact, you're tampering with the environment. You have the Board of Directors of Luminum-Aluminum Flushboxes Incorporated, and they've got a beautiful dining room, and they heard this wonderful tale about this young genius who is out in Bukwuk because their aunts told them. So they make him the General Manager of Bukwuk. This is how you destroy empires. And taking the say-so of the most entheta character in the organization as the proper opinion of the people in charge of the organization, of course, puts everybody at risk instantly, immediately and at once.
So you just say, "Oh, Bill Zugzug wrote a bad report on Mamie, huh? Well, that's very, very interesting. What's the via lines? What's the via line – Bill Zugzug's via lines? What – what – let's see, he's – let's see, he's Assistant to the Assistant to the Assistant to the Assistant Janitor. All right, and he's in Division 3. And Mamie, is in – she's typist over here in Prom-Reg." What routing did you get the despatch on – telepathy? [laughter] What value does the thing have, don't you see? Has no value at all.

Now, you want to know who should be putting the – somebody is recommending that you be – put somebody in charge of a typing pool someplace or another and so forth. Well, it's very simple. How many letters did they get out? If this is what they're in for, why, that's your action line: How many letters should be gotten out? How many letters were gotten out over what period of time? What was the – what was the period? That's all.

And this sounds awfully brutal, and it sounds like somebody is being very mechanical. No! What somebody is doing is just cutting the throat of all these rumor, entheta, tanglefoot lines and letting us get on with the job, see? That's the only thing that makes any difference, because you find out this is a coordinative factor. You find out if anybody was sitting at a typewriter doing the job over a short – certain space of time they would have gotten out so many letters, don't you see? If they get out more than the average, why, very possibly they could persuade somebody else to get out some letters.

If after we put her in charge of the typing battery, why, the typing battery production falls off and goes into a complete spin, we try to find out if that reason is traceable to its – some of the other causes. But it went into a complete spin so we decide at that moment that that was the wrong person to put in charge of the typing battery, and her appointment was only temporary anyway, so we put her back. Get the idea? Not whether or not she was very charming to the Org Sec. See? That's a high crime. Not a high crime. Funny definition but it's a... Do you see?

Now, of course, actually this person has to be personable one way or the other, and this person has to be persuasive, and the person certainly has to [be] either a screaming genius on the subject of policy or follow policy, one way or the other – to have gotten the quota out, because it, of course, confirms basic policy or not. This is very simple then.

Well, your organization can live, then, as long as people are following the basic purpose and it isn't too impeded. And the organization will live and people in it'll be happy if that's done. Otherwise they'll be very unhappy and very miserable.

So it sounds very, very robot, you know: "What are the statistics? Give me the raw data on that. You want a what? What's the data? You've just had a letter from Josie, huh! Well, all right, fine. I'm very glad you've had a letter from Josie. And she says that the Association Secretary should be shot. Well, that's very, very interesting. I'm very, very fascinated, and so on. Was it written in Chinese or Russian? What's the statistics of the organization? Oh, it's been on a steady rise. There hasn't been any falloff of any kind whatsoever. Go get lost. We have some emergencies on another continent. That doesn't happen to be an emergency." Got the idea?
So if you do a good job, why, you're let get on with it. If you do a real good job, why, you get kicked upstairs. Simple, elementary. If you're a personality whiz kid, great! It'll show up in the statistics. You understand?

And that's basically how civilization is killing itself today is not letting – not setting up any system by which its basic purpose is forwarded by its personnel and choosing the people who forward its basic purpose. And that's how they're killing themselves. They choose people because their ties match the Managing Director's wife's piano scarf, you know? Or would – that they hold good liquor.

The United States Navy in actual fact chooses officers solely on the basis of whether or not their wives are socially acceptable, and I won't say agreeable. [laughter] But it's gone to pieces completely. Had nothing whatsoever to do with organizational pattern.

Well, I've had to dig all this stuff up and ferret it all out. And I found it very, very interesting. And I didn't know I had to reach that far back and dig into the very woof and warp of the universe just to find out how to get us a running org. But I've had to do so, and it's been fairly successful, and I hope the information will be of some help to you and make things easier for you as you go along.

Thank you.
THE PROGRESS AND 
FUTURE OF SCIENTOLOGY

A lecture given on 16 March 1965

Thank you. Thank you.

What's the date?

*Audience: 16 March.*

Sixteen March. Sixteen March AD 15, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, didn't bring my notes. Guess I've got to get another gag than that one – nobody laughs at it anymore.

This has been a mad, mad sprint. This *is* a mad sprint.

Back in 1950 people used to yammer at me and yammer at me. Of course I knew how to administer and administration in general. They used to yammer at me, "Why don't you do something about the organization? Yap, yap, yap, yap," you know ARC break, ARC break. "Well, why don't you just drop everything you're doing and go in there and push a desk?" Very important! You push a desk. And all of this – all of this added up to a big bunch of nonsense.

In the first place, I got caught absolutely flat-footed in 1950, completely flat-footed. Wrote a book. Published on March the 9th. Anniversary of it has just gone by. *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health.* I was even contracting at the time to go on and do some stories and novels and so forth. And I had for a number of years paid for all research and so forth out of my own money or my products – the products of writing. And there I was minding me own business and the book hit. Nobody ever expected this book to be a bestseller. And it went instantly and immediately to the top of the bestseller list and it just stayed there and stayed there and stayed there. Had a lousy publisher, he was caught flat-footed, too. He was an ex-commie. He's still alive over in New York. He tries occasionally to put out a timid paw in my direction and when I don't instantly answer up he ARC breaks like crazy. Finally, HCO Sec NY was able to get in touch with him the other day and it's all good roads and good weather now.

But it actually blew him off of his post. It blew him out of his own publishing firm. Because nobody expected it. And his publishing firm was rigged to publish books and make a little money and all of a sudden it found itself with too much money to deal with and there were just these thousands and tens of thousands of dollars rolling in the front door of that
place and they had one of the biggest book publishers in the country and yet they still couldn't turn out enough books. Everybody was short of books, short of books, short of books, short of books. And it was just too much confusion. Whatever the political allegiances and other things of the people concerned, and so forth, it was just too much. Nobody was braced for this at all.

Next thing I knew, right after the book was published, and so forth, a bunch of chaps came down to see me and told me they'd fixed up a foundation for me and all was going to be well and they would run all this. That was in essence what it was. That moment I took my finger off my number and I said, "All right. It's all right with me."

And oddly enough at those very first meetings some actions were proposed by me which we just now are getting the completed cycle of action on and for lack of which – and for lack of which everything has been appetite over tin cup. But I had one vote amongst eight or nine or – I've forgotten how many it was. And it was just by dint of personality I tried to hold the thing together. You never heard so much squirreling and mess-up and so forth in your life. And I didn't have any management control – nothing. As a matter of fact at that time – you may find it hard to credit perhaps – but I was totally anonymous as far as anything but the author of the book was concerned.

I had a number of US Senators interested in this. As a matter of fact I had the senate dining room one day – I had lots of friends down there in those days, still would have if I went down and stuck my nose in. Every time I do, why they all say, "Hey, Ron! Where the hell have you been?" you know. "What's the matter, you mad at me?" Something like that. I'd say, "Oh, I've been busy." And I had the senate dining room down there one noon, I remember, along about this period. And you could have heard a toothpick fall from one end of it to the other. I was simply telling people about – a group of scientists had found – you see, your effort to leave it anonymous and that sort of thing is well borne. Occasionally, why, you don't want to use the word or something like this or you're being timid. And yet I was telling them somebody had found the dynamic principle of existence and I was telling people what it was and so forth. And that place was jammed from one corner to the other with senators and so forth. The next thing you know the table outside of the perimeter of the table I was sitting at with three or four old senators and the table outside that went silent and the table outside that went silent and the table outside that went silent and the next thing you know there was wasn't anything happening in that dining room. The waiters were standing there, see. Darned-est thing you ever wanted to see, you know!

And I said, "Gee!" I said, "I've got a bear by the tail here, you know." That was actually before anything much had occurred. They had never heard of this book or anything. But I said, "Well I just write the stuff up," you know. And actually that was my attitude until about July of 1950. "Oh, I just – just wrote it." And I wasn't making any commotion, I wasn't promoting my writing name. Actually a writer seldom promotes his own writing name anyhow.

Names – names of course to me are very, very indifferent things. After all, I'm very well known under about six pen names, you see, so names don't mean much. It's the guy that was important. But this name, this name, this one name started to move up and hit me in the face, don't you see. I've worn it very pleasantly and so forth, since it isn't that L. Ron Hubbard
is a pen name, it happens to be my own name. But this name, this name was strictly exclama-
tion points, you see, around the place. And I was trying not to wear that hat. And finally, the
fellow who was serving as general manager at that time – I was having to do fantastic things;
I was putting the place together with my bare hands – everybody else was running around
being important. I'm a working stiff myself I wouldn't quite know what it is to be a sedentary
type desk flyer, you know. Just flying a desk as an executive you see, sitting there – sitting
there at zero mph, going madly down the carpet, you know, and I wouldn't quite know what
that was.

And I was all over the place and I think I was delivering eight hours of lecture a day or
something of that sort; I was teaching about three or four courses. I was buying all the furni-
ture, putting everything together, I'd had to go out and find the building myself because I'd
found out the reason they couldn't find a building is they went around and told everybody
with a poor mouth, "Well, we're just a charity organization, we can't pay very much." I kept
saying, "Gee, but man, we're expanding, we've got to get out of here, you know."

"Oh, I've been trying everywhere!" And so I said to Parker, "You come along with
me!" I said, "I'm certain that there are buildings in this city." And that was what he was telling
people, "We're just a charity organization and we can't pay very much. We don't have very
much money."

Money? My God! The doors were falling in with money! And I just cut him off and
just scolded him right in fro... right in front of the building owner of the building we were
standing in, you know. "What do you mean telling people lies like that? You've got to con-
querr that hab... habit of yours, Parker, telling people lies like that!" Turned around to the fel-
low, and said, "We've got plenty of money," I said, "Give me the keys to the place, how much
did you say it was? Oh, yes, well give me the keys to the place, because we're moving in this
afternoon." And the fellow says, "Well, the lease and so on..." Well, I said, "That's your look-
out." I took the keys out of his hand and we were into – into our original headquarters.

And there were three mainline railroad trains which went one on each corner of the
building in a triangle. And that's why you – that's why you see to this day the Dianetic symbol
in our shield. [laughter] You can just imagine it, you can just imagine.

Well, anyway, I remember, I had been sweating it out, working away, tearing around,
giving the lectures, and also ran the HGC to the degree that any time an auditor had any diffi-
culty with a case he brought the case into my office and I banged him down on the couch and
got the case started, handed him back to the auditor and roll 'em. I used to crack cases
pangety-pangety-pangety-pangety-pang, you see. And then run off and give another lecture
and so forth. And gave a night course. And the original, the original HAS course mock-up
which you have now is the original Elizabeth mock-up. PE came much later. And that was
simply that for a certain fee, a number of people could take a rather long, elementary, indefi-
nite course, but they were definitely, definitely taught exact data. And they were taught exact
data out of Book One – Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. They were just
taught this book. It wasn't somebody lecturing about how nice life was – they were just told
this data, you see.
And engrams and locks and that sort of thing were described to them, and so forth. And those people all moved over a hundred percent onto the original HCA Course. Well, it was fantastic. I'd give this about – I think it ran about three nights a week, and so forth. It's what you'd see now as an equivalent of the HAS course. See, it was an Academy course, it wasn't a PE. These students were given full student responsibility, don't you see. They weren't given very much auditing but they were given some. And so on.

Now the first real blow along this sort of thing came when I got ahold of the Elizabeth auditors and I called them together in a staff meeting. I used to have lots of staff meetings. And it was a query on my part, "What do you want to call yourselves? All right with me to call yourselves anything. What do you want to call yourselves?" And they said, well, so-and-so, and they'd get a lot of suggestions, they didn't discuss it there, they were going to have a meeting so that they could decide on this, you see. And they had to get the Los Angeles auditors a little bit later. This was not decided for some time, by the way. And they got the Los Angeles auditors to have a staff meeting to decide what they were going to call themselves, don't you see?

And they came back with "Hubbard Dianetic Auditor." And I said, "Hubbard Dianetic Auditor? All right. Hubbard Dianetic Auditor. Okay." I could see myself walking into something here, you see. "It's all right with me, you boys want to call yourselves that, all right." And Los Angeles flicker-flacked back and forth on the telegraphs, and so forth, and they – "Hubbard Dianetic Auditor." That was passed. I didn't have anything to do with it. Oddly enough, many years later we tried to drop this name and it was very peculiar but all of a sudden we had a completely empty school and nobody wanted the other certificate and there were no students of any kind and eventually when the certificate was reoffered again in Scientology, I think it was "Hubbard Scientology Auditor" and so forth, we instantly had a full Academy.

So these boys had a good instinct on this and they knew what they were doing. But they didn't want to be known as anything else.

Now, the point is that I at that time was trying to – well I after all had a body to run and – this is back in 1950 – and I had a body to run and it was a bad show because I wasn't getting any sleep and I wasn't getting very much to eat and that sort of thing. And I had a...

Very amusing story goes in connection with this, because just before the 9th of March I had been – run into a chap by the name of Palmer, over at the Explorers Club, who had just had to drop an expedition. And it was an expedition to the Dodecanese, some islands which are just south of Greece, to dig up a ship which lies in thirty fathoms of water down there which is full of statuary from Greece. And it's a Roman ship of Roman times and there might be something in there by some boy like Praxiteles or something like that, don't you see. So he had run into me at the club and "Oh, hiya, Ron, I haven't got much time to talk to you, do you want an expedition?" I said, "Do I want an expedition? What's the matter with you?"

And he said, "Well, you know that – that thing I've been talking about of going over to the Dodecanese and so forth, well that's all off. The Ecuadorian government – the Ecuadorian government has got an exploration that they want me to conduct down there and as a matter of fact I've got to go right now and – oh, by the way, here's all the pack of materials and all
the appointments and the visas and everything that goes along with this, and so forth, and it's all yours, Ron!

Well, oddly enough, interestingly enough, it was really an even swap. Because right at the middle of the beginning of World War II, why, the Ecuadorian government had, in connection with the Explorers Club up there, had gotten in touch with a fellow by the name of James Robert Gresham. And Jimmy Gresham couldn't think of anybody to take to Ecuador but me. The Ecuadorian government offered him fifty thousand square miles of Ecuador if he could go in and find out who was in that territory. And we were going to go down there but I unfortunately had a commission in the navy and there was a war on. Anyway, this all sounds very involved but here the thing came back to me again. Palmer walks into the Explorer's Club, he's all excited, he's going down to Ecuador, see. They're still looking for somebody to go in and get his head lost.

"So there's the – there's the packet," he says, "there's the packet." It was just before the publication of the first book. I said, "This is pretty interesting! Go on down there and do some deep-sea diving, only thirty fathoms of water – what do you know! Nice, warm Dodecanese and so on." So I started writing around to people and connected them as the heir apparent to this expedition and started to whip it up and there was money available and there was everything else.

Those lines are still hanging there, not quite connected! But actually, if you could imagine it, I was thinking still in the middle of 1950 of occasionally nibbling around about this expedition, you know? It sounded awful good. And the deeper we got into 1950 the better it looked! [laughter] And one day the general manager, after a big board meeting and so forth, got in touch with me and he says, "Ron," he says, "you've got to front up here. You've got to front up to these people." He says, "They're depending on you," and so forth. Well, I wasn't doing anything that's not fronting up, I was just working like mad and wasn't paying much attention to the – to the figurehead on something. I was still telling people this sort of thing. And he said, "You must do that!" and I – bah!

Well, there goes your – any liberty or freedom of motion you have, don't you see, on something like this. And I shook my head and in the interim – between the times, seeing they're just about two hours apart, these times are – I found out that Joe Winter was using the fact of my agg... attributing the development of the subject to a nebulous group of nonexistent scientists to squirrel the whole cockeyed lot. And we had some kind of a wild cross going – mind you this was a working subject. This was not an unworking subject at all. And we had – we had cases snapping out of it and we had people coming in and going out shouting three cheers and that sort of thing – it was just good straight Dianetics.

And it wasn't very soon, there, I'm starting to get – starting to get difficulties with cases. Starting to run into cases which were being audited in some peculiar way. I was getting somebody there who was telling people that "Auditing is an art. There is nothing scientific about it." You can imagine somebody telling that. You can imagine somebody telling students that. A wide-open invitation to walk around and do Gestalt therapy while they eat candy or something and not do anything for anybody. Well, that was the state that mental health was in at the time of the emergence of Dianetics. Nobody had anything done for them. It was every-
body had some kind of weird opinion. I remember they had something running called psychodrama in those days. And it sure is!

But these subjects were all pretense subjects, don't you see? You listen to them, they read awful good in the books, but I have the last textbook that was published by psychology which was uninfluenced by Dianetics. And I took it off the line with me own little pink hand down at the American Book Bindery. Because it came off the line – it was the basic textbook of psychology for this University of Chicago. And it rolled off the line and the last copy of that binding went off the line as the first copy of Dianetics came on. So I just turned around to the girl who was in charge and I said, "Do you mind?" and picked up the copy, right off the binder rollers. I said, "Do you mind if I take this book?"

"No, go ahead." She was after all making her fortune off of me, so, perfectly all right. And I have that book to this day. Actually it was insufficiently dried so its cover is warped. But so is its contents. [laughter] And I picked up that book – I picked up that book for evidence, for evidence because I knew that the book following, just behind it was never going to afterwards have a straight picture of what psychology was. I knew that. And it's got "man's IQ cannot be changed, he's an unchanging animal, he's – we don't know anything about what the psyche is and therefore we can't give you a proper definition for a psyche." You see, it's got all that stuff in it, don't you see.

Well, I didn't want this – I didn't want Dianetics being influenced to that degree and it occurred to me then and there that there was some truth in what the general manager of the Elizabeth Foundation was saying to me. And I was still a bit queasy about this though it seemed to me like, you know, saying all right, positively and completely owning up to the truth of it is, I wrote it all, I did it all, it's been in the works since 1938, don't you see? That – that was a brave statement. So he backed me up against the wall about two hours after the first meeting and he says, "Well," he says, "have you decided?" he says, "Because this is probably going to be a very crucial point." And I said, "Yes, I've decided, all right, you can tell them I did it all."

And so I talked from that viewpoint thereon, which is of course the truthful viewpoint. And it was very reluctant that I took over these – this type of hat and responsibility because I knew that all hell was going to break loose and boy did it!

There was some gal who had left me forever, for instance, down in Savannah, Georgia, the year before. And somewhere toward the beginning of that – of the year just previously, hearing things were in the wind, she had turned up and I couldn't get rid of her. I hadn't anything to do with her, I wasn't anything, you see. Navy – naval officers being naval officers accumulate baggage. My life was not prepared to be a wide-open book; I had been a writer all my life! I have lived – I had lived in Greenwich Village, and so forth. As a matter of fact, my life was sufficiently incredible that I seldom wrote stories about it because they were too unbelievable. And I used to actually have to lie about my life because I was accustomed to boys of my own age, or young people or writers of my own age, and so forth sitting there, you know, and just calling me a bloody liar. I'd tell them the truth, you see. Well it didn't pay – it didn't pay. So what you did is water it all down, don't you see. The truth of the matter was pretty – pretty exclamatory sort of point existence. My adventures did not take place in my
own textbooks – in my own, that is to say, my own fiction stories. They took place in the raw. And this sort of thing is very easy to catch up with. If you're preparing for the seminary and so forth, why, don't live the life of the pirate! If you're going to go before a committee of evidence, make sure you have a clean nose for a number of years or at least since the last amnesty! [laughter]

Well, nobody issued me any amnesties. This girl – this girl, she was hammering and pounding around the place and so forth and there were psychologists all over the place. The commies decided they were going to take us out of the running and at – at that time the definition of a psychotic person was one who thought the communists were after him. They had carefully planted this in the mores of the society which is a very interesting definition. I don't know, we may do the same thing someday, it's very successful. When we want to get somebody why we just spread it around you see, the definition of a psychotic is somebody who thinks the Scientologists are after him, you know. [laughter] And then we promptly go after him. [laughs] No, I'm afraid we wouldn't do anything that bold, we don't have to.

But when things were really blowing up – it was quite interesting that when I approached the Justice Department concerning the state of our organizations and so forth and gave them a list of two hundred and some names and asked them to please tell me which of these people were known as subversive agents, they countered – J. Edgar Hoover's boy there countered and he said, "No," he said, "I'll give you back the names who are not communists. And therefore I myself won't be hung with the fact of having given any state information to anybody."

People like to weave the idea that I'm in bad here or there or people think badly of me and that sort of thing and that is not – definitely not the case. See, if I were in Washington in 1955, if I cared to work at it, I probably could have wangled legislation protecting Scientology. It's quite the reverse picture, don't you see. These guys, I go in to see them, even – well, today, I'd go in Washington, see the guys that – "Oh, yes! Gosh, how are you?" you know. "Gee!" you know. And the letters I receive on my business lines and that sort of thing, "Oh, thank you, thank you for writing us," don't you see. Very courteous and so on. The atmosphere which has been built up in some people's minds, you see, is there's something not quite nice or there's something not quite right about being a Scientologist. Oh, that's just an operation, that's nonsense. Right at the top, right at the top I hear nothing but the snap of the right index finger touching the cap brim, wherever I go. It's very interesting.

The situation is very good where we are. But in those days it was equally good. And the FBI was very nice about this and out of two hundred and some names they turned me back thirty. My press relations man during that period of time was not just a communist, he was actually wanted by the FBI and they actually put their hands on him and put him away a very short time afterwards. Revenge was taken against these people that we were never told about. Actually, the FBI rounded the worst of them up. Some of them fled to Mexico, some of them did this. But these were people who were really kicking our heads in. They were robbing offices – oh, it's very incredible. There were a couple of murders. This is a wild and lurid time I'm talking about. Well, of course everybody says, "Well, you couldn't..." you know, the everybody says, "He – oh well, they must've had something very wrong," and so forth. Yes, there was something very wrong. The most forward philosophy of the world that's making the most
progress is communism. And it met its – it met its match. And it recognized that it had met its match. Democracy as a philosophy had gone completely flat and stale. There wasn't any religious backwash, you see, against any expansion. They didn't have any opponent anywhere on the line. And they were under orders at that particular time to infiltrate all social and domestic groups, don't you see, to do this, that and the other thing and subvert things. They had everything running their own way. It was all fine. All of a sudden somebody stands up and he says, "There's another philosophy in the world." And they went to work on that fast.

Now you think, all right, after this length of time it's very hard to believe it. But I was the guy who's – was hearing the bullets go snap past his ear. Murder, sudden death. Reads like – reads like – well I don't know, James Bond in the tamer pages. I rescued a woman who had been electric shocked half to death and was so drugged she couldn't even open up her eyes; they had tried to get her to swear out a warrant to get me committed. An airplane was ticking over at an airport – this is incredible stuff – an airplane was ticking over at an airport to pick me up and fly me to St. Louis, put me in a spinbin where I would never be heard of again. Interesting! The two boys who were sent to pick me up and so forth unfortunately had not been as well trained in the science of combat as myself. That's right! They speak once in a while of pistol-whipping. Well, there is where the pistol-whipping occurred. I wasn't pistol-whipped. I said this is just too confounded thick. I don't know who my friends are, I don't know who my enemies are, I don't know anything about anything, all I know is I want to get the book I'm writing on finished, so I just withdrew from the whole scene.

I know I've left you with a definite impression that there were a lot of things going on that you have not been informed of, but I can assure you that there were a lot of things going on that I was never fully informed of! All I know is that I had taken over my hat rightly and the second I stood in to the run wearing me own hat, hard and heavy, that is to say, "I am me," all hell broke loose and I was trying to hold the fort. It's taken the better part of fifteen years to where a foothold could be put in to a point where that hat can be worn in this society.

Because it's a hat, of course, that speaks about freedom. And it speaks about the betterment of man. And it speaks about this sort of thing that you don't have to be a slave. It assaults the very foundations, you see, of your economic systems. It assaults the very guts of the foundation we live in. This is another philosophy. Entirely different philosophy. A philosophy that you can't be – people can't be lied to. They – we can see through the magic spells, don't you see, the black magic spells being woven. This is a civilization where some entheta kid sitting in a government chair telling everybody how bad it all is over there, and so forth, can all of a sudden get thirty million people killed as one fellow named Hitler did. This is an interesting civilization. And that's because people don't know who they are or what they are, where they're going or what they're doing.

All right, you start laying the truth on the line. And it's liable to blow off a bit of confusion. All you got to do is put in a stable datum and the confusion starts to blow off.

In the early days of Dianetics and this is the early beginnings of Scientology, of course, as it was the same exact moment, well this didn't violate that rule a bit. And you hear a lot about things going on this way and things going on that way, and what happened there and wasn't it all terrible and so forth. No, we got through just because of one thing. As I fi-
inally, in July of that year, in spite of the turbulence and everything, listened to people's pleas along this line and I wore my hat of being me and nobody has ever been able to throw me off of that line since. And there's been a lot of tries – a lot of tries and it's very, very, very turbulent.

But being able to stand up and say you're yourself and you did it, and yes, I'm the fellow who wrote the book, yes I'm the fellow who dreamed it up, yes I'm the fellow who leads this group. And don't qualify any way, shape or form. Don't go putting your – don't go backing up and saying, "Well, as a matter of fact I am God's anointed child on Earth." And "God, you see, God appeared to me in a dream and all of his lightning bolts, you see, are going to hit if you don't accept this fact." This is perfectly all right to be somebody's deputy if he exists. But how about dreaming one up? How about dreaming up a source to be a deputy of? Perfectly all right to be a deputy.

I myself found out to my – greatly to my relief many, many years before Dianetics and so on – that I was a very good subordinate. I found out I was excellent. And I took a great deal of pride in this. Because most of my life up to that time I had been solely and entirely in command. And I began to wonder if there was something wrong with me, if I was the kind of fellow who only had to be in command. Was I the kind of fellow that couldn't be anyplace else but in charge, you see. Because I had these chaps around, you know. Fellows who couldn't be anything else. And one day I was appointed to a very subordinate post. And I had several officers in echelon immediately above me. I wasn't even really in charge of a section, don't you see. I was just a subordinate with a capital "S." And you know after a – after quite a while on that post and so forth I suddenly looked at it and wondered why I was so pleased with myself. I was just grinning at myself – I'd look at myself in the mirror and find myself grinning, you know? And it was just because I was perfectly well qualified to be a subordinate and everybody was happy with me as a subordinate and they knew that things got done. My commanding officer in that particular instance would wave his hand in my direction, and say, "Hubbard so-and-so and so-and-so," you know, and Hubbard would go, do so-and-so fix it up, just like he said, you know, no embellishments. Took all the privileges of subordinates, you know. Privilege – privileges of a subordinate is to goof. You know, to goof on occasion. You don't have anything to do, why, don't do anything, you know.

I remember the CO of this particular instance used to leave at ten o'clock in the morning. We were lying in dock. And there was no particular reason under the sun, moon and stars to be around the ship and I think I had about sixty ensigns. And he used to come in in the morning, I'd be there about eight o'clock and straighten everything out, and he used to come in about nine o'clock, something like that, and then he'd hit the beach – nautical term – he'd hit the beach, you see, with his cap and his raincoat on and so forth and go home and read his – read his pipe or something. And so when he walked in he'd give me a whole string of orders, rat-a-tat, tat-a-tat, tat-a-tat, tat. As a matter of fact he was dead wrong; it was the lousiest sort of subordinat-izing, See, whereby the top man is skipping his second-in-command because you are effective and efficient and the second-in-command is not effective and efficient and this is being made plain to the second-in-command by the top man, you know. I mean, one of these unbearable situations, you know.
So the old man would walk in, he'd give me a whole string of orders and I'd go around and give all the ensigns their hot-water bottles to rush from here to there or whatever it was. Turn out the men, running in the divisions, having an inspection and that sort of thing, the old man hit the beach I think about ten o'clock. And ten fifteen, I'd look around, see everybody was working, so forth, put two or three of my chiefs alert on the situation, pat everybody on the back, get on my white cap – white topped cap and my raincoat, pick up my briefcase, hit the beach! [laughter]

One day – everything was running like apple pie order, you see. The men knew if they got me in trouble, why, they'd be in trouble so nobody ever got me in trouble, and so forth, and probably there were dozens of them beneath me in these hundreds and hundreds of men and so forth that also probably hit the beach at ten thirty, don't you see? [laughter]

And one day, at ten fifteen, I was clattering down the steps ready to go ashore, it was in a big administration building, what we were doing was putting a ship in commission. And all of a sudden, why – that man's name by the way was Roger Edison Perry, Captain USN, see, old line. And Perry, you know, that is the Perry. And he was a – he was a descendent along these lines. And he was really, he was really all Navy. But actually a prince of a guy. And my God, he's forgotten something. And there I am, almost to the bottom of the steps, dressed for shore and there he is, coming back to get his briefcase or something of the sort. So he says, "Well, Hubbard – um," he said, "are you going over to the ship, uh..."

I said, "No, sir."

He said, "Are you hitting – are you – you got a conference over with the – um – building constructor or something?"

I said, "No, sir."

And so, "Well, what are you doing?" He says, "Dressed up and so forth and..."

I said, "I'm going ashore, Captain."

And he said, "Well, this is uh – this is just a rare occasion?" Christ, he didn't want to offend me – I've been running his whole ship for him. [laughter] He says, "This – this – this is just a rare occasion?" He said, "You're just – you have some errand of your own?"

I said, "No sir, Captain, I do this every day." [laughter] And he squirmed! [laughter]

And he said, "Well" he said, "well, all right," he said, "but you shouldn't make it so obvious!" [laughter] Very funny!

Anyway – anyway, the business of becoming a subordinate or being able to occupy a subordinate role was something that I was very happy to be able to do. But to occupy a top-dog role, which is all the way up, you know, there's no government or God or something of the sort or any mystic vision back of you and not even galactic empire status, don't you see – couldn't even reassume one of your old identities on the whole track and saying, "Well, we once owned this, you know, we once owned this empire and so forth." And just to be able to stand up in the howling winds of space, you know, that sort of thing and confront everything simultaneously and stand there regardless of the dead cats, the alarm clocks, the bricks and everything else which are coming your way, that took some doing. And that's all you look at
when you look at this early history and so forth; it is simply a stable datum going into a very, very aberrated world.

The truth of the matter is, although events of the world are moving ahead at a very giddy pace and although there appear to be a lot of risky things going on in the world, the world is really a better place because we are in it, you see. Things have changed. We've changed the whole face of psychology for instance. We changed the – there are people around who know that we exist.

Now, at no time, of course, could anybody have done this all by himself. It would take a... Once in a while early staffs and that sort of thing took – took a real beating. I'm well aware of one incident where they held off the – I think eighteen or twenty Philadelphia policemen, and so forth, who had come to arrest me as a witness in a bankruptcy. Nobody could ever get anything on me, I never did anything. But they can arrest and put in jail the witness in a bankruptcy suit, which is Federal, don't you see. And the staff at that time in Philadelphia and so forth, when they first saw these cops starting to load up and load into the place, and a couple of Federal marshals and that sort of thing, simply held them off, barehanded, insisted that they should show their cards and should do this and should do that and these guys started to get cross with them, and the next thing you know there was a battle royal, man! And gave me an opportunity to catch my breath and I finally – I don't know what would have happened... And by the time the Federal marshals came up to where I was, they were shaking so badly and they were so upset and demoralized, you know, they'd had an awful time getting through that outer perimeter, that I took the gun out of one of them's hand and put it in his holster, "Because," I said, "you're nervous." They were completely demoralized. They took me downtown, and I had to stand around for a while and get finger printed, and so forth, and they didn't dare do anything because I hadn't done anything.

And then they found out there'd been a "dreadful mistake." You never saw Federal judges and marshals and that sort of thing quite as embarrassed because they'd been told an awful lot of lies from the Wichita Foundation, which of course was a squirrel outfit, which had continued on. Bad old days! The bad old days! Well I was out of there in no time at all, I mean, I had people this way and this way, in other words people were standing up for me here, there and everyplace, don't you see. And anybody trying to do anything to me was wading in through death. But from where I looked it looked awful lonesome occasionally. It takes some doing. It takes some doing. And we operated very well and have ever since, in a sort of a ragged sort of way, as a fairly compact group. And it's only been that, that it's been possible to go ahead and make the progress we've made in society.

Well, you may not think we're making too much progress in this society, and so forth – well, to get back to what I was going to tell you in the first place, is we never started! All we've been doing is standing still, waiting for the flatirons and dead cats to sort of clear out of the air. Because just putting in a stable datum of Dianetics, just putting in a stable datum of this particular character, blew off enough confusion in this society so that it'd make it possible after a while for us to move.

For a long time it was impossible to hold a position very fixedly or straight. Very, very impossible. And there's where you see the early foundations moving. This is just standard
phenomena. They moved from here to there to the other place, don't you see. We used to have an axiom that it took about two years for the flatirons to catch up with us, you see. And after about two years, why there wasn't anything more you could do in that locale and sure enough, that was about the time lag.

It was – it was tough. But we were in actual fact as an organization – I was standing there as a being – but as an organization, and so forth, we couldn't stand up to everything that came our way. Don't you see?

Now, I may have given you the impression that we've made no progress and so forth. My whole idea throughout this entire time was to go on and do my researches, finish it up and deliver. Deliver the goods in spite of every interruption and so forth, to eventually come out the other end with a case progress for every case that came under anybody's nose, that it could be done easily and so forth. And I devoted my time exclusively to research. And I paid no attention at all to the brickbats and the dead cats. Let them fly! See?

Well, maybe that was rough on people. But actually the group has constantly more or less been asking me to stand up like the general manager did, so that he could save his board, don't you see? Back in 1950 the group has been asking me to stand up and actually direct an advance line into the society. And instead of that, I have been sitting back, fixing up the general situation of technology and so forth so that it could be delivered. I've somehow or other kept the organizations running and functioning, in spite of all these other things, that I've not concentrated on that at all.

I've put – taken lots of time and lots of energy – lots of time, lots of energy – in pushing around communication lines and writing things for organizations, working for and working in organizations, but the bulk of my time was spent on research.

Now, you have to have something to hold up there. You have to have accomplishment and you have to be able to deliver. Now, we could deliver to some limited degree. In the early days – in the early days, the reason we didn't deliver – now, get this very straight, and that's why I was telling you about early enturbulences – the reason we didn't deliver is because there wasn't any way to enforce the way to do it. Do you understand?

You could give somebody some directions, but he did them wrong and that kept the whole of Scientology – Dianetics rather, that days, that kept the whole of them enturbulated. Now, how'd it keep them enturbulated? That's because by unstraight technology improperly administered, their cases did not make an advance. Do you follow? There'd been enough very bad auditing here, there and so forth, to upset people here, there and so on. And there wasn't any way you could discipline the administration of the technology.

Now, you have to have two things in order to discipline the administration of a technology. Three things actually. First, you have to have the technology. You can't be pushing hidden standards off on somebody. He doesn't know what the technology is and you're raising hell with him for not using it, you see. You can't do that. So you have to have the technology. And you have to be able to make that technology known. In other words, your instructional materials and that sort of thing and the publication of the technology has to be very good. And the third step is, you have to be able to police its use. In other words, make sure that it's that technology that's being applied.
Now there is the one, two, three of an organization, whether it is in administration, whether it is in technology or in any other way. We put a stable datum into the world... It was, of course, completely impossible to have finished off all the technology and so forth by 1949, published it in an orderly fashion in 19... well you could do this, maybe, if you were talking about a new design for kiddiecars, you see. But not for God's sakes something that required the entire experience of a group and it required its entire contact and so forth with society.

You couldn't just say, "Well, here it is in all orderly fashion, now go ahead and do it." I mean, that's the ideal, the unthinking ideal. But no, we live in a very real world! And I upset some of you when I talk to you about getting arrested and fighting and all this sort of thing. But the truth of the matter is, is we aren't just an idea. See? You have to differentiate between a nice philosophy, lying in a book, disturbing nothing on a shelf – not even reading itself – and bringing individuals, live, human beings, up to a point of recognition of their own being-ness. Now, that is a live action! That's totally live as an action.

Now, we don't look at it because it's much easier to face a concept or an idea than it is to face a living, breathing entity. And from 1950 forward, we were a living, breathing entity. From about July when I took over, to the degree of saying, "All right, I'll stand up to it." "All right, we will push it through."

Up to that time, we could be a very nice excitement that people would leave alone or not leave alone or something like that and we didn't have to be very serious about it. But a lot of people were being serious about it, don't you see. No matter how it was stated, a lot of people were being serious about it. And we then were a live, breathing thing. And we weren't just an idea.

And if you get an idea, if you think that 1950 was just somebody who, well, he just wrote a book and people took exception to the ideas, or there was some trouble about the ideas, or this guy was not well braced to take over such a standard horribly prominent point in the spotlight of existence, and that was all that happened, you have an entirely wrong concept of the situation. We were live, breathing things, me amongst you, see.

And the point is, we were not at any time along the line anything else. We weren't a philosophy going through the society. We were beings. And when we first started up the line, it was the enturbulation of the trillions which began to blow. And it was pretty much! Just asking people to confront their banks. It was pretty much – pretty tough. And nobody was in a really steady state, while being better than the man on the street alongside of him, nobody was in any very steady stable state. And when people processed each other, there wasn't any way to really get the straight information for this and therefore they didn't – weren't able as you are able today, to run out your overt s and PTPs and feel a lot better, bang! You see? Oh, no, they didn't have this technology.

We had to fight our way up in a very aberrated state. We had more ways to knock out the whole track than we did to knock out, or even know about, our little overt in the last hour. Didn't even know about it. No, we didn't have – we didn't have weapons at that particular time. We had a lot of technology. We had more than man ever dreamed of, but that wasn't very damn much! And we had started at that time to make a hole, you might say, in the conglomerate and collective aberration of mankind.
Remember, it was a livingness that was making that hole, we were live beings. It wasn't the principles making the hole, you see, it was we applying them and pulling ourselves up somehow or another, off the rug, or lower. Rough. Having to stand in there – not really the good tools, yet, don't you see? And not the communication and administration lines necessary to enforce those tools we had. The squirrel processes that were run, the guys that were half-spun by them, and so forth, it's a fantastic back chapter.

But remember you're looking at a living being. Now, it's a good way to say, "Well, it's all Ron's fault that it didn't all go smoothly." That's right! You're perfectly, absolutely right! I should have been an OT, who came to Earth and got ahold of somebody named Moses. And said, "Hey Moses, here's some rules. Now you go back off and front for me." There, is anything wrong with that story? Can you imagine somebody doing that, if he was capable of all that power? "Hey – hey Moses!" "Here's your ten commandments, Moses. Don't let your people sell bad pig to each other – only sell it to strangers." No, no. No, this guy, this didn't happen. It just required more raw nerve to stand up by yourself. No, it'd have been best if I'd come in here from Arcturus, you see, as an OT and simply said, "Men!" That isn't the way it happened. That isn't the way it happened.

It was up out of the ditch and by the bootstraps. And I should not go around saying, "Well, of course I'm just very ordinary and very common and so forth." I'm probably very extraordinary, who knows! I recall pieces of my own backtrack that certainly look extraordinary! No reason to invalidate myself along the line. But the truth of it is, we were living beings and we moved up into the teeth of every aberration in the society, almost simultaneous at one fell swoop and the confusion that blew off was so fantastic that as – it's taken fifteen years just to stabilize our position organizationally, where we could stand still and resist the brickbats which came our way.

Now that is an evolutionary step which is vital to the growth of any organization. And we are through it. Very rough. We won.

At any time we could have gone appetite over tin cup. We could have finished. We have been within an ace of it, time and time and time again. Philadelphia – look at the frailty of it. Crazy fool wants to seize all of Dianetics. Can you imagine some dumb fool trying to seize all of Dianetics? Well, look it over. What was Dianetics? You say, well, Dianetics was a book or a copyright. Oh, no, Dianetics was a bunch of living beings. He wanted to seize all this. Oh, he couldn't seize all that! It was not possible to hold. So he goes and tells the Federal marshals, and so forth, that there's a bankruptcy suit in which this man is a vital witness. And he's about to leave the United States, so you'd better arrest him so that he can testify in court. Crazy things, don't you see? The man's dead! He's very dead! Nobody could survive the overts which he pulled – not just that overt, but the many overts. He's very dead.

I don't think that it was accidental. Because his first love was money, and Suzie was talking to inland revenue that were trying to get her to pay some – or internal revenue, was trying to get her to pay some wild taxes of some kind or another, a hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars' worth of owed taxes on the old Foundation. And she just looked him straight into the eye and says, "Well, we don't owe you this and as matter of fact..." and gave this man's name and said he was the fellow who made the money off of it and if he's claiming this
as taxes, "You're never going to get it off him, he's clever!" She just put the finger right straight on him. She's a very sweet girl! And internal revenue said the hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars he was claiming off his taxes for his expenses in trying to wreck Dianetics, they declared that his activity in Dianetics was a hobby. All the money he lost, trying to run this squirrel foundation, that Dianetics was a hobby with him. And therefore he had to pay all the taxes. He paid! He had to!

The tide of that sort of thing, you see, one day he's perfectly able to present suits, and so forth, and get you arrested and the next thing you know, all you have to do is tell the government, "Well, it actually – that's the man that owes you the money." And they go over and collect it off of him. Now that's a symptom of the turning tide. That's the only reason I've mentioned these two things. At one moment it's just the breath of a whisper, see – half the cops in Philadelphia are down and picking you up and fighting with the Foundation and ohhhh! You see, all kinds of things like this. Few years roll by, and you say, "That's the man," and they go over, say, "We're going to arrest you unless you pay up." See, the tide turns. The tide turns. It's been gradually turning, just to that degree. That's a more dramatic thing.

The people that in 1950 were having such a ball wiping their feet on us and that sort of thing, well actually, you could sort of cry, to see some of those people today. Not that it was us particularly, it was just they – it was – they look in the same shape as somebody who had tackled a ten-thousand-volt power line. But it was a collective power line that they – see. It wasn't just one power line. They look pretty bad! One of them is living as a beachcomber. I hear rumors of this character now and then, so forth. I haven't got the slightest bit of rancor, as far as these people are concerned. As a matter of fact I feel a little bit bad about it occasionally, and so forth.

But they just made a head-on collision. Going to stop us in our tracks, don't you see. Ha-ha-ha! They got holes in the back of their heads now they're laughing out of, don't you see. The society at large, in other words, has – first the people who attacked us, any of the people connected with those early days, those people are gone. They're either dead or they're in terrible condition, as the institutions which attacked us are weaker. You see? This tide has turned. We can now hold our position. We have for some time now been holding our location in space organizationally. We are able now to instruct in the right way to do something and it gets applied. And we do that, it gets a result. We're able to hold our own comm lines.

We're able to bring it up to a point where today I can calmly release a bulletin and say there's a new set of comm lines, and they are so-and-so and so-and-so. And I know they will go in. And we're sufficiently this way in that that we can say in no uncertain terms that our organizational form takes this shape and it's mostly – what shape do we want it to take, rather than what shape have we got to take. We're dictating our form.

Now, this is a big change. This is a big change. So 1950 I said it will go as far as it works. And it won't go any further than it works. And we're going to hold the fort here and we're just – this is a holding operation. And I well knew, that – instinctively – that the brick-bats were going to come over hot, thick, fast and furious, you see? The stable datum going into an aberrated society and the confusion was going to blow off. I just did my work from that point on, working it out with the experience with people and things, holding the fort, get-
ting gradually the lines in, getting gradually a greater security, getting gradually a little more forward motion. And all the time working on research. It will go as far as it works. And actually it won't go another inch further.

So when people have said to me, "Why don't you get in there and administer?" And people have said to me, "Why don't you bang and hammer and pound away at – at despatches?" And why don't you do this sort of thing. No, for fifteen years I have known it would go as far as it worked. And it wouldn't go another inch further than that. That's all.

And an organization will be as rich as they make it work. And things will be as smooth as it is working. And the individual will be as good as it has worked on him. And he will be surrounded by those who – as good as he has been able to make it work on them. And that's all! You've said it all. So it goes as far as it works.

So at this particular time I am in the rather interesting and fantastic position of being able to calmly put in the organizational structure and to work hammer and tongs which I am working right now – something on the order of maybe as much as eighteen hours a day – on putting in the administrative form and set up, which doesn't alter what we have got in actual fact, but simply makes it firm, takes all the lessons we have learned over the last fifteen years, puts them in effect, smoothes it all out, found the final form of the organization that'll work like a bang, and it'll probably be that way five thousand years from now. And there it is, be able to put those lines in and write those things up. With enough security, backed up thoroughly enough, backed up with enough enthusiasm, and so forth, those lines will go in and that's the way it'll be, and so forth. All the lessons, all the things we've learned, can take effect.

Because actually we got to a position where we were holding ourselves from expanding. It'll go as far as it worked, had gotten up to a point where it was working faster than it was administered to handle. We have suddenly done a breakthrough here, this is a very peculiar breakthrough, very odd, but we're making Clears and these are a shock to people because they've been expecting them for fifteen years, never realized, of course, the best reason why you wouldn't make a Clear was if the data wasn't straight. See, if your organizational form and the discipline of it all, and the brickbats – if that wasn't good enough, and the brickbats coming your way were so terrific, and the yipple-yap in the society against the individual staff member was so great, you couldn't expect him to sit there and do any kind of a job. Even though he had the information in his hand, he would be so distracted he would hardly be able to duplicate the bulletin, don't you see. Well, you wouldn't have expected that to happen. Well something funny has happened.

It's Class IV and Level IV is supposed to be the Clear level and Clears are emerging at I and II. Very funny. And I won't mention any names. One of your Instructors is – has just got through writing me an alarmed note on the subject of a Clear and I'm going to put it in the Auditor, "Crisis on Saint Hill Course." What do you do with this person, see? We can't process this person on the rest of the processes between where she is and Level IV and to VI.

In fact, I don't think the person will now run on R6EW. I've got to break out the actual bank pattern, and so forth, and start posting it in the cabinets in there so she can run from the
top down. I don't think she can find a dramatization on a bet. Clear, you see? Clearing too early. We've got more problems, you see? [laughter]

"Well, life is pretty – pretty difficult; it's pretty difficult to make a living these days, because you see they clear too fast." Well, that's a different look than, "We're having awful trouble with this person, Ron," drag him into my office in Elizabeth, throw him down on the couch and find the engram necessary to resolve the case by some means or another and not even an E-Meter. Turn him back over to the staff auditor and have him go run the engram and finish it up. Yeah, that looks a little bit different. And the guy gradually, dozens and dozens or even hundreds of engrams later you see, making a progress up toward Clear. In the meantime the society is caving him in, the suppressive persons on the other side of him are telling him he didn't make any gains, don't you see? All these various wild things occurring. A living enturbulence, not an enturbulence of data.

Now, we move over into the other line as, "Ron, what do I do now? Hey, this person is supposed to go up through Grade II and Grade III and Grade IV and she can't possibly get her auditing checksheet because she is Clear and it won't run on anything." How do we fit this in? Crisis at Saint Hill. Well, what is that? That is actually a more cleared environment. We aren't getting lambasted every day in the press, don't you see? We're not getting that. The environment is getting clear so a person possibly could breathe and get audited without a whole bunch of PTPs in the next five seconds, you see. It looks better. It looks better.

It's very symptomatic that I come in today and I lecture to you – the last time I lectured to you before that you were all black in the face. And last time you were. And I come in today and you look a great deal brighter and you look a great deal brighter than that. Well, that's because a channel of order has been introduced into this particular course, which, of course, has its rough edges as they always do, but it's smoothing out and I think by this time has smoothed out.

In other words, it's – we're in a position in this course now where an Instructor can take responsibility for a certain strata of the students of the course, the individual responsibility for those students. In other words, he can stand up now in the entheta of the environment and that sort of thing and wear his hat. Things are becoming more orderly, don't you see? Up to that time he had to sort of stand on the fringe of all of this commotion.

Well, let's put him in there and let him take it on the chin; it'll smooth out. And I noticed just looking at you today that you've smoothed out remarkably.

So, the action of administration is simply smoothing out the enturbulence of the environment, and that's all there is to it. We introduce a stable datum into the environment, it blows all over the place. It blows up, practically. You'll very often introduce somebody to Scientology and you see a tremendous amount of confusion ensue. He's going through the same thing. He collides with the people of his immediate environment, they haven't gone anyplace, he has. So he is to some degree getting his block knocked off in his environment, don't you see? He's going through, as an individual, the same horrible curve that any of the rest – that we went through as a group. And this individual very well could possibly get himself into a lot of trouble and that sort of thing. Well, I'll point something out to you: If he
keeps at it – if he keeps at it, why, it won't take him fifteen years, as it would a larger group, to get up to a point where he can hold his position and his case gain, don't you see? In the first place, he's served by far better technology. He's served upon communication lines that can be administered.

There's a terrific relationship, you see, between the environment and the individual and the speed with which a process works. And you've got to be able to get a process working on somebody that will be sufficiently effective... This is what I – these people who go out here and say, "Well, I'm going to audit R6 on the public," you know. They've missed the whole point. All they're going to do is un-stabilize the guy. They don't dare un-stabilize a man in his environment this much. The environment's going to knock his block off if they un-stabilize him to that degree! This guy's got to learn to walk his – in his environment. You don't tell him to fly and then knock him down and laugh. That's a horrible thing.

No, this guy's got to go out there and he's got to have something that he can understand and grasp and communicate to his environment and so forth, because he's going to get plenty of randomness anyhow. And this result has to happen fast enough to take care of these things, you see, before the environment knocks his block off. It's a race between the auditor and the environment – this man's environment, see. And it's always that kind of a race. And that's true of us as a group, don't you see?

There is a race between us and our environment. We were living beings. You processed a living being. And his relationship is between himself and his environment. You, therefore, have to be able to deliver technology to him that he can somehow or other stand up with. And you don't dare unsettle him and throw him back into his environment. No, you've got to bring him up on a line where he can hold those gains stably and that they're real gains to him, and so forth, and he can go back into the environment.

Furthermore, you've got to provide him with a certain amount of administrative protection. And today you've just been given weapons of administrative protection for your pc. And you've been given a method of forcing a pc to take action and not keep on messing up in his environment and knocking himself downhill.

This is all germane to the situation. Now we are more powerful. We are more powerful than we have ever been before; and things are more stable; and processes can go in; and administrative systems can be evolved and presented. Hats can be checked out on and we can have a rather simple administrative system. We don't have to have a very complex one as long as the thing is well followed, as long as its channels are delineated. As long as our mutual understanding of the existing situation and the lessons which we have learned up all these years, and so forth, continue to be applied, we're perfectly fine.

We're in a position of much greater ability in the society. Scientology is up the world around. It's going up, up, up. It doesn't look like it sometimes in an organization that's fighting for its life and so forth, until you look at the curve, and look where the state of the organization was a few years ago, or even last year. Why, you don't get the kind of a picture it is. Now, you've got to bring up an organization on a gradient the same way.

Some of you will be putting organizations in or handling the putting of organizations into place in this society, because there'll be hundreds of organizations tomorrow where
there's only one today. The ratio is going to go up at a great rate of speed by pulling the blocks. I'm pulling every point and barrier, and so forth, off the line that keeps us from expanding right now. They at one time were protective barriers. We mustn't do too much of a forward fly up the line because we would have gone too fast and we would have wrecked ourselves beyond that. So we had lines that were blocked, lines that were blocked, lines that were blocked.

My whole job right now is entirely devoted to administrative actions. I'm just putting the administration into effect, putting it into effect. Now, the whole action is spot the place where the jam was, spot the place which restricted expansion and pull the pins on it and then spot another place which restricted expansion and look back and pick up the policies that handle that sort of thing, you see. Put in the communication line, pull the block out.

And you can't go at this very long as an auditing process on an organization which is already restricted in its ability to expand, without some fantastic things occurring. Now the trick is to do this without settl... unsettling the existing organization. So you begin to see in these bulletins now: "Do not disturb any line which is actually in and operating at this particular time. Leave all those lines in. Regardless of what they do to your org board, and so forth. The lines which are working for you will still work." Don't you see? "Also put in this other set of lines which parallels that set of lines," don't you see?

Well, what I'm working for is an accelerating – an accelerating curve. And this will occur. And you'll see it in a relatively short time. We've gotten to the point where the – where the society itself can be bowled over. So we might as well just start knocking the aberration out at a very high rate of speed. We're past the critical point of case gain. Now it really doesn't matter how fast the case gains. We have made our point of stability. We are there, we've got our feet down, we can hold our position, we don't have to back up because somebody whispers in our direction, we can hold our communication lines in.

We have just gone through two governments trying to knock our blocks off and we have emerged at the other end thumbing our nose at them in a very impudent fashion. The United States government is so scared to bring that thing to trial, it's pathetic. I had the British government ask them the other day about it. Right! And they don't know anything about it. I imagine after a while they'll get mad and bring some wild suit and try to finish this thing up or try to do something, and so forth, but it's – it's sort of like a boxer who's gone down on one knee 15 or 20 times already in this fight, don't you see? And he isn't very enthusiastic about lifting his head, see, he hasn't got any direction left because the attacks which we're getting are directionless.

Doesn't look like that, maybe, to the poor guy down in Melbourne. Why, I should imagine Melbourne feels pretty cocky it's lived through it. I notice Melbourne is coming up they – for a while they were nattering at Saint Hill and nattering at people and so on as you could imagine, they had their heads knocked off down there. Well, they must have been very strong or they wouldn't have stood up to that. It actually doesn't matter much what the press does say about us now. You could have screaming headlines come out in every newspaper in the world, "Scientology is no good," and everybody'd say ho-hum. They have worn that out. We have heard that all before, don't you see? We've lived through these things.
Now, what we've got to face up to now is the fact that our expansion will be an accelerating expansion. What we've got to do now during this year is finish up getting our communication lines in and square things up. There is some really marvelous things in the works, fortunately. The whole basic administration technology, and so forth, is laying out before the eye. These things are quite wonderful, some of them. I'm fascinated with them. They – they just – most fabulous operating keyboard you ever wanted to play on is an organization in this particular universe. It isn't play on it either – it's if you want to strengthen up an organization, stabilize an organization and that sort of thing, just find the expansional blocks and pull them. And find the – the things that, you know, that block expansion, find those expansion-blocking barriers, see, try and find those things, pull it. Find those things, pull it.

Open up your communication lines, put in your barriers, and so forth, on the edges of the communication line, not in the middle of it. So that you channel your action, and so forth. Just keep doing this. Strengthening up the edges – letting the lines flow harder. Strengthening up the edges – letting the lines flow harder. Going at the formula of how to put life into a group, from the – in other words, we are very much causative in this. How do we put life into our organizations? How do we get them rolling again? How do we get them to stand up straighter and that sort of thing.

Well, this year they will go through several flickers and flackels and they'll go up and down and – and so forth. And they will restabilize. But I can assure you if they will go very stably, it won't cost us any organizations to reorganize these things. I already put it to test. I changed the whole org board suddenly to a more workable org board last summer. I just told them all to put it in and put it on the org board, but not do anything with it or move anybody's chairs or anything, but just put that up. It was immediately followed uniformly over the world by an increase in income, a decrease in upset. So reorganization can actually mean a smoother run for everybody.

All right. Now, we're just about to put in the rest of that org board. And we're about to put it in with a smash and a bash and a bang. Rather quickly but with the same orders. Don't change any lines you've got, even though the line is wrong, that you're actually using, and so forth, why put the person's name on the organization board the way the line is working. And also put this org board in, too. And then gradually they'll see where these lines actually snap, and a lot of duplicate functions – there are a lot of duplicate functions right now in the organization being carried on in two different places – and these duplicate functions one after the other are just being deleted so that you've got single functions for each one of them, you see?

In other words, you're actually reducing the amount of traffic in an organization. The traffic in an organization is being reduced now. Even though the potentiality is, why, I guess we've raised the traffic potentiality of an organization two or three hundred times. I had just in the last day or two... stuff will really be flying on those communication lines. But there's no barriers for it to hit, don't you see? There's people to catch it, you see, and there's things that people can do about it if the lines are wrong.

Now, the only thing we're asking a staff member to do organizationally, and so forth, is just discipline the communication line. That's the only way he can get in trouble, is the fellow who fails to discipline the communication line. He doesn't wear his hat with regarding the
discipline of how the communication is supposed to be done and how the thing is supposed to be routed. Or he enforces the discipline so savagely, and so forth, that he ARC breaks somebody on the other end of the line, see. He's got to measure delicately between these two things. That's all we've got to do. Because the technology and so forth has got to have lines to flow on.

There is no vast rush at this particular moment, oddly enough, of getting the final technology out. There is no vast rush about getting a public book out. There is no vast rush about this sort of thing, because if we don't get the organizational line in – we're doing promotion, things are going up, it's all right, don't you see. But unless we've got those lines in, the same things will happen to us, we'll enturbulate, we'll have another peak where we're hitting the society with a great deal of new material, don't you see, and we're hitting the society with this material, and the society is reacting back against us. Well, we don't want the society reacting back against us without our lines in good shape. It'd be folly, don't you see?

So the thing to do is to set the lines up, get them very smooth, fix it up so that these things are all in form, and in a moment of stress and with an expansional action and increased traffic, that there are lines for that traffic to flow on. Then follow it right up behind that with the actual release out into the public of additional technology, the release of it into the organizations.

Frankly, everybody in these organizations is pretty well trained on the exact technology. It's a tremendous joke, don't you see. The newest and latest now, the newest and latest is about to be released into the organizations. The newest and latest is about to be released into the public. It's quite interesting. The newest and the latest is a subject called "Beginning Scientology." That's the newest and the latest.

I am being laggardly in giving you your level processes and your auditing checksheets for these levels. Because they're just a little bit different than you think they are, they're a little simpler than you think they are. The processes are a little bit simpler to do and I got that material – it's all actually sitting on my desk. I haven't had time to write up this – the bulletin that delivers it to you rat-a-tat-tat. Because you'll recognize all the processes now – to do them, you'll say, "How – how could it be that easy? " I'm sure will be your first reaction to it. Not – not, "How – how do we learn all this terribly complicated..." and then you'll all of a sudden cognize that yes, these are the processes that always have worked, don't you see?

But your first – the first book of beginning Scientology is of course what book? It's a book called "Beginning Scientology." And it composites the identical track of Scientology. And it has the elements – the successful elements with none of the distractions, and the lead on in – of everything we have done. That's all. And you haven't got to worry about the rest of it. But we can cover years of that area in practically the breath [blink] of an eye of the workable technology which exists today. The philosophy, and so forth, that went along with it, and the other developmental things – is very interesting, that the Philadelphia lectures of 1953, is it? Or something like that, or 52, oh, 52 – those confounded things contain most of the technology for Level VII. They're practically a textbook on Level VII. So, there's a lot of that technology, but it's not come out even. Don't you see, I mean, it hasn't been released in exact chronological sequence. There's been – some of the earlier technology was more advanced.
Don't you see? Well, all we have to do is take up what was released, more or less, at that time, as it went forward, right on up to PT, which fits the levels, and then take the stuff that was – came out of sequence and add it on top of that. And we've got the whole subject.

Now, there's nothing much to this. There have been some tremendous discoveries, and so forth, during the last twelve months, as you may or may not be aware of – Clay Table – there's things of this particular character that are sweepingly important.

The point is the first book that'll be released into the public is already written. Called "Beginning Scientology" and it has a small section out at the beginning of a book called "Excalibur" I wrote in 1938 and then it has the pertinent sections of The Original Thesis and then it has the pertinent early sections of Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health. All written. It's just a paste-up job. And all the distractive materials taken out of it, and then it's told – the person is told throughout... this book does not include the instructional drills – the instructional drills or the practical drills, and so forth, and doesn't particularly include all of the processes. You'll have to get those from an auditor from your local Academy, see. And this isn't all there is to it. It goes on for several levels after this, you see. It describes the conditions to be attained, but it tells the person exactly what to expect in attaining them, see. And we don't make it a fifteen-minute wonder, don't you see. Get the idea? We say, "After you've gone through a few levels, man, you'll be Clear." And we keep putting down footnotes, of course, with "this material is not all of the material." In other words, we can keep leading the people up along the line. And your next book up along the line is similar materials, and so forth. It isn't just cut-up old books, though, it goes off – it goes further into a more composited line.

But we have to have that first entrance book because that was our first entrance into the society. And if we leave that as a gap, no student thereafter would ever be able to understand that he knew what the earlier beginnings were. And he would have an unknown on his backtrack which would make him uncertain. So we must have that – we must have that there, fronting up the line. Well, this is the first entrance point to the society, so obviously it contains the elements which make it the first entrance point to the society. The dynamic principle of existence is survive. That's all! There are four dynamics. You know – you know this stuff!

And the processes that went along with it, that were very successful, had to do with very light PT processes that had to do with communication, and so forth. Doesn't matter if some of the processes were developed far later, but fitted that particular level and that were much more effective. We just get the guy so he can talk to the people around him, and we teach him about locks and we'd show him something about engrams.

Very interesting, an old-time Dianeticist the other day recovered his sight, because somebody timed on an E-Meter two engrams. Guy recovered his sight because he just got the date of two engrams. Didn't improve at once and then began to improve very nicely. Just heard about it.

Here's the upshot of this, is this whole technology was workable. But how could technology on lines that were scrambled and as upset... Somebody would have to write somebody who knew somebody in the Elizabeth Foundation who had a rumor that the latest technique
was... and even though a bulletin was released at that particular time the chances of it being received, followed or applicable were very remote.

Well, bring it up to the point the guy is spotting spots in space and spotting spots in the room, or something like this, and he isn't doing it right and the D of P walks in and says, "If you keep doing that wrong, son, you're going to be talking to a Committee of Evidence." That's a little bit different, isn't it? A little different view. And you say, "That's a rough one to live in!" No, that's a smooth one to live in! The society is a smooth society in which you can have some law and order.

We're moving ahead into this, we're moving into a position of extreme maximum thrust, you might say, and we'll be there very, very soon. I'm not just shooting the breeze, because the information that is pouring in here now and the data which is crisscrossing, and so forth, is – shows that everything I'm putting out to them is being perfectly well received and going into effect very rapidly.

The bad old days – the bad old days are actually repeated by every human being who faces up to the society and tries to stand up as himself – and tries to stand up as part of a Scientology organization for the first time. He's hit with a confusion, but fortunately due to the work we've done and the research we've done the period is over very soon, if we do our job well.

But everybody goes through that same cycle. You get a new person, "Oh, it's fine, it's wonderful, it's delirious! It's great, it's great, it's great!" You see him the next day he's falling flat on his face – somebody's invalidated the living pants off of him, don't you see? Uh, bing-bang! This way, up and down and so forth, recognize what you're looking at. The guy has put a – he's putting new data – it's new stable data, into his environment, the confusion's blowing off. There's new – new stable data gone into him and the confusion is going off. It's a repeat track. It can't be otherwise because the road is up and out. And man was way below a level of confusion. He was too far down to even know he was confused.

Thank you very much.
ARC BREAKS AND
GENERALITIES

A lecture given on 30 March 1965

Well, all right. All right. Well, I see nothing's wrong – nothing's wrong with your mor-
rale at all. Nothing's wrong with your morale at all.

[part missing]

All right, this is the what of the which?

_Audience_: March 30th, _AD_ 15.

Well, good. When we used to run whole track you used to get some very remarkable
dates. This is the 30th of March, what year?

_Audience_: _AD_ 15, 1965.

AD 15, that's better. Somebody over here said "1965." That's out of style.

[part missing]

Good enough. Good enough. Well, there's all sorts of things I could tell you about, to-
day. Tremendous number of things. I could have told you about the conditions formulas and I
could have told you about the new org board and – the wildest thing that's happened in a long
time – and so forth. So I just wondered what condition you were in. Well, actually you're in a
condition of "morale" – good morale, you see – so I probably shouldn't talk to you about the
one I chose out to talk to you about: ARC breaks. [laughter]

I could talk to you about the new levels and they're pretty well taped and there's all
sorts of – all sorts of data. I actually – actually my pen finger is the jam on the line right now
because I can't get the stuff out by transcription. That usually – that transcription line breaks
down. I overload it and it jams like mad. And at least when I write it out it's there on a piece
of paper and it doesn't have to be transcribed, you see, before somebody can find out what it
is and the mimeograph line is pretty fast so it gets out all right.

But it's simply the proposition of having enough hours in a day and I keep looking up
and finding these 24-hour days and I wish they'd stop it. Lousy 24-hour days. Well, that's
what you get being on a little tiny pipsqueak, periphery planet, don't you see, that's way out in
the twelfth magnitude sun, you know, in the skim – scum of the galaxy. That's the way it is.

Anyhow, that's all right. We're still making it. We probably wouldn't make it at all if
we were any closer in, man. [laughter] Somebody would have noticed this.
Now, the general pace of operations is quite rapid and organizations were moving right up very, very nicely through last year and when I went down to Las Palmas for a few week's vacation and so forth, a shift of my position and so forth was adequate to put a little discouragement on the line. Now we're busy picking that up again. They went into a slight decline. Now they're coming back up again.

But what's very interesting is just – this is not apropos to the lecture I'm going to give you – but what's very interesting is – is the number of data which you can get which are completely false which throw you a terrific curve.

You get people coming around and giving – this is not ungermane to the lecture, by the way – get people coming around telling you "everybody thinks" and "everybody says" and "the field says" and "they say" you know, these terrific resounding blahhh and there's been one bird said it. Don't you see? So that is then pretended to be – by some chaos merchant, you see – that's pretended to be everybody in the whole universe thinks this, see. It's the way they run a democracy or a newspaper.

But the point is that we were thrown a couple of curves last year and one of them was the Gradation Program. And we were thrown a very bad curve. It was reported to me from at least two sources that should have known, that the Gradation Program was unpopular. And do you know something? It alone was responsible for the resurge of organizations last year. I just spent last night doing nothing but working on it and isolating it. And that's what I finally came up with.

There was only one thing thrown on the plate last year that was new and strange. People have been hearing me talk about Clears for years, see. So nothing about whether we were making it or not would have had too much influence on anything. Some influence, yes, but not all that influence. And the only thing which was new and strange was the Gradation Program and that was brand-new. Whoever heard of that before, see? And you don't climb in the top story – I used to say this – you don't take the pc into the top of the Empire State Building when you haven't entered the front door at street level, you see.

But – and the truth of it is that the Gradation Program was responsible for a continuous rise in growth and when I wobbled the Gradation Program, acting on the very good authority that had been given me as an "everybody" and an "anybody" and "they," you know, and monitored it and modified it slightly, the decline set in – and the steady increase ceased. And it's just traceable to those two factors.

Now, there was a price shift at the first of the year. Most people think it was the price shift to show you how bad the data is in this. No, it was the way it was presented by the local organizations and Registrars. And the reason why this must be true is Saint Hill went along without any price shifts, don't you see, and its curves are just on a steady increase and they keep right on increasing. And there was a price shift in organizations in the field and that brought about a complete – oh, a very steep decline – but that was coincident with my having left for a vacation and it wasn't, therefore, totally assignable to this price shift.

So we went in to try to take a look at what this was and we found out that unwittingly Registrars and so forth had apparently used the confusion which was possible in the change of price to just lock the doors of the organizations tight and shut.
Now, a confirming data is necessary in this, but apparently people were being denied auditing.

In the first place what they did was sell a tremendous quantity of auditing on the basis that prices were going to rise. See, they did that uniformly. Well, of course, the organization has already said "Prices will be unpayable in one month," and then they are very surprised when the public finds them unpayable in that month. Do you follow?

Audience: Mmm. Yes.

So nobody need be amazed about this. You see, they've already said, "Buy it now because it's all going to go up to some prohibitive figure in thirty days." Well, everybody bought it now and of course did just what the org said and didn't buy it thirty days later. Do you see that? What they did was really advertise that people would not be able to get audited in thirty days. Do you follow that?

Audience: Mmm. Hm.

So that was a very, very bad piece of promotional handling to use this as a promotion gimmick.

And then the next point that was catastrophic and so on was to confuse the public with what they could get with what and to present this in a completely cloudy way to the people who walked into the organization, see. "Now, let's see, oh, you say, Mr. Zilch, that you want some auditing. Ah, well, let's see now, there's the international – I think it's the li-li-the – the lifetime member – no, uh – that – that – excuse me. Uh – if you – if you – very few people can have a membership. Uh – you sure you wouldn't want to pay full public price because it's just too hard to figure these memberships out?"

Of course, I'm gagging it up but we have seen a letter written by the Washington Registrar that was just as bad as that!

Some poor woman wanted auditing and that's all she was asking for, and she got membership discount confusion and that was not what she wanted so it didn't answer the auditing question, did it? The auditor's question in this case was, more or less, "When can I come in for some auditing?" And the answer to the question is, of course, "Well, actually it's all so confusing that uh – uh..." No further qualification. It's just all confusing. And the person responded as though she had been refused auditing.

Now, actually if you sorted through all these – these lines – if you sorted through all these lines and looked at them very carefully, you eventually probably could have figured out what it was and how much it was, if you had a pencil, paper and an IBM computer handy. And it upset her considerably. So she sent the letter in here, not complaining, but sort of pathetically, you know, "How can I get some auditing?" You see?

So there's the front door, you see, of the orgs locked, closed, key turned, with a number of empty cardboard boxes, wooden boxes and these spikes that they used to have that horsemen couldn't get through, you know, when they were attacking a castle, chevaux-de-frise, they called them, you know. They were a fence of spikes sticking straight out to the public and they were marked: "We don't know if you can have it or not because we're not sure
exactly how much it is ourselves." Do you follow that? Because the truth of the matter is the
prices didn't rise. In one area they declined. That's a surprise, isn't it?

Prices in the United States dropped from 625 for an intensive or a course to 500. But
the United States promoted it that there was going to be a price rise. I don't think it's told any-
body yet that there was a price drop! Do you follow?

Now, this is what it takes to lock the door. What it takes to lock the door, is locking
the door.

And what it takes to unlock the door is the key to how the door got locked. In this par-
ticular character it was sufficiently broad and gruesome and so forth and it was so obvious
that it was written all over everything in red paint saying, "This is the barrier to the door." Don't you see.

So that was very simple. We just pulled all the boxes out of the way and threw them
all aside and tore down the barricades and removed the chevaux-de-frise (those spikes) and
said, "What you do when you buy auditing or an intensive is you go to the Accounts Cashier
who is the first door past Reception and Reception is there," and Reception says, "There is the
Cashier." Do you see?

The glass will be so fixed, you'll see it – I'll see that it happens, too – will be so fixed
that a person going into an org will have to bend over very uncomfortably to talk through a
hole, so there's no invitation there for anything and the exact data of what it's all about is
hanging over to the side of the window. Simple, elementary.

And that there will be a credit membership so all you have to do is sign an invoice.
"Oh, you want a – you want a course. Your name is Jones. All right, you want a course; your
name is Jones. Jones, Jones, Jones, Jones, Jones. You're not here on any discrepancy list and
so forth. One – one course – there." And the guy reaches through and signs "Jones" on it. He
takes the slip up to the D of T and goes into the course. That's all. Total.

Now, somebody comes into the org and says, "What's this Scientology.?" And the
Registrar says, "There's the book. Go over to the Accounts Cashier. Pay them two dollars and
seventy-five cents and there's your answers. When you've read the book, why, come back." Don't give them some weird idea, "Well in your past life you probably..." No, let's not – let's
not do that, see. See.

So the key is somebody stumbles in and says, "What is Scientology?" See, "There's a
book." But if somebody stumbles in and says, "I want some auditing or I want some training,"
even though they haven't read a book, you say, "There's the Cashier's window, get your ac-
counts clearance. All right, you got your slip of paper? All right, now go up to the second
floor and you'll see on the door 'Director of Training.' All right, I'll take you up there." All
right, you turn them over to the Director of Training and they're in course. Got it? No barri-
cades.

Now, this is going to get worse and worse because there could be then a cash payment.
There could be – they could pay for it in cash or they can get it on total credit. If their credit's
good, the credit discount is not as great as the cash discount – costs a little more to buy one on
credit, that's all, and you get a better discount after your credit is proven good. That's all. It's just – costs less. You're not – the org's neck isn't out now supporting a bad credit risk.

In other words, it – we'll work it out so that somebody feels they need an intensive, all they've got to do is go down to the org, sign their name and go to the HGC and sit down and be audited. Period.

And that was what was the matter with Central Orgs. Now, I always knew there was something peculiar about Central Orgs and organizations and auditors and that sort of thing. I knew they did something that I didn't do and I was – never could put my finger on it. I never, never, never could put my finger on it. And it's the fact that I never talked about money. I don't think you've ever heard me mention a course fee. I never talked about money. I myself don't have problems with money, so it never occurs to me to wish a money problem off on anybody. But somebody who is having a lot of personal problems on the subject of money would of course think of money the first time somebody popped up.

They walk in – they're thinking of auditing – so the person who has problems with money, of course, says to them, "You now have a problem with money." "Oh, you want some auditing. Well, you now have a problem with money." [laughter] "I don't care what else you were worried about, you're now worried about money!" Just gratuitously hand them a problem.

I don't think ever in my life I even ever held out my hand for a fee. I don't ever mention it. I've even acted sometimes as Registrar for an organization that didn't have anything to do with money and people would walk in occasionally and throw some money on the desk and I'd invoice it so they could have a receipt. I gave it to them so they could have a receipt, not so I could have any money. Now, that's about the wildest look you ever saw!

I remember auditing some people in the early days and we never talked about money and they got embarrassed after a while and they gave me several thousand dollars. That's a reverse look, isn't it?

Look, why are we shutting it off? Because if our processing on the individual works, of course he's more capable of having money, but he's not more capable of having money before he has processing. Do you follow?

I mean we have – we have actually the wide open, marvelous "open sesame" of taking Joe Jones, any Joe Jones anyplace in the society and waving the magic wand and he can now make money. And we're worried about money! Well, you'd have to have the door closed and locked and with Federal Marshals outside of it and spikes and manholes and tiger traps and signs up at the other end of the avenue pointing "Go the Other Way!" Something over the entrance say, "Abandon ye all hope who enter here." You know. It'd take a production and I think it has! I think it has taken a production because this is something that never occurred to me in all the days I was auditing.

Well, just – actually yesterday afternoon I got a report that they hadn't done – I asked all the D of Ps in the world – I do this once in a while – I asked all the D of Ps in the world to give me reports on what they had done with Clay Table Auditing. They're very clever people and they knew very well that that was a wide-open trap in the road laid by Ron,
because they promptly told me, each and every one, that they were being good boy – except one, he fell in – that they were good boys and were only auditing people on the levels and so didn't have any current experience with Clay Table Clearing. [laughter] But when they were running it earlier, before it was laid out on levels, they had the following experiences. But one says, "Well, I just gave it to a couple next door and they were doing it out in the yard with a lot of people standing around." Now we know. Now we know.

We know that Scientology is working out of the magnetism of this auditor. Can't be working out of its good sense, you see.

Scientology can – is so good that you can do it wrong and get someplace. That's a fact, fact, fact. You don't get very far very fast, but you can often do it wrong. You have to do it viciously wrong in order to not get any results. I mean, you have to work at that, but you just slip and skid a little bit and you'll still get some results.

Well, I'm just mentioning this because they ran a test – one of these Ds of Ps had run a test recently – he just passed it in action – but the process had been successful because the person that it was run on had at once gone out and gotten a five thousand-dollar-a-year increase in wage. This is in a casual report, just last night's report, see. Well, if you can do things like that, why the hell are you worried about money? Do you realize the end of the road – I hate to tell you this because I sound like some new HAS student that is now selling it to his mother [laughter] – the end of the road is to hold out your mocked-up hand with some perfectly good twenty dollar bills in it that just appeared. That's the end of the road. In other words, the creation, direct creation of money. Now, I don't know whether that money is counterfeit or not. [laughter]

Now, an American – an American OT will have to be very careful in mocking up gold. He will have to be very, very careful in mocking up gold, because an American is not supposed to have gold according to the United States government. So I think he'll have to practice... mock up – well, he'll have to – he'll have to settle for diamonds only. But a South African OT, you see, will not dare mock up diamonds because the IDB will be after him and there have to settle for gold. And I can see right there a tremendous trade developing between the American OT and the South African OT. [laughter]

Going from the ridiculous to the sublime, that is – that is actually what you are facing. You have the tools by which people can make money and now we're going to worry about money. Now, frankly every time an organization turns around they write "Income is much better these days. We have just run the Registrar on the debility to have money. Now our income is up." I wonder if there's any coordination? Well, why should they have to run the Registrar on that? It must be that the Registrar is talking a lot about money. Must be that the Registrar is being pestered by the org to make some money and the Registrar pesters everybody who walks in about some money, don't you see?

So we'll leave it up to the Registrar to go ahead and get the money but we won't permit the Registrar anymore to interview people. Now, you say, "How are you going to do that?" I think we will do it easier than the other way. Since I myself have never had the experience of registraring anything, since I never found it necessary to do so, we find out that that is an additive system that must have come into Scientology somewhere along the line that I myself
never did. And I have begun to be leery over the years of duplicating something or putting something into the machinery on a successful line, you know, which didn't need improvement. And believe me, the – the early line on the subject of money in Dianetics and Scientology didn't need any improvement. It was very, very good indeed. So it must have been something added on the line that suppressed it and it must have been our system of selling that suppressed it, don't you see?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Now supposing, supposing we got all you who will be going home and waving the magic wand over auditors so that they audit – supposing we got all you so – so streamlined and so forth that you would go ahead and audit somebody straight. End of sentence. You know, no additives, you know, you just audit them. I'm going to tell you how in a minute, but you just audit them, see, and let nature take its course without any personal consideration of how the person should be checked in his forward progress or anything. I'm being nasty now, aren't I? I've been training students too long; it's soured my temper. Not true. Joke.

I've found actually, you always did, and tried like mad to do anything I asked you to do and I have to be very, very careful to ask you – when I ask you to do something, to tell you very elementarily in no way that can be misinterpreted, don't you see, because it's actually the communication line which winds you up in doing something different.

So I very often – I used to have a system which I more or less abandoned when study came out – and I think my system was very good – and that was I explained it, any datum, at least nine times in a lecture in different ways and fashions and that way it walked around all the misunderstood words, don't you see. And it was quite a system I used. You listen to an old tape, you can just almost count the number of times I have put the important datum into the tape. Nine times – it's there, it's woven in and out, it's stated differently and that way. But once in a while a student will get very cross with me – they've taken it down the first time in their notebook, don't you see, and then the next time they didn't take it down, the next time they didn't take it down and they get flunked on the examination of the tape because they didn't give the generalized statement of it, because it's in there nine times in nine different wordings. Did you ever realize that that was a hazard, because it's the concept you're being taught, not the verbs and syllables and objects, see.

But I was very successful this way but in training auditors straight up and directly, why, I actually have to be very careful to just make my communication clear because I find out that you are as good as I have clarified the communication to you, and it's – comes home to roost so I have no business making a crack about your doing it wrong. But sometimes you will do this: where I have left a gap, why, you'll throw a couple of anvils in there. It's my – basically my fault; I left a gap, don't you see – but once in a while I will find very remarkable departures in the middle of it and I'll find goofs of various kind whatsoever but they always are appearing in gaps that have been left in instruction.

So instruction is basically trying to cover all of it very, very carefully so as not to make you feel like an idiot, see, so elementary that you feel idiotic in going over it that many times and yet not leaving anything out that can be left to chance.
And when we have had a process for quite a while that has been trained for quite a while, it is invariable done very well. But when we haven't had a process very long, why, that process will be done very oddly. In other words all the gaps of how you do it and all the possible misinterpretations haven't been ironed out of it yet, don't you see? That's the difference between a new process and an old process.

Now that we're in the business of relaying an awful lot of old processes now – the new levels are just composed nothing of but old processes – why, we're in clover, because most of these jumps have been gotten around and if you really got too curious about how something was run, why, just go back over the fifteen or twenty different periods of Dianetics and Scientology when the same one was presented and take out the one that seemed to work for you best. You know that could be gotten around to this degree because it's been gone over and gone over and gone over. In other words, you basically do very well.

Now, in a – in an approach to auditing in general, if you did this, if you did the processes that work on case after case after case, you see, and you just did those, and reeled them off and got them done and you never Qed-and-Aed with somebody... For instance, people got a remarkable idea these days that a Class VI Auditor only audits Class VI processes, you see. We have a Class VI Auditor, I heard an organization – I shouldn't be too – so general and say an organization – Los Angeles. I read a letter the other day off the lines that wasn't to me – sees all, knows all, you know; and to the "see all and know all," you add a crystal ball and quite a bit of information comes my way – and this was – this was actually stated, this actually stated, this was actually stated that we have a Class VI Auditor but we don't have anything for her to do yet because nobody is ready for Class VI. Direct quote, I have the letter. Caow!

The reason the public would want a Class VI Auditor is because he'd sure know how to run Class 0. In the first place, Class VI Auditor would not run Class VI – not run Class 0 without an E-Meter. He'd use an E-Meter at Class 0. Sounds real weird. No, it's only a Class 0 Auditor who doesn't use an E-Meter at Class 0. Class VI Auditor would use an E-Meter at Class 0, of course! Only he wouldn't do anything different at Class 0 but he wouldn't have any canned list in his hand. He'd go pocketa-pocketa-pocketa down possibilities of this and that and he would do an assessment which of course lies down there around IV and III, don't you see? And he'd do a red-hot, fast assessment and he'd say, "Oh, Communication Process 0-A, there's the assessment, bzmmmmmmmm. You – here's the auditing question, bang thrprp." Clear. We've had Clears at Level 0 run this way.

So a Class VI Auditor is worth pearls, don't you see? Because naturally he's classed all the way up the line, so he can run the exact process of the level with the command of anything he has. Now, he can't run things on the pc which the pc hasn't got command of. That's the only thing that's different. In other words he can't run the pc on Clay Table. The pc doesn't have any command of Clay Table, see. He can't run the pc on The Book of Case Remedies straight off the bat because how the hell does he know this pc can even talk? Do you follow?

He wouldn't do perception and indication steps of the environment or something like that again when he didn't know the pc could talk. But the processes which are exactly found at the levels, and so forth, of course can be run with all the tools the auditor has to hand, which
is an E-Meter, he can run them with good and bad indicators. Why, if some guy who was educated at Class VI to indicate whether or not the pc has got the wrong item certainly would never run five minutes too long on having found the wrong terminal. Do you see that? Because his indicators would be up.

So of course a Class VI Auditor should get more money than a Class 0 Auditor.

Now of course, I – if I were – if I were somebody – somebody charged up to me and wanted me to audit them at that particular level or stage and so forth I – "You want me to audit you, you sure? All right, all right, I'll audit you." And I'd go ahead and audit them. And I'd run Level 0 on them. I've learned my lesson. It's the pc that can't do it, not me. [laughter, laughs]

Well now, after I'd audited them for a while, why, he could make more money and he'd pay me. Do you follow? Because I know very well if I – if I ran Level 0 on somebody – just straight Level 0 – I know I wouldn't goof on the indicators or the terminals. I'd make the right terminals and so forth. Run Level I on somebody. I'd run Level 1 and finish all the tone arm action on Level I. What do you mean, "Tone arm action on Level I?" Yeah, just that. Doesn't have an E-Meter. When a – when a Level I – Grade I pc is run by a Class I Auditor, you haven't got an E-Meter there, don't you see. Well, they can make it. That's what's weird. Don't you see?

Don't you see that it'd be an enormously faster procedure if somebody was sitting there saying, "All right, now let's see. What have we got here. We're going to run a Touch Assist on you," and you've got a one-hand electrode on the guy, you see, so he can point and everything, "What are we trying to do here. Something about your – uh – you say you hurt your foot recently, huh? Your foot? Your head? You hurt your foot, your head, your shoulder, back... ? Oh, noticed when you came in your hand was – hand. Hurt your hand recently, huh?" And the fellow said, "No, I hurt my foot." And you say, "All right, very good. And what happened with your hand?"

"Oh, that was just before – I'd forgotten about that. It was just before that."

Well, it's well now, so why run the Touch Assist. He'd forgotten he hurt his hand. Do you follow? You all of a sudden blew a memory into view. I'm giving you a very sloppy forward progress but it would just be on the basis of guiding his attention here or there while watching the needle on the meter, you know? Very rapidly.

Touch Assist. Touch Assist. How would you do a Touch Assist if you were a Class VI Auditor? I don't think I'd just do a Touch Assist on somebody. I think I'd look him over. I'd find out if there are any bruises or scars to Touch Assist. Even if I didn't have a meter, don't you see? And I'd also find out that it was different two sides of the body. I'd know that probably it was hung up on one side. And I just did one, by the way, I think last night. Touch Assist.

I'd found out it wasn't going away. Indicator. A burn area was ceas... it was not ceasing to be red. In my experience it should cease to be red very rapidly. It wasn't ceasing to be red. So I tried to find out why. Well, how did I try to find out why? Well, I just wasn't getting any, you might say, tone arm action. I didn't have the pc on the tone arm but there couldn't
have been any tone arm action if the burn area was not getting well. There couldn't have been any action there. So I was running a process with no tone arm action, regardless of whether I had the pc on a meter or not.

So I look this over and I said there must be something here I don't know about, there must be something the pc doesn't know about. The pc's obviously in very good communication with me so it isn't Level 0 that's hanging up this pc. You know, brrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr. Know my stuff in other words, you see?

Ah, well, heh – when the pc did this, I wonder if the pc had a withhold. Well, here's a rationale that comes from up at your next level up, see. Here's a rationale from a higher level. Pc must have had a withhold. Must have had something. Must be an overt connected with it. There must be something connected with this thing. Yeah, but how do you run this out at the lower level? You can't go running "What have you done? What have you withheld?" or something like that, see. You're just running Locational type processes.

Well, there is one that'll blow it into view if it exists. "All right, where did it happen? Where are you now? Where did it happen? Where are you now? Where did it happen? Where are you now? Where did it happen?" You see. "Point to where it happened" is the exact auditing command there. "Point to where it happened. Point to where you are now. Point..." See, it's sort of a Touch Assist on the environment, knowing the thing probably is held up on the environment. And all of a sudden pc tells me, "I was hiding when I burned myself." [laughs] Looking for an overt and found a withhold, you know. How much withhold can you have? Withholding the entire body.

What was very remarkable is, is the whole incident then blew into view. I came back and finished the Touch Assist. I flattened the tone arm action on the other process, you see. I'd already run by all the rules. I'd taken the tone arm action out as far as it would go out on the Touch Assist but it'd – if it wasn't getting well, then there must have been something wrong. So the tone arm action was gone as far as I was concerned. Now we'll do something else to give it a booster. Now we'll run the tone arm action out of that. And when I say – using that word "tone arm action" very advisedly, because the pc is not on a meter, don't you see? Doing it by comm lag – three commands, see. Or cognition. Pc'd gotten well at that point I probably would have quit, too. And then come back to complete the Touch Assist.

It's very remarkable. The red faded out of the burn just bzzzzzzzzz. But it was also held up for a moment, it stayed pink – toward the end it was pink – so I knew there was something here I wasn't doing and I suddenly found out I wasn't touching – it wasn't right leg, left leg, right leg, left leg, but it was back of the leg, front of the leg and back of the left leg and front of the left leg. It was the front of the leg where the charge was stopped. You get the idea? Well, there's also not only two sides to a body but two sides to a leg and there are two sides to two legs making four sides. So I just ran my Touch Assist on a four-way and booooooom! and that was the end of the red spot. The blister didn't entirely go but I never expect the blister to entirely disappear and what do you want for a nickel? A miracle?

But the tone arm was – action was flat. The pc had come up to cognition. The pc was very, very cheerful and very, very good in communication so we gave the pc the win and ended the session.
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Well, that's quite remarkable. But that's high-level class auditing low-level process, see. You use everything you know without making the pc run something different than the pc would run at that level. See. Quite allowable at that low level for a pc to s... to point where he was and point where he is. That's just a Locational, you know. As long as he's pointing, it's objective, see. He isn't doing it in his skull. He's doing it out here. You get the idea?

_Audience: Mmm-hm._

So of course a Class VI Auditor would be worth his weight in gold at Level 0. Do you follow?

So that's – anybody – the public charging in, saying, "Oh, you're a Class VI Auditor, you've got to run me on GPMs." You say, "I'd be very glad to run you on GPMs, never refuse auditing. It will however take you quite a few intensives, I must warn you, at that particular stage. I'll be very happy to audit you on GPMs, and it's going to take quite a few intensives."

"Well, how many would you say?"

"Well, I'm not prepared to say how many it would take you. Well, it's – it's going to take you quite a while. And you've got to start in and the thing for you to do is to start in on it. Yes, I'll – I'll eventually audit GPMs on you but I can't, of course, start with that now, because you've got to go quite a ways. I'll eventually audit GPMs on you if you want me to when we get there, but of course, you may want somebody else to by the time we get there. We never know."

"Well, all right, all right." That's all right with him.

"Oh, okay. Now, are you all set? Now I'll have to take you to exactly what I'm sup¬posed to audit on you so as to get you up to being audited in the HGC."

"Fine, fine."

"All right!"

Level 0. You follow? It doesn't take forever to go up those levels. Might take a few intensives. Might take a Saint Hill Course, but you'll eventually get to GPMs.

Now, the datum that was very vital that we missed last year and that a curve was thrown at us on is that the Gradation Program was not popular with the public. I've now compared some other data and I have found out that the public, whatever the public is, included more people who told me, "Oh, thank God, I know where I'm going now," than it did, "Oh, that's horrible! You mean, have to be trained some to – in order to get processed. No."

In fact, no member of the public told me so, but two different people on communication lines did, who themselves had no opinion on it. And they reported to me that "the public" had said so. And one of them attributed a tremendous decline in an organization to the fact that the public didn't like the Gradation Program when the organization in actual fact on inspection was found not to have declined. Now, that's the wildest one!

"Well, the reason we're having this tremendous emergency and no money's coming in and the telephone calls come in and people, they're so confused. They can't sign up in the HGC and the reason we're having this tremendous emergency up here and so forth is this
Gradation Program and nobody can possibly understand any part of it and so forth, and they're just having an awful time and that's why we're in a slump and you've got to do something about this fast." And last night I remembered this and I went back and looked at the graphs of that organization and that was a steady, continual rise through that whole period. Now boy, that's sabotage! There's a place where stupidity ends and sabotage begins. [laughs] So there you are.

I've just got through checking through this on the basis of the fallacy of ever accepting rumor as the final fact. Rumor may be enough to cause an investigation of something, but it would never be enough to cause any – to base any action or decision on. Rumor is something that you must never base any action or decision on because you can do more damage basing an action or a decision on a rumor than anything else I know of. So it reduces us down to the point that we've got to operate on statistics.

And what are statistics? Statistics are particularities. And we find out that an organization will cause ARC breaks amongst its staff if you can't get a statistic on everybody present – week in, week out, a statistic. My God, it sounds like a slave factory. A statistic – terrible!

"You mean the Letter – the Letter Registrar is..." First thing you think of. "Oh well, the Letter Registrar has to get out so many letters during the week and that's the statistic." Yes, that's the statistic. That's fine. "The Letter Registrar's department has to get out so many letters during the week. That's the statistics." No, brother, that's rumor. Why is it rumor? Because it doesn't staticize every person in the department. "The typing pool got out 1,000 letters." Perfectly useless datum, a completely useless datum! You now know nothing. First place, you'd have to know how many they got out last week. That'd be – add a little meaning to it. In the next place is who in the typing pool – who's the typing pool? You very often find out on very ambitious org boards and so forth that one little girl is the "typing pool." Well, that's all right but she's been wrongly staticized then, hasn't she? She's been called "the typing pool" instead of "Letter Registrar's typist."

No, I'm afraid you'd have to be able to look through the entire Registration Department and find the statistic on every personnel there, otherwise you would start rumors and upsets and all sort of things.

To take gross income of an organization – this is the way businesses run – aw, business. I don't know how they're alive!

It takes a singular genius, see? You know? To which we add a little bit of Scientology and we can get a fabulous situation, see. But frankly I don't know how these businesses are here! I've been writing up this sort of thing and developing the various philosophies and administrative procedures and so forth, and it's becoming more and more incredible to me. How are they here? How do they live at all? And the answer is, they don't. They don't. How do people live at all? They don't. How does the civilization exist? It doesn't. Unless you consider the civilization on the basis of the life of a mayfly – which is just about what they have here on this planet – mayfly type civilizations, you see. Three hundred and fifty years, thousand years – gone, see. They usually don't even last that long, see. That's a long civilization here on this planet.
On the whole track – sorry to go whole track on you – but on the whole track I was studying the org boards and so forth that I had known in going over org boards and methods of putting together org boards and a lot of things like this and I suddenly remembered a relatively successful org board. And it had lasted for eighty trillion years and I considered that was fair. That was pretty good. It was a Galactic Confederation org board. And it was a very nice board and then I took the board apart and find out what made the organization collapse. [laughter] And I found it. And I found it.

They made no provision of any kind whatsoever for the alteration or improvement of anything. And there was no place on their org board where anybody could suggest an improvement. And that was why they collapsed. Eighty trillion years, so that was pretty good. So that must have been a fair org board. It actually only had one principal element missing from it.

It was, by the way, an interesting org board, very interesting org board. There were about two billion staff members in its central organization. A lot, huh? That was just one org. That wasn't their – that wasn't their district offices, you see. That wasn't their continental office or system offices or something like that. You might be amused. The datum on the thing that it was in projectors, multi-eyed projectors that looked like a fly's eye, you know? Fly's eye with a thousand lenses. These things were on tracks in back of a huge screen and they repeated the internal parts of the organization's schematic and there'd be several of these projectors and they would interlock. The image would be interlocked, don't you see.

Now, if you wanted to change one of those, what you did was bring it forward till there was only one of this type of unit and that was the one showing, and you wrote it on the front screen and it held that in memory and you erased it on your front screen and it held it in memory on its screen and then you shoved it back on the track again and its thousand eyes would project it onto this huge screen making that one notation repeat all over the galactic system, making each office the same. Isn't that interesting? Gimmickry. And having – remembering this elaborate machinery and remembering what it took to make an org board and remembering how many people it took to keep one up and remembering how many communication lines were simply devoted to the org board, I said, I'm being asked to do one here on two dimensions?

You say, what's that got to do with our org board? Well, let me tell you, an org board would be no good at all if it wouldn't go up to two billion staff members. It wouldn't be any good at all. It'd be useless. Why? Because sooner or later up the line its design is going to trip the expansion of an organization. Might only you'd get it to two hundred people before it'd trip the whole expansion by having a fault in it. But if you could blow it up easily without confusion to two billion staff members, that would be fine. So I had the problem of blowing it up to two billion staff members and blowing it down to one guy. And that was the problem I set myself.

I had one for a while that could be – an organization could be reduced on this org board to three people and it could go up to about a hundred and fifty people. And I thought that was pretty good. That was more than we had. And then I finally got it from one person to two billion. It'll slide all the way up and down without an alteration which I thought was
pretty fair. But a galactic civilization, of course, had a flaw in its board and so it only lasted eighty trillion years. And we can't take that chance. We mustn't have these germs of destruction around.

Well, that's a little bit of space opera but very interesting space opera. Happens to be true.

But the main – the main thing – the main thing that we're interested in with regard to this is that if you can't staticize – that is assign the figure, not to its units, not to its departments or sections or groups, but to the people who are there – then you're going to get some kind of an authoritarian atmosphere and there's going to be injustice and there's going to be weird things happening and people are going to be cutting each other's throats and the organization is going to be a tiny little bit ARC broke and so forth. Why? Because it's entered into a generality. The data is a generality.

Now, if we assign, as they commonly do in business, the entire success of the organization to its chairman of the board or its general manager – the entire success of the business – we'll only be about 70 percent right, 60 percent right. This guy must have had some ideas and he must have been on the ball, but what about those other 30 or 40 percent? Well, that's a margin for error. We could say Gestetner Limited is making its way very well because its managing director is the – is a very good man. And then we go around and in some 30 or 40 percent of the time we'll find a managing director – not of Gestetner Limited necessarily, I don't even know a man – but he spends all of his time raising cactus plants on a balcony and never even reads a report. And we find out that Gestetner Limited had nothing to do with this man at all.

In other words there's 30 or 40 percent error that can enter into it. You see, if 50, 60 percent of the time, you see, 50, 60, 70 percent of the time we might be able to say this. We say it's a good ship because it's got a good captain, see. Well. It's got errors in it. It's potentially false, see. It's right often enough to almost operate and so that datum is practically worshipped in this civilization at this particular time. Gyah, ta, dya, tyah tyah – Oh my God! I mean get down and burn the incense and joss to that datum. That's practically the senior administrative datum of this whole organization.

"MacArthur won the war." I don't know if he did or not – I was there! In a sort of a divided frame of mind about having saved Australia at the present time – they'll never quite live that down, I'm afraid. I was demanding some data the other day from Melbourne and I got a bunch of papers in about the inquiry. I was looking for statistics by which to pick the organization up and that's what I got back. I got data about the inquiry. It was very useful because it said at least they were mailing things, that they still knew our address. Oh, I'm being cruel. Actually they cabled me the other day on a compliance so I shouldn't be too mean, but I was actually expecting other things than a bunch of legal papers, don't you see. And in they – in came all the legal papers.

No, MacArthur didn't win the war. He was a fairly bright cookie and so on and he probably had a lot on the ball, but I notice he didn't win the Korean War. So there – he must have done something just enough wrong in World War II so that when this showed up again in the Korean War, why, it went by the boards and we find out what he did wrong. He wasn't
a good politician. He couldn't take Mr. Truman and chuck him under the chin and throw him the right brand of Missouri corn.

That's right. That's right. Actually he was talking to a man who wasn't a military man, who must have been incited against the whole thing before he took a crack at MacArthur. My God, here was practically America's hero number one and he mowed him down. Well, what did he do wrong? Well, he was in an emergency called the Korean War and he didn't promote, that's all. He probably tried to reorganize before he tried to promote. I mean if – he disobeyed a condition formula. I'll tell you about those someday, they're very interesting, see. But he should have promoted. He should have promoted MacArthur, he should have promoted the record, he should have done a promotion of a new idea.

One of the ways you do that kind of thing – I'm very well accustomed to handling political figures in some spheres and so forth. I have an enviable record in this direction in some areas on the backtrack – enviable, absolutely. Guy could inspect the whole area and never learn a damn thing, you know. And go away thinking everything was beautiful when everything was falling to pieces. But it sure did keep interference... Because all a politician can do, being generally inept, depending on the generality "the will of the people" which of course doesn't exist either.

This bird, all he – all he can peddle is interference. And if you've got a situation somewhat under control and it's very difficult to handle it, some politician coming in and interfering with things can knock it all in a cocked hat.

In first place, he doesn't know his job. Now, if they'd – if they'd send you somebody who was an expert on this kind of thing you could sit there, you know, and you could go chitter-chatter with him and get ideas and he'd get ideas and you'd toss them back and forth and you'd come out and you'd wrap this thing up, don't you see? That would be a different proposition. But so what – you're going to get some unknowledgeable personnel around who has a tremendous amount – unlimited power and so forth, it takes great skill, you – great skill in handling this bird and it is a skill.

For instance, you pass through the word that the pilots of his plane, who also are attached to your outfit and so forth, feed him the data, the rumor line as he is flying along, and you fix it up so the hostess or the Wac that goes along there, she feeds him the rumor line and your customs officers all feed him the rumor line – he's all inspected the place before he ever gets there.

"Nice how well things are running in Syria, isn't it Mr. Truman." You know.

"Boy, we're sure going great guns in Korea these days. Yessir. Yessir. MacArthur is doing a good job over there, isn't he, Mr. Truman?"

Public opinion! What's it made out of? Somebody's hat. Give you the idea. Then the politician arrives and he says, "Well, I'm glad you got it all in hand," you see, as he goes around thinking he's looking at things. "Glad you got it all in hand."

He knows it's all well in hand because he's got his favorite liquor in his hand. He goes away and does what you want. In fact, if you rig it right, he'll insist you carry out – he'll advise and insist upon and dream up the exact campaign which your strategists have just got off
the drawing board a week before he arrived. He'll insist on this and threaten you with court-martial unless you do it.

What's all this? What are we getting at here? What am I talking about to you, anyhow? I'm telling you that there's troubles of various kinds, aren't I? I'm trying to show you there's little problems around. What's the common denominator of all these problems? How does it apply to you? There's a great moral to be learned in all this: generalities. When you try to explain a condition with them – see, not all generalities are bad – but when you try to explain a condition with generalities which do not apply to parts and bits and piece, particular – particularities, you muck up the whole situation. I mean you could muck it up at will. That's what a propaganda minister is in Russia. I know now, by the way, that Russia is going to take the United States like the United States once took the South. They got a better propagandist in charge.

That's the wildest, dopiest stuff I ever saw in my life. A Russian walking outside of a damned satellite. Why? What is the scientific value? All they did was needlessly risk a man's life. They should have tossed a dummy out. Don't you see? But you could have put birds in a – in an airless tank or something like that. How do you know that a – that a metal bolt head or something like that wouldn't have fractured that was holding that line and so forth. Well, wing walkers have been known in flying circuses since World War I. So they put a wing walker in space. It wasn't even a – wasn't even a clever idea. I'm afraid to my shame that I probably would have turned it down, if it had been okayed by me, as being too stupid. Actually I would have turned it down on the basis that it was risking somebody's life needlessly but I probably would have come back with a better one.

But they got a better propaganda minister and they're promoting communism and who's promoting democracy? Nobody. No. Mr. Wilson, I think his name is, and Mr. Johnson, I think his name is – these are rather obscure people I'm talking to you about who will soon be gone from history, so I might as well immortalize them by mentioning them on a tape. [laughter, laughs] Greater contempt I could not think.

These birds are reorganizing a co... an economy during a period of decline and according to the Condition of Emergency the order is promote, change the things that are pulling you down, economize and prepare to deliver something.

That's the formula for being in an emergency. And both of these countries are in an emergency and they've both forgoten to promote. They're not promoting. There isn't anybody over there saying – overseas at the present moment saying – I don't know, exporting something, you know, a rah-rah. A big advertising program, you know. I bet – I bet the British government hasn't bought a penny's worth of American TV time. No promotion, but a lot of economy.

"Crisis! We're having crisis!" All they're doing is advertising a crisis. Well, don't God's sake ... Our Accounts Department's sometime or another are just going to get into serious collision with me because they every once in a while tell you or tell a staff member or tell somebody that they can't have that because we're broke. And you know that very often they say that with thousands of pounds sitting in the bank account. It just isn't true. It's a lie. Not only is it the wrong thing to say but it's a lie. And in a Condition of Emergency, Accounts's
always saying, "Well, we're very poor." That's the wrong thing to say, because it's the postulate that they're poor and they'll get poorer. If you don't want to be something, don't postulate it. That's all. It's as sensible as that.

And what's going to happen to you if you're broke and you owe a lot of bills and you rush around to all of your creditors saying, "Gee, I'm awful sorry I'm so broke. But I have a couple of cents I can give you." What's he going to do? He gonna call up his lawyer and he gonna sue. What did you do? You didn't promote; you advertised the crisis.

And this Wilson up here: "Great man, great man." He's done nothing but export crises. That's England's primary export today, is crises. It inevitably lowered the pound and so forth. A good propagandist in the right position or a good manager who really knew his business wouldn't have exported a crisis. He'd have promoted like mad something that he could deliver – something he could eventually deliver. And he'd have promoted it like mad and then he would have cut down – he would have made the changes on things that had pulled him down, right now, and then he would take a good solid look at his economy and he would have quietly put that back together again so that it worked functionally. And then he would have stood there and prepared to deliver what he had promised in the promotion. And that's what he would have done – one, two, three, four, bang.

That's the short formula by the way. There is a slightly longer formula that merely takes those same steps and expands them slightly. That's the proper action in an emergency. That's – whether it's a personal emergency or not, doesn't matter.

The other thing you can do is to – after you're out of the emergency period, to act like you're still in the emergency period when you're actually in another condition and apply this Emergency Formula to an entirely different condition. That can get you in a lot of trouble, too. The United States never does anything but apply an Emergency Formula – to its own internal businesses and so it never, of course, really gets up to Normal Operation for the excellent reason that it never ends the emergency.

Business firms never end the emergency. They always have their salesmen on emergency programs of some kind or another – huge advertising budgets and that sort of thing. And they never have a – never have time to even out. So actually what they've adjusted to is a normal emergency which drives everybody frantic and because they stay in an Emergency Condition after they're actually quite capable of assuming a Normal Operation, then they actually don't expand. They wonder what's all this. And they never get a chance to expand. Because in Normal Condition you behave quite differently, quite differently. You handle that with kid gloves. Promotions you handle with sledgehammers on – that is to say an Emergency Condition on a promote, why, that's a sledgehammer proposition. But you don't do that in Normal operating conditions, you see. That's the way it runs.

So anyway, make a long story short, what's the long – what's the long and short of the difficulties in which people have. What's the – what's this add up to? What's this have anything to do with? Well, it has to do with "have to know what's going on." And you never can really find out what's going on with the mass of something. You can only find out what's going on with the individual bits of something. Because if a mass is not related to anything but
the mass, then you never understand anything about it. Because it hasn't anything bigger and it hasn't anything smaller and it doesn't have anything anything. So it's just a mess.

When the Russian starts talking about the people, if he starts to talk about the masses, watch it, boy, watch it! Now, he can of course compare the masses of Russia to the masses of the United States, don't you see. Why, I don't know how you compare the mass of a bunch of Russians to the mass of a bunch of Americans, except you can put them all in opposite colored but similar uniforms with similar weapons in their hands have them shoot at each other, then you could figure it out. And that's the net result of talking about the ma-a-a-a-sses!

So anyway, seems to be there's something wrong with this thing called a generalization. A generality is a very general term for a generalization. You generalize something that can be particularized as to its condition and you get in trouble. Now, we in actual fact have found certain principles that men have in common. And this is quite remarkable. But that's only because we have studied the unit "man." You get what we've done? And actually when I say – when I say "men" I mean a thetan plus a body in this universe, you see? And "its, its characteristics are ..." Don't you see. And to the degree that this is dead-on and so forth, this person with certain characteristics which are just those characteristics, sit down across from you in the pc's chair and you utter certain auditing commands to that person and that person promptly responds and improves because this is because we know "a person." Do you follow that?

Now, the closer we get, the closer we get to know that person – he isn't the average person – he couldn't be anything else but that person, because a thetan is that thing and a body is that thing. So to this degree we could generalize. But look how wrong you could get in generalizing on the character of man. It'd have to be the character of an individual.

One of the things very interesting is Scientologists who attempt to approach groups to do anything with the groups with Scientology quite normally fall on their faces. But you can approach almost any individual with Scientology and, bang! Well, there are two reasons for this and one of them: Scientology is not a study of ma-a-a-sses. It is a study of the guy. You see? And we know what the map of this bird is – right there.

But now, let's make a generality about generalities, understanding that. And we find something very interesting. We find that only an ARC break can worsen a graph. There are two data. One is that if a graph is unchanging, there was a PTP – present time problem is what keeps a graph from changing. This has been observed over and over many times and so forth. I first observed it in 1955 in Washington, DC. You don't get any graph change in this pc – his IQ doesn't go up, doesn't go down, nothing happens on the thing. He's got a present time problem!

And if the pc's graph worsens, the only thing that can worsen a pc in auditing, so that his graph worsens markedly during processing, is an ARC break. You already knew those two data, but that means that of PTPs and ARC breaks it must be that the ARC break is really a bit more important than the PTP. And yet oddly enough until recently we didn't know anything much about it except it was bypassed charge and it was this and it was that. Yes, we knew its mechanisms concerning this and we knew those mechanisms were in common but we didn't exactly know precisely and bing what an ARC break was.
An ARC break is a generality that should be a particularity.

Now you see, there's nothing wrong with saying a generality. See? It is that it is substituting a generality for a particularity – and that's an ARC break.

Now, you can go in reverse and substitute a particularity for a generality and you'll get an ARC break, too. So it's this both ways. Does – it's the same meaning. Don't hang up on that. And that's all an ARC break is. It's substituting a generality that should be – I've written this up in a bulletin. I haven't really stated it quite that well in the bulletin. It'll serve. But you're liable to get hung up and say, "Well, when sun shines, skies are blue." That's a generality. Well, it isn't that kind of a generality. There's nothing wrong about that because it shouldn't be a particularity. As a matter of fact it'd be quite false to say, "When the sun shines only this sky above us is blue." That's not right. So there's nothing really wrong with a generality. I'm just adding that to the bulletin content that you will get shortly. But it's a generality that should be a particularity or a particularity that should be a generality.

Now, what's a particularity? Well, just call it a single. It was a single; it was called a many. See? Now, reversewise you'd think there was a many that was called a single – would reverse it, don't you see. It was a many that was called a single and so forth. Because you so seldom run into that, that you can practically neglect it. And the one that you'll be working with and so forth is the generality which should be a particularity. And that's what causes the ARC break. Bang! And the reason you don't carry ARC breaks well in your fellow student is you just don't ask that next question. You shortaudit it all the time. You would have discovered this if you'd asked the question about two or three times more, and if you'd known exactly what question to ask and how to ask it, but you just stop short. You never found the bypassed charge.

Let me give you an idea: "Oh, I'm all upset and so-and-so and so-and-so."

"All right, what are you upset about?"

"The Instructors are mean to me."

"All right. That reads on the meter. I'm indicating to you the bypassed charge. You're ARC broken because the Instructor's mean to you. The Instructor's mean to you."

All right, the guy says, "Yeah, yeah." "You feel better now?"

"Oh, yeah, they're sure mean to me." "You feel much better?"

"Oh, yeah, jeez, damn 'em."

You've seen this, haven't you? Next day, he's not there. He's blown or something. Well, you either – you have to come to two conclusions now – either ARC break finding doesn't work and it's not possible to find an ARC break, which some people stupidly come to the conclusion on – well, I shouldn't use the word stupidly – sillily. [laughter] Or that you didn't find the bypassed charge. One or the other. And unless you knew the exact character of the bypassed charge you could still occasionally miss so you'd think there wasn't – there was something else wrong besides this thing called an ARC break and you could still make a difficulty with it, don't you see.
That thing that's missing is that there was a particularity there that was into a generality, it was being falsely called a generality. And that was what it did. And if you'd ask him the next question – you see, this is what I mean by short auditing him – you said, "Well, I have an ARC break and that reads on the meter and 'the Instructors are mean to you',' see. The one – the example I just gave you, short – handing it. If you'd ask him, "Who is 'the Instructors'?" Sounds like weird English construction, doesn't it? And it is. It's – this is the trick you have to know. It's very easy to do because it's just relaxing and Q-and-Aing. [laughter] But it's "who." See. "Who is, who is 'the Instructors'?" It isn't even good English, you see? And they'd say, "Uh, it's Pete."

"Well, that reads," and so forth and if you went into your song and dance, "All right you're ARC broken because of Pete, you see."

He'd "Yeah," he'd say, "yeah, that's sure right. I'll go and find him and knock his head off, that's what I'll do." You've just short-questioned it. You haven't found it yet. But you've reduced Instructors to Instructor. Now, what does Instructor represent? And you ask this question again, whatever it was, "Well, has some Instructor said something to you?" Usually ask it like that, you see, or "Has some Instructor failed to answer you?" Or something like this, you see.

"Oh, it's not the Instructors, it's the students." Bang, it reads.

The auditor: "All right. Who is 'the students'?"

Pe says, "It's Agnes, heh-heh. I'd forgotten completely. She said I was a lousy auditor yesterday. By the way, let's go outside for a smoke, shall we."

This is the kind of response you get. And you'll for the first time, some of you, will see an ARC break just fade magically before your view. And this is the wildest magic you ever saw anything of.

Now, one of the things that is interesting is you'd think it'd work in reverse. And you say, "What generality has been uttered?" See. I'm sure – I'm going to have to say this because somebody's going to come up with it and do it. That's – I'm sure. And the person being asked that question of course is just into the dispersal of anybody who has ever pulled a generality on him. And he just goes bsee and he can't see anybody. You follow me? People who are around saying "everybody," "they" – these wild generalities, and so forth – you should do this as a drill, don't ever try to audit anybody on it because it's murderous. Just ask somebody, "Who says 'they'? Who uses generalities? Who says 'everybody'?" Any such question. And you'll see the person... Because oddly enough the person has uttered a dispersal, you see. He can always find somebody eventually. But don't expect to be tremendously relieved because that person is probably a generality in the mind, you see, of the person who did utter the generality and it probably isn't it again. You follow?

But it – this doesn't work well when you say, "Well, this person's ARC broken at home all the time." All right, "Who uses 'they'? Who uses 'everybody'?" This is the indicated procedure, don't you see as it... and it doesn't work because it's too cotton-picking general.

Generalities are too general on the track and you just asked this bird to face up to his whole bank going straight back to VI because what is basically wrong with VI? All the GPMs
are generalities! You didn't expect that one, did you? That's why people ARC break so hard on R6. It doesn't say who's supposed to be this way or anything else, see. But main thing wrong with it, it probably wouldn't ARC break anybody then if they weren't reverse generalities that one really couldn't believe. They're entheta generalities, these things. They're not "to be pleasant and sweet and be a good girl" – the type of goal we used to find on some pcs here, of course. It's "to be a nasty bee." That would be more in keeping, not to use end words on you. "Be (blank)."

Now, I don't want to swear on this tape because some young man might hear it. You girls, you can generally absorb that kind of conversation – don't want to corrupt any young men. Anyway, the main point here is that you have a fantastic weapon in your hands for clearing up an ARC break. Now, just exactly how this produces such a cataclysm, I leave up to you to watch. I won't try to describe all the mechanics of it. I'll just tell you that's the mechanism – that somebody should have used a particularity and they used a generality. And this just ARC broke the living Godfrey out of this pc.

I'll give you an idea of a typical ARC break. "The Instructors tell me that they're going to put you on a special unit to catch up because you're doing so badly." The guy sort of caves in and it's all right with him and he goes off and he's not quite sure what's happened to him. He feels kind of bad about it but... Well, a person who will do that sort of thing is probably in the first place telling a lie, and probably nobody's mentioned it. But the reverse side of the coin is if the person did say it, it must have been from one Instructor. We can't remember four Instructors or something like that all standing up in a row, don't you see, all saying this at the same time. [laughter] Even if all the Instructors were present it would have had to have been one Instructor, don't you see. So the thetan hearing this, of course, gets an insight into the fact that it's impossible. And while receiving it, because it's startling, also resists it because it's impossible. Do you see?

Usually it violates his good sense. There are a lot of other little factors mixed up in it. But it takes that particularity-generality thing to trip it off. You find there's normally entheta tied up in it – the degree of the ARC break has to do with that, it's how frequent this occurred, you know. There are a lot of other little factors but they measure intensity, just the intensity of the break. They don't measure the mechanics of it. The mechanics are just the generality which should have been a particularity.

Now, a person who loses things, and this also solves loss, produces the reverse side of this coin which is the only other reverse side of the coin and that is: when you lose a pen and you can't find it, it might be anywhere and so becomes a generality. So a single pen is then a generality. So it's a generality, you see, which should be a particular – and trying to find this generality and so on. One of the ways to cure yourself of an ARC break, by the way, is remember that it can only be in one place. No matter how lost it is, it can only be in one place! It's quite a remarkable observation when you come right down to it. It didn't become a hundred billion pens just because it got lost.

But that is the trick the mind plays on one at such a moment. Girl disappears. Guy no longer sees girl. Now this girl might be anywhere and that's why it's an ARC break. It's not
even that the girl is gone. As a matter of fact if you questioned him closely sometimes you find out that is quite a relief. [laughter] But it's "Where is she?" [laughter] Do you follow?

So you find that most people after they've had a breakup in their love life or something like that will develop colds. And that is the direct mechanism of the lost item. It's an "everywhere" that should be a particularity, see.

So when you take a particularity and make it into an "everywhere," when you take a particularity and make it that way, why, you get an ARC break because it's a lie, of course. And when you take this particularity that should be there and it all by itself becomes an "everywhere," why, it's again – different type of lie – so person ARC breaks. And all you-uns got to do as an auditor is find that-un.

Now, on R6 it is enough to say – after you found it – that it's – GPM – it's just a bypassed charge, an end word or something like that. It isn't whether or not the pc can or can't remember it or anything of the sort. You get the pc trying to remember it – somebody out in Chicago was terribly ARC broken because of the last three minutes of one of my tapes. And the auditor – he was calling up Washington trying to get a copy of the tape to find out what the end word was on it so that he could cure the ARC break. Well, now if they'd spotted it, that would have been that. They wouldn't have to have known what the end word was. They'd have to push his nose back into it to find out what – it was unimportant what it was! If that had been the charge that caused the ARC break all he'd have to do is say, "All right, it was the last three minutes of the tape." That'd have been the end of that, see. Boom! You follow?

Audience: Yep. Yes.

It would have gone.

So the test of what was the bypassed charge is: When it is located, does it – the pc cheer up, you see. That's the only test of whether or not it was the bypassed charge. So having to find more about it, you see, immediately tells you you haven't found the bypassed charge. More about the bypassed charge that you have found, see. If you don't follow it in on the particularity and finally find the particularity that it was, why, it'll continue to be an ARC break.

Well, this is a very happy view so just press it home just a little further and ask your questions to turn those generalities into particularities and learn this little gag. You'll have a bulletin out on this in the next day or so. My bulletin line's a little behind. But the particularity, find what the particularity was and you say, "Who is 'the Instructors'?" see. "Who is 'everybody'?!" See. Because you're using a sort of a Q and A to – a repeater technique from Dianetics if you please – to get the generality repeated at least once to the person. So you use it back at him again. It's very nasty but you're in an ARC break and you're not auditing anyhow so of course Q and A is perfectly normal. [laughter]

And let me assure you, let me assure you this, if it isn't quite magical in the way it knocks apart ARC breaks, if it doesn't knock apart your pc's ARC break, then please look over the whole subject of particularities again and generalities and so forth and go over it real carefully because you must have missed something. This'll cure an ARC break in a cross-eyed mule. This would even cure Wilson's ARC breaks. That's right. Right. Marvelous! So you won't have any trouble using that, just remember what its mechanics are.
Well, all the rest of this is is the staticizing of life. If you don't find out exactly what is going on in life, if you can't assign values to the particular parts of life and if you can't take a look at what Joe is doing that is different in his production and so forth than Pete, why, you're liable to get into a sort of an ARC breaky generalized condition about life and not really know very much about it while thinking you know a great deal.

Our whole observation is based upon what are the characteristics of a thetan – I wish to point that out to you – and on top of that he can build the wildest generalities you ever heard of but we've got him right where the chassis sits.

So then it is for us safe to indulge in these things about a thetan, see, this is the thetan or a thetan – the generalities about people and masses don't go.

Thank you.
Thank you.

Well now, today – today is a red-letter day. Today is quite a day. This is about the first day I ever brought notes to a lecture. So I want you to mark this down. And what is the date?

Audience: April 6, AD 15.

April 6, AD 15. So you want to mark that date down: "Ron brought some notes to the lecture."

Now, today – you have been hearing a lot about organization and reorganization and re-re-reorganization. And I'm about to give you a talk on the new org board for all organizations over the world. And you will find that your notes on this will probably be fairly scrambled. The whole thing will be published in Auditor 8 – the whole org board – and there will be HCOB – pardon me, HCO Policy Letter 3 April 65 released, which gives the basic organization in detail. And there's a lot of stuff gone in on this, and actually I've been working on practically nothing else for weeks. Of course, I've been working on everything else for weeks, too, you see? But my concentration has been on this, and it sort of stopped the – nobody will believe this. People are somewhat alarmed with the number of policy letters coming out and so forth. Those are parts of the new hat book, and they're simply being released to get them out so they won't cause randomity, because when we send the new hat books off to the printers, we'll – probably we'll have them in 68-1970, and that – a bit of missing data between now and then might prove very catastrophic here and there.

So you notice that around orgs and so forth these things are being released as just General Non-Remimeo. Non-remimeo means that they're cut on a stencil and just run off and a few copies are sent to each org.

Anyway, you will be seeing a lot of this org board. And I'm merely pointing out to you about this, that there is something about it to understand. There's a great deal about it to understand. And the first – the first is that the org board does not change regardless of the size of the organization. It may get longer at the bottom, but it doesn't change in its significant characteristics, departments, divisions or anything else. They remain constant, and it doesn't matter if it's a Class Zero Org consisting of three guys trying to lift their heads up off the pavement as an organization. or an organization of 200,000 staff members; it would be the same org board. And I know that startles you, but I almost told you the real figure: two billion.
This board is – this board has a lot of back history, and it is a refined board. And I may as well tell you the truth here amongst us girls. This is a refined board that I spoke to you about in an earlier lecture of an old galactic civilization. And you say what's that doing amongst us? Well, we applied Scientology to it, and found out why the civilization eventually failed. They lacked a couple of departments and that was enough to mess it all up. And they only lasted eighty trillion. We'll be going a lot longer than that, so we want to get something substantial. We don't want these temporary fly-by-night affairs, you know.

Matter of fact, practically every government of this planet has fallen on its head before it was even heard of. They go up and vanish so quick that history is practically unable to keep track of them. I'll bet you – I'll bet you – just yesterday; just the other day: 1500 B.C. – you cannot tell me the primary civilization which was in exist... That's right, I thought you couldn't. You don't know what government was in power in Europe and the Middle East in 1500 B.C. You see? Just that little, tiny, tiny span of time. What is that, thirty-five hundred years. You don't even remember. Temporary. Makeshift. Didn't understand. Nobody had ever been to school about org boards; didn't know anything about it.

Now, actually there've been lots of schools about org boards. They didn't have Scientology, but they did have org boards. There have been some of the wildest org boards that have ever been invented. Don't consider the United States Army has any org board; it doesn't. Armies don't have org boards; they have *command charts!* Hmph! You want to see the picture of a suppressive person, look at an org board of a military organization. It goes: commanding general, adjutants, officers, nobodies. Everywhere except the Mexican Army. And that has commanding generals, and that's all. [laughter, laughs] It'll be like our City offices using this board for the first time, and it'll look like the Mexican Army because everybody'll be top brass. Two ranks of top brass.

Now, our org board – our org board is erected to stay there, and therefore has been worked out very carefully against various known philosophic principles, so that it is itself a philosophic machine and in a very short time you're going to see this org board in a Comm Center, where the public is able to walk by it, become a jam spot. I can – I can assure you it's going to become a jam spot, and you're going to get little despatches from communicators saying, "Can't we put the org board behind a door or something, so we can get some work done?" No, that isn't the thing to do. It's just make the Comm Center bigger – you see, elementary – and just put a duplicate board in there the public can stand in front of. Say on it, "Don't look at this board; look at that one," you know, so as to get them out of the road, because you're not going to be able to keep people off of this board.

That sounds very funny, very funny. How come an organization board could suddenly move up into such prominence? Well, you'll see before this lecture is over.

Now, the main thing to know about these things is a command chart is only one tiny, two-bit little function; that's a minor function of an organization chart. Because an organization chart must take care of *function*, and it must take care of the *activity*, and it must take care of *what happens*. And you look on an army's organization board and you don't find anyplace to refer a lost battle. Well, that's pretty interesting. What do you do with lost battles? I can just
see an army signalman trying to put a lost battle someplace in an army org board. He's trying to look for the guy's basket. Where do we send this lost battle?

Now, let me tell you why they fail. This is the principle, and this is a principle of this universe: *If the function is not expressed, it will be worn unknowingly by everybody.* And you can write that down in letters of fire right on the frontal structure where it comes to organizations – right on the front of your skull so you can look at it as a thetan. Write it backwards, of course, so that you can look at it properly.

The function that isn't expressed is worn by everybody. This, therefore, becomes very important when I say, "Where do you put the lost battle?" Well, just that all by itself, and that's a very minor point, would of course eventually defeat the organization with such a board, because its decay is on automatic. But of course man's reactive bank being the way man's reactive bank is, of course he'd invent such an org board.

Now, where you have, then, one of these org boards, you have a frailty that goes along which is almost the same order of magnitude as what I just told you – the function which isn't expressed on the org board is worn by everyone unknowingly, see (and you can make a note of that because that's very important) – is the other monitoring function which gives us bureaucracies, and that is: *When you put a box on an org board, it will be filled.* And that is at war with the other function.

Now, let's look at these two contradictory data, and they are almost of comparable magnitude. If we don't express the function on the org board, it will be worn unknowingly by everyone. And the other datum, if you put a box, a square or a function on an org board, they will assign people to it. Inevitably and invariable, you will find this to be the case. Those two things then are at war and have not been solved by organizations of the past.

So, in the effort to stay within the realm of possibility with regard to personnel – economic possibility, population possibilities and so forth, within that realm – then they drop functions off the org board because they can't have an organization that big, because this again is a hidden datum that people will fill the box. They'll put somebody in that box. You got a box there; it says, "Adjutants – Adjutant's Boot Shiner." Oh, you'll find an Adjutant's Boot Shiner show up. He may be totally unnecessary. Maybe adjutants have ceased to wear boots, but he'll be there. And if they've neglected to take mules off of the US Army charts, you're going to find mules and mule helpers and mule holders and mule curriers, and I'll bet you there's some place in the United States Army right now that's just got tons of mules. I'll just bet you.

And I'll bet you in reforming the cavalry charts when they turned them over to mechanized – people who like animals don't like machines, so they turned over the cavalry and mechanized it, you see, on the theory that cavalry goes across countryside or something. But they forgot to take the spurs off the officers, don't you see? So, therefore, I know definitely that they forgot to take some spots out of their org boards. And you're going to find some mighty peculiar things if you went sneaking around a cavalry regiment today. They're mechanized. They're in tanks, you know, and they got motorcycles and armored cars and jeeps, and all that sort of thing – officers still wearing spurs. They sure raise the devil with tank upholstery, too, getting in and out of tanks. [laughter] But if you – if you looked around there, you
would see some peculiar things. And if you went and look at their org board, why, it isn't there.

Now, if there are – no tank repairmen, or anything like that were provided for, you wouldn't find them there.

Now, oddly enough, man, when he works as a team, must have policy or he is not a team. He cannot work as a team without policy, so all he works as is a bunch of individuals. Even bad policy, you see, will at least make a team out of him. Do you follow? It isn't whether the policy is bad or good. It's does it exist and is it followed? Fortunately, I don't write policy on the basis "any old policy is better than no policy," but it so happens... (There'll be somebody cursing his head, unable to get this through his skull at some time or another. Probably going to remember this line on the tape and hold it up to me. You probably better cut it out.) But that's true. Any policy is better than no policy because that is what makes the team. It's simply the agreement. It's the extant agreement, and if there isn't an extant agreement, then you have individualized action.

When you get individualized action, even though this is occasionally very spectacular and very successful – which hangs the auditor in a lose – in a win, you see, and then makes him lose afterwards... This very spectacular individualization of action within the rest of the team, weirdly enough, even though it occasionally wins a battle, in actual fact does more harm than good. Because it sets an example of breaking policy, which then breaks up the team.

The worst team you ever wanted to see is one composed of "all-stars" taken at random as the starring players, with spectacular individualities from each of the winning teams of a country. I don't care what game you're playing, if you want a really stinking team, get those boys, because they're running according to the different policies of their different coaches, don't you see? And they are already, by "all-star" players, preselected as doing something that was very noticeable, which means they didn't even follow their own team policy. So now you group all these fellows together in a mess, and each one – each one is magnificent and a collective mess. And they probably could be licked by any little batch of high-school kids on the same game, who were welded together by policy. "When Bill does that, I do this. That's it. That's play sixty-four. What's play sixty-four? Well, when Bill does that, I do this and then Joe does that." That's just policy.

Now, you see, if they were facing some individuals who were very, very good individually, and those individuals they were facing had no policy, do you see that these three guys on the organized team could easily defeat the other team because they're defeating – there actually, in basketball, would be five men against one, not a team. In other words, each member of an unorganized team – each member of an unorganized team – is standing naked and alone. And so any small group, no matter how small, as long as it's more numerous than the one, can rather easily defeat one.

So we in Scientology, compared to the world's population, are a relatively small group. We tend to be a lot of ruddy individualists, which is fine in our private life, but our organizational actions must be coordinated. And if we knitted together our organizational actions and our functions across the world, and we had a good similarity of action, good du-
plication from organization to organization, and then we grooved this in and put this together very nicely... Who else on this planet is following policy? Nobody. Even the commies, who are the closest to organized people, have such rifts about policy that nobody knows whether to follow Lenin's policy or Stalin's policy or Khruschev's policy or the new coexistence policy, see, or the old revolutionary policy – whatever that was. And you probably do not realize that there are about – well, I know – I know myself of three or four brands of communism, and therefore I would say there are probably three or four hundred, you see, because I'm not a – I'm not a – to use a difficult word – a "buff" on the subject, you know?

You ever hear of a fire buff or a police buff? He's the fellow, whenever he hears the police sirens, goes out and jumps in his car, you know, and follows the police car. Or he's the fellow that follows the fire engines to the fire. And he's – the railroad buff – why, he's always down looking for old steam engines and so forth, and he's asking for a ride on the cowcatcher or something like that. "Buff." I'm not a communist buff. I don't – I don't follow them up very much because it won't be necessary, see? I just don't like to become a buff to an impermanent fixture. There's no future in it. And they're really not long for this world.

Why? Well, there's two good reasons why. One, they themselves – they themselves aren't that good. They're a temporary Earth civilization. One of these temporary things that goes away in, what? A flicker of an eye and they're gone, see? Up one minute, down the next. Disappeared. Down-the-drain type of – type of operation. So they couldn't be going very long, and their duration alone doesn't make them very worthy as an opponent, see?

They wouldn't be... Now, you say, "What do you mean 'duration' – they wouldn't be here long? They'd be here long enough." Well, maybe they'd be here long enough for atomic fission, but we're working on that one, too.

Now, the point I'm – the point I'm trying to make out is that if you were better organized, and then organizations were better organized, you wouldn't have to do anything spectacular about the other organizations. Do you follow? This will not, then, engage you in a war with the other organization. We don't want a war with these organizations. And oddly enough, I have traced every single blowup we've had back to a wild departure from policy – very simple, primary, known policy.

Melbourne blew up on the refund policy. They just didn't follow any part of the refund policy. That's rather incredible. Our policy is when somebody – somebody isn't satisfied and so forth and wants his money back, we promptly give him his money back. We also tell him, "Well, you're through with Scientology," but that has nothing more to do with it. We don't want to stand around taking his money and giving it back and taking his money and giving it back. The devil with that. It's too hard on the Accounts Department. So we just say, "All right. You've had it. There's your money. Bye-bye." And that's been policy since heck was a pup. And Melbourne didn't give the man his money back. No-o-o. And when they did give him his money back, they didn't follow the rest of the policy. They didn't get a quitclaim from him. So he turned right around and sued them. They gave his money back and he sued them. Pure idiocy. Then, Melbourne is rather expert at departing from policy, and you needn't cut that off the tape. [laughter]
That's where they come a cropper, you see? They are not part of the team. And you will find all the symptoms of individuation present, which is they yammer at the other teams, see? They cuss the other teams out. They're always getting ARC broke about the other teams, do you see? And they just individuate more and more and more and follow policy less and less and all of a sudden they aren't there anymore, unless somebody intervenes with heavy cavalry.

Now, if we're going to make our forward progress – we have a lot of good organizations through the world, of which Melbourne is one of them now. (I have now acked them.) The situation is that these are placed in rather strategic areas. They're placed in strategic areas to spread a sphere of influence.

And when those spheres of influence meet on their own borders, we don't want them to be different and create a ridge; we want them just to flow smoothly out and meet. You follow? It's all rigged to do so.

Now therefore, if we are a good team, and if we watch our individual cases, and we come right on up the line as people, as beings, and we also are part of the team, then we won't get into all the trouble we got into as roaring, screaming individuals way back on the track. In other words, we can make it all the way because we've kept order all the way.

Right now we could turn people loose... It used to dismay me – I've already faced this problem – it used to dismay me when I would clean somebody up as a case, and then he'd get into busy-busy-busy activity of some kind or another and go tearing off in a big busyness and not do anything for the forward motion. Because normally he would go out there and he would go for a while and he'd be all right, but after a while, why, he'd sort of cave in – loneliness and other things, you see? This was a bum show. So obviously, then, we weren't making our way with his case.

So we find out that case stability depends upon the smooth organization of individuals. See? Sensible as that. And then we'll be able to make it all the way. And without an organizational shove back of that, then the guy goes up, and I don't care whether it's a thousand years – I don't care whether it's ten years, a thousand years or ten billion years – why, there he is in the theta trap, or there he is going downhill again, or there he is with all this stuff plastered all over his face, and he can't figure out what it is, and he's now forgotten how to run 8-C or Touch Assists. Well, you see, it'd be a temporary affair, and like an Earth government, wouldn't be worth doing.

Now, it isn't that anybody is trying to weld everybody together to the end of time, but I should say offhand that every person and being, and so on, who is going up with Scientology ought to take Scientology up with him. Seems only fair. And then you'll find things will work out fairly smoothly and very easily.

Now, what do you fall back on when you come a cropper all by yourself out in the far reaches of this particular planet? What do you fall back on? You fall back on an organization. You fall back on me. How could I be there at all if there wasn't an organization to take care of the action? Do you see?
So an organization is not a necessary evil or not some reason why, and so forth. The organization is there to serve Scientologists and to handle the thing and the public and spread it out and so forth. There's lots of reasons why it's there, but this isn't a lecture on purposes. But remember that it is a coordinated activity and therefore, it must be very close to flawless. Because once you put one of these things in brass and start it – you know, you put it in concrete and you start it rolling – if it's almost right, you've had it, because it will become an all-devouring monster and fail by the germs of its own destruction. And the thing that destroys almost any organism is its own germs. It's the things it laid in. It's the things you did, not what were done to you.

The only way you can come down is for having made a mistake yourself. There must always be that prior mistake. Sometimes it's very slight. Sometimes you couldn't possibly have hoped to have predicted the action would go the way it went, but it did go in some fantastic tangent to the way you expected it to go from that particular point and you had made a mistake, and there one starts down. You make enough of those things and you're really going down. But it takes quite a few.

What's interesting is an organization watching its general income curve go down, doesn't realize when I look at it I am not looking for a thing that is making it go down. I'm looking for the hundred thousand. I'm looking for the gross errors, but the lots of them. They're not really ever composed of one major error, one howling, major error. That – if you go around looking for that, you make the same mistake that has been made by every philosopher that I have ever read. He's made a mistake. It's contained on this chart. And what's contained is this:

He says, "What you must have is understanding." "What you must have is understanding," says the old philosopher. "Now please, please, please, please. What you must have is understanding...

Boy, that is an error that I myself fell into and have carried on for a very long time, until I was drawing up this org board the other day and recognized the flaw. It's understandings. It's plural.

It's a sort of a trick. You look at something and you're trying to understand this thing. You're looking for one big thing to understand. And it isn't composed of one big thing to understand; it's got about fifteen or twenty little ones. That's the biggest – probably the biggest single bug there is in philosophy anywhere – that philosophers looked for understanding. They looked for an understanding. I can tell you quite frankly there's 265 times 6 separate dynamic urges in man – separate, basic, principal dynamic urges in man. 265 times 6. And there's 265 times 6 times 18 separate causations. Now, the big understanding there is that they exist. And the other understanding is, is it was an effort to make them so numerous that nobody could embrace them.

Well, all right, let's get to the next point on this org board rather slippily and rapidly. I hope I've made my point that there is some necessity for organizational action. It must be smooth; there must be policy.

The next point is that it must be comprehensible. It's got to be knowable. If there were no system by which it went together, it would put everyone who read it on a memory basis. If
it didn't cross-categorize and if it didn't do various things, if you weren't – couldn't classify various types of communication, various types of duties or functions and so on, it'd just become a madhouse. It'd be chaos itself. So the org board must express the functions, duties, sequences of action and authorities, and boy, that's a lot to express.

On a two-dimensional board you're going to express the potential duties, well, of a couple of thousand staff members and bring it down to one staff member. And the one staff member is not going to be any different than the two thousand, two-hundred thousand, two million, two-hundred million, two billion staff members. See? What are we looking at? Boy, that's a philosophic conundrum, isn't it? Enough to give you a headache to think of it.

How are you going to take an organization that would accommodate and define and delineate the duties – this was the – this was the principle on which I operated – of two billion staff members and reduce it down to one staff member? Well, actually, when I first started out it would go up to about a hundred staff members. You could get it as big as a hundred before you needed a brand-new org board – and that means the organization would have to be torn apart and thrown away – or you could bring it down to three and that's as low as you could get it. You could only get it to three.

And I was stuck between three and a hundred or thereabouts. And I said that isn't good enough, and I started cracking me brains trying to figure out – might as well crack my brains; I don't want to get damaged myself. So I said – I set myself the artificial problem of making it so that it would go up to two billion (this is totally just theoretical, just so I'd have a bzzzt figure, you know, big) and down to one person. And that was the span of action, duty, function, organization and form.

Well, that's why you're going to see people looking at this org board and jamming up things and so forth: because – hold your hat – it gives the cycle of raw meat to OT. It gives the cycle of actions a person would undertake from the public. So it became a public org board, too, because the public looking at it enters from the left and proceeds straight on through to the right. That's all. And it must take care of him properly all the way along the way. It must therefore be the way. It must therefore be the route.

Now, following the laws and principles of how you make a channel and what you do to keep the channel rolling and keep an impulse on the channel: You must of course have an impulse into the channel. The edges of the channel must be held firm. The barriers in the channel must be removed. The noncompliance of forwardings in the channel have to be taken care of, and the distractions must be removed from the borders of the channel. And there must be some place for something going down the channel to arrive at. Must be a place for it to start from and a place for it to arrive at. And we have defined life, and life without that channel won't exist. That's livingness. Livingness is going along a certain course, impelled by a purpose and with some place to arrive.

It consists mostly of removing the barriers in the channel, holding the edges firm, ignoring the distractions and reinforcing and reimpelling one's progress along the channel. That's life and that's this org board. It's dreamed up with malice aforethought to put somebody on it and shove him straight through. It's rigged – it's rigged to remove the distractions, rein-
force the edges, pick up the barriers, take care of the noncompliance, reimpulse any particle on the line with a place for it to go. It does all these things.

Now not only that, it 'gives you all the levels that will now exist for the Gradation program; all the levels for the Gradation program. And this is where Clear fell out of the hamper suddenly after all these years. Suddenly took a look at it and found exactly where Clear fitted. Clear is a sort of a baby OT. He hasn't learned to walk yet, but frankly there's nothing, nothing to erase between Clear and OT except the physical universe. His next bank, of course, is the physical universe. And I don't think he's going to go around and erase that in a hurry, but he could go before it or go after it, couldn't he? He wouldn't have to erase it. But that's a Clear. A Clear is a baby OT. So that occurs on the board. Well, you take a baby; he's in beautiful condition, but he sure as hell can't walk. Did you ever notice? You follow?

He Clear as a bell, you know. I mean, you could ring him and he'd gong for hours. Beautiful condition. He's got lots of experience if he could only call on it. I ran into this head-on myself. I don't know if you've read the bulletin yet or not. Is it in your hands?

Audience: Yes.

Yeah, all right. I don't know what you thought about that. Gave you a terrible shock, I imagine.

But a Release, we've been looking at release for a long time. It's very funny. I've never been able to get anybody to check out a Release or a Clear. They have big arguments – big arguments about a Release. There's only one question they had to ask, but they'd never seem to be able to say that anybody was really Release. And big arguments ensued about Clear. Well of course, I had to be within shooting range of this exact position on the forward travel, and so forth, before I could suddenly say, "Ah, for God's sakes. Ah, what the devil." You know? I got all the right answers, and we got the right answers all the way to the top. That's what's so funny, you know? Nineteen fifty-five-twenty, Philadelphia Lectures, you know? This is very funny. They tell you all about an OT.

Creation of Human Ability, published here in England ages ago, got the steps in it which you now undertake. Of course, you can't take those steps with a reactive bank in your road, because it reactivates the bank and the bank shoves you back down again. It's wild business. You see? So there it was and I looked it right. So I decided, "Well, Ronnie," I said, "the only thing you can do is just confess. Just fess up to it. All right, that's the way it is." Because we'll leave it to the universities to make popularity with data, and we ourselves fare best when we simply tell what we know when we know it. And this is a case in point.

[For the 2nd time in the lecture, a jet plane flying overhead can be heard] (That's one of these new jet fighters; they're practicing. Well, we haven't got any OTs in the class to go up and give him the idea how to land, so we'll go on.)

So these points have to show up on this board. They have to be taken care of on this board, because this board isn't taking care of one kind of being. It isn't taking care of thetan-wog-class, spun-in X-2, see? I'll be a son of a gun if the board isn't taking care of all of these types of beings. And they're different types of beings as they go on up the line, don't you see? They'll act differently and they'll behave differently, so therefore we had to move up in the
direction of accommodating this fact, and so the easiest way to do that and so forth was simply to express the various stages on the org board itself and match them to the departments of the org board. So you find each department of the org board expresses one of these conditions.

Now, I knew nobody else would want to take the original basic point on the horizontal line, so I did. And that's the first organization that we ever had in Scientology. And that was the Office of L. Ron Hubbard, and that's Department One, you see? That's the Office of L. Ron Hubbard. That's the old Phoenix, Arizona office I first put together, and it eventually became HASI. Well, what's more elementary than that? And I tried and figure out what else would go on this, because I knew there was something a bit odd here, and so on, and I suddenly realized we had forgotten a piece of our own track – in Scientology track. And that was the first organization of Scientology, and strangely enough, it is still functioning. It functions just exactly like that.

And when we tried to straighten out Saint Hill here the other day, we found out that the only things wrong – I found out, the only things going wrong here in my perimeter is that the lines which are always in on the Office of L. Ron Hubbard never had been connected at Saint Hill. But they were trying to go in all the time, but nobody had connected them up. There's always an LRH Communicator, and he normally – he has lots of multitudinous duties of one kind or another. And the – such a person – such a person has a lot of things to do. And this person has – well, he handles signatures for one thing, and authorities and signatures. And you'll see these things coming in, and they're typed up in various parts of the organization. They're scattered all over the organization.

People wonder, "Well, how long am I going to have this line?" You know? "It doesn't seem to belong..." Well, it belongs in the Office of L. Ron Hubbard, of course. It's a letter written up for my signature, or it's a certificate for my signature, or it's something else for my signature. That's just one of these many functions, see? There are a whole bunch of these little things. There is "Where is my file of policy letters," don't you see? There's that kind of a function. There's all kinds of little functions of this particular character that doing without them and scattering them around the organization elsewhere winds everybody kind of up in the soup.

Now, therefore, that stuff is all corralled and that's under the first department. But the main thing to know about the first department is that it is an issuance of conditions. We have some conditions now which are hung around people's heads because – for this excellent reason: that if they exceed a condition, if they try to be in one condition when they're in another condition...

I'll give you an idea. They try to be in a Condition of Emergency when they're in a Condition, let us say, of Affluence – you know, they got lots of money, and they try to act like they're in a Condition of Emergency, they will very shortly be in a Condition of Emergency. Do you see? And reversely, weirdly enough, if they are – try to be in a Condition of Affluence while they're in a Condition of Emergency, boy, will they be in a Condition of Emergency.
I found a whole bunch of formulas here of one kind or another which regulate the steps which should be taken – these are basic policy – they regulate the steps that should be taken for any given condition of an organization or its department. So the name of that area is conditions, and that's the point of conditions. And that announces conditions, but of course, if you Hobson-Jobson this around, when somebody comes in, what does he tell you about? He tells you about conditions. He tells you about his conditions, or he tells you about the conditions of the world. He's always got a condition in mind. And that's what lies from there off the board into raw meat, you see?

You have – the first cognition is that there is a condition. That's the first thing a person has got to learn: that there is a condition. The world is drifting around; they think there are lots of people who take care of the mind, and they think there are lots of doctors around that heal everything, you know, and they think there are governments that are taking care of their citizens. They're in some happy little theetie-weetie dream, you know? And they've never really looked at the conditions, you see? This guy is going around and he isn't the least bit aware of his own condition. Not even the least bit aware of his own condition. You know what's going to happen to him? Do you realize that very shortly he'll be dead? That's the condition he's in. He's going to die. And do you know that you could look somebody right straight between the eyes and tell that with the greatest of truth. He's going to die. It seems so ordinary to a human being that he should die that it doesn't ever occur to him as a condition. It's a condition of his day-to-day life. He's getting older, so he's going to die.

When you say this to somebody, it puts him into a little bit of a state of shock. You say, "You're going to die. That's the condition you're in. You're going to die." And do you know the whole medical profession and all insurance companies have built all of their business on that one statement: "You're going to die." That's the condition. That's the condition of the human race.

So it actually goes from death, see, into the first part of our board, which is, we say, "At this point of the board it's not necessarily true that you're going to die. Yes, well, if you keep on going the way you are, you're going to die; but it's not necessarily true at this part of the board. You don't have to die. And that's a condition of Scientology, see? You don't have to get sick, and these things don't have to happen to you. In other words, conditions can be bettered." You get somebody to realize his condition and so forth.

So we get a whole new battery of processes, by the way, that come out underneath this thing that we've always taken for granted and which has made it difficult for us to sell the individual Scientology. And by applying those various processes, you, becoming accomplished in these things, will be able to walk out on the street and tag somebody. And it doesn't matter whether you tag him or he tags you, why, in short order, if you handle this thing right, you're just looking at a Scientologist right there. Because what have you done? You've put him into the first condition, which is a realization that such a thing as Scientology exists, and that's the first condition you're trying to establish in a being. And it gives you the drill of exactly how you do this to anybody, whether he's a paranoid or a nut. And the only person you wouldn't convince and so forth would be somebody who was utterly unconscious, like a psychiatrist. Now – the fellow is too far gone. You can't talk to a dead man about it because he isn't there.
Now, this isn't a matter of death. These conditions can be very high. And the funny part of it is that all processing from that point there on always contains a condition. This is, then, in common to the remainder of the chart. So as you move in from left to right, this one always carries along slightly with it.

But after you've had a condition, what have you got to do? Well, an old-time auditor like you ought to know you'd better communicate with it, so that is our next department. And we have the Department of Communications, and the name of the level is communications. That's all.

Now that we've got the guy so he knows a condition and he can communicate, he can now find out some more by perceiving. So the next point is perception. The next department must be perception, and that is the Department of Inspections and Reports. Elementary. If you think it over for a moment, you'll find out that communication must precede perception. Very, very delicate little point here.

Now the next line after this is orientation. After you've perceived, you know where you are. So you have something known as orientation. You can orient yourself. If you're ever having a nightmare, all you've got to do is open one eye and find out where you are, and you cease to have a nightmare. Most elementary process I know of. And so it is in life. This fellow comes along and he's been having nightmares up to this point that he calls life. And he then, being aware that conditions can exist, and being able to communicate with those conditions, perceives, and so orients himself and finds out that he has been living in a thing called a nightmare. You see he would, just like that. So that these earlier stages, now, are walking along with us, see? We haven't met this next one yet, but there it is.

In the next step, after one has achieved orientation, is of course understandings. But orientation weirdly enough is the Department of Compilation. After you see where you are, you note it down. After you put a few of these notes together and so forth, they add up to a compilation of orientation, and you can hand them to people and they can orient themselves, don't you see? But you can't hand them to people without understandings. You've got to compile them into understandings, do you see? Organizationally we're tracking. You get – I'm subtly shifting from case to organization, don't you see?

Understandings, of course, is what else but the Department of Publications. They would, of course, publish what's to be understood. Do you follow?

But a preclear – he had run into a condition, he communicated with it, perceived what it was, oriented himself in it, now he would understand it. So his level at this point would be understandings. He would be able to attain understandings, and not, for God's sakes any more – please, we've had the error too long – he doesn't attain at that point understanding. He unders... he gets understandings. And his understandings, of course, have been compiled under orientation: He took notes and he put them all together and they became understandings. Well, of course, they can become published. He can now say, "Look what I understood." He can now tell people what he understood. He can now tell himself what he understood. And I think that's all understanding is, is telling yourself.

So, we now run into the next department, which is really the Department of Promotion, called Department of Prom-Reg – Promotion and Registration. And that's Prom-Reg, but
what do you guess it's under? It's under purposes. That's all a Prom-Reg ever handles, by the way. They're handling people's purposes. If they ever handle anything else but their purposes, they're in trouble. If they don't alter, change, shift or enforce purposes, they don't ever get anybody to appear anywhere on a course or in an organization. As far as the pc is concerned, why, he has arrived at purposes.

And if you count these very carefully, conditions is one, communications two, perception is three, orientation four, understandings is five and purposes is six; which puts our PE and HAS off the chart where it belongs and reorients by taking advantage of the missing five that we had without changing anything but a few class numbers, gives us our same certificate scale and holds stability on R6, which everybody knows most. They don't pay much attention to the rest of the numbers, but R6 they do pay attention to.

And Department of Prom-Reg is the sixth department, and it also happens to be the sixth level and it's also the sixth grade, which – that's the sixth pc grade, and that's the sixth auditor grade, don't you see? And what has he achieved at that point? Well, he's gotten rid of all the false purposes and he knows what his purposes are. And he's achieved a state of Clear. Now, that's all HCO. We have got no further now than HCO. And HCO is a double-barreled-department division and it's the only one there is.

I'll track back. There are numerous other of these things, but I'll have to cut you in on what this is all about here. And the numerous othernesses of all this is that HCO has always had a post called HCO Dissem Sec – HCO Dissemination Secretary. And the HCO Secretary takes care of the conditions, communications and perception. In other words, takes care of the Office of L. Ron Hubbard, the Department of Communications – that's everybody in the org's communications, not just HCO – and the Department of Inspection and Reports, which includes of course OIC and cable data and justice and Committees of Evidence and lawyers and – anything that you would inspect and report on, see, is contained in that area. So it's very easy to understand what is grouped under that.

You'll see somebody studying this board wondering where something goes and then all of a sudden he goes clink. Well, of course, it couldn't go anywhere but there, and sure enough it goes there. In other words, it's a board that lends itself to understandings.

So the Dissem Sec takes over at the Department of Orientation. The HCO Dissem Sec takes over at the Department of Orientation and has the remaining three departments which are, of course, Compilation, Publications and Promotion. Now, frankly, you could say, "Well, why do we call all that HCO?" Well, actually it can't work by itself because the original formula which led us into Scientology was, having known the conditions, I found it was necessary to communicate with them in order to perceive, orient myself in them, and with the resulting understandings find out what my purpose really was.

And so that was a formula, and it was the original formula by which we moved in. But I have put the thing in order, not as it was expressed at that time – it was expressed nearly like that – but I put the thing in order so that it is clarified. So if it led to this much technology, it must have been a whale of a purpose. Must have been quite a purpose in itself, and to knock it out at this particular time would probably be to knock the whole basis out from underneath everything. So we keep that as HCO, and we say that's all HCO. But HCO now has two secrete-
taries, but one is not the HCO Secretary. She's still top dog. You've got the HCO Dissem Secretary taking care over Department of Compilations and having three departments under her.

Now, the three departments, the first three departments under the HCO Secretary, are Division One. That's Division One, and that simply means communications. That's their specialty because it's the center action of it, and that's the communications division, but you would call it the HCO Division merely because we know it as that over long periods of time.

Now the next one, Division Two, which takes care of the Department of Compilation, Publications and Promotion, would be the Dissemination Division – \textit{Dissemination Division}. The division has three departments. Now, you'll see the purpose for these very shortly.

Now, there are six of these divisions. That's a lot of them. And we're going to find something very weird that they missed way back on the trackspace operaeque. I will explain to you what it is. It's a staggerer. And that is, all you've got to do is cross two divisions on a hat, and from that point on, you have jammed the ability of the organization to expand. And that is the secret.

To the degree that you then cross hats on this chart – that is to say, somebody tries to wear a hat of Division Two and a hat of Division Four – if you carefully, in actual experience, look over the thing very carefully and wonder why in the name of God everything is going to pieces and everybody seems to be very upset and so forth, you look over the org board very fast and you'll see that Josie Ann is on HCO Dissemination and also on Field Activities. And that seemed logical to somebody, but somehow or another it is absolutely jammed into a horrible mess. And you go in and look at her basket, their comm station, and you will find out that it is stacked so you just can't see over it. The lines lock at these points and six is irreducible.

Actually the six is irreducible. You can't call it really an organization until it has six people in it, one for each division. And the degree that it won't expand is the degree that you cross those divisional hats. And when an organization gets just so big, you cross departmental hats at your peril. When it's very small, you can cross departmental hats; but when it gets very big or just mediumly big, you start crossing departmental hats, you'll find out that all the traffic is piling up at that point. They're just making a horrible logjam.

In other words, what I'm talking about here is we've got six separate activities and these separate activities – as you look into them – these separate activities go on a basis of... Your first one is communication. Now, if you don't have – see, that's Division One (we call it HCO) – you don't have communication, why, you're in pretty bad trouble. Have you ever noticed anybody who was out of communication? I think that you very possibly have used the word occasionally. Well, he's in pretty bad shape. But if somebody doesn't disseminate at all, they never put out, they could be in communication but they never give out anything. They would talk to you, but they never give anything out, one way or the other. You'd find that was pretty bad, and they'd be pretty sick. So that's actually One and that's Two. Dissemination, then, would be Two.

And then if we look this over very carefully, if somebody isn't neating the organization together, if there isn't an Organization Division, there's nobody looking after the organi-
zation. Well, the organization then wouldn't be there. It'd just be these other divisions floating out into the air, you see? So you've got to have an Organization Division and that's Three.

And – I want to write it big enough so that you can see it, or I'd string them all out in one line the way they should be.

And you then come in here and you've got to have a – you've got to have a Technical Division, because that's what we're in. That's the know-how. And even if you were making beans or spaghetti, you'd still have to have a Technical Division. Why? Because this is the – this is what you do! It isn't what you know. That's clear back up in the other line, see? But it's what you do. That's the technical activity, and we're particularly in technical, so therefore, it's the doingness of the technical, not the technical sitting there all by itself, don't you see? And that, of course, is Four.

And your next lineup, immediately after your technical, is the point that has been missed in all org charts on this planet and back to eighty trillion years ago. You can't make a product – just make a product. That is not possible. Times change, things alter. You can't just say it's a product. And nobody does, oddly enough, but they don't have it on their org boards. And sooner or later they neglect it. They've got to qualify the product. Got to qualify it. They've got to say, "This is how it behaves, and this is what it does," and then they got to go back and straighten up in the manufacture of the product anything that went wrong in making the product that made it fall down in qualification so that it couldn't meet the conditions which it was going to be used under. Do you see? So this was an absolutely vital step.

And no factory actually does miss this. When they do miss this, they've had it. They keep pouring out automobiles. I think – I think once in a while... The Lincoln, the Lincoln car of – I think it was about the 58 model or the 59 model – this was missing. And they sold those things madly (to important people, too, because it took that much to buy it), and just gave themselves the worst name you ever heard of, because out that thing went, and its electrical connections promptly started failing all over the place. It had never had any inspection on put-together, and the distributors hadn't got this step on their org board in their garages, and so on, out through the country, so they filled up their service bays and showrooms with non-running Lincolns. You couldn't repair any Lincoln because all the Lincolns they'd sold had come back. Nothing could move on the line because, the qualification step having been missing, you now had the whole product unmoving. Even if it did go out, it was rejected. So they left this up to the public; so the public was doing this step. You see, somebody had to wear the hat. You follow that? And inevitably somebody has to wear the hat if it's missing on these things. It's very, very amusing. So that's your Qualifications Division, and it – I'll go into what composes it, but that's the outfit that takes care of that little step.

And then you've got here your Distribution Division which is Six. And it's very funny that we would have a Distribution Division. That sounds very weird, because you have to make up your mind what we're distributing.

And it's very amusing. You go over this lineup – I mean the stuff I've been over here the last few weeks – I say it cracked my brain. I didn't want to get in the road of it. Spare myself. Just fantastic numbers of small points that would keep coming up and have to be answered, like "What do we as Scientologists make?" "What do we produce?" "Are we – is an
organization marketing Scientologists?" And you know, it's not! It's not even vaguely. An organization is simply selling Scientology.

And you say, "Well, wait a minute. Wait a minute. Then what is Scientology?"

Scientology is the ability to change conditions. Pretty interesting, isn't it? You got that? Scientology is the ability to change conditions; the technology of how you change conditions. That's it. And we've being worn that by changing Scientology. [laughs]

Now, I hate to put it into this kind of category and so forth, but if we were selling soap powder and somebody said, "Well, what's this do?" Let's say that he was a bog-wog out from the wog-bogs, and – bogwalker from the middle of Bogtown – and he said, "What's this stuff do? It's pretty. It's kind of sticky to the hand, and what's it do?" and so forth.

And you say, "It is a marvelous preparation!"

"Yeah," he says, "What's it do?" and so forth.

And you say, "It's beautiful. It's very beneficial."

He says, "What's it do?"

We have to tell him eventually that it is something that changes shirts from dirty shirts to clean shirts. And we would only miss if he didn't know that a clean shirt was desirable. And out in the public we're dealing with a bunch of very dirty wogs. [laughter] They don't know that a clean shirt is desirable. Before something can be sold, it has to be able to do something. Well, we know a lot of things Scientology can do, but a lump-sum statement of what it can do comes back from the beginning of this channel that we go through here. It can change conditions.

It's pretty interesting because anything that could change any conditions anywhere would have to be a very, very well regulated group because it'd tend to fly to pieces with the greatest of ease. We'd have to be able to be a group so that we could decide amongst us what conditions were to be changed eventually. And if we ourselves didn't decide this but we all went off individually changing conditions, it would look pretty chaotic. Because the weird part of it is, is we've got in our hands the universal solvent. It'll dissolve anything.

Well, what do we put it in? Well, we'd better put it into an organizational form and decide what we're going to dissolve with it, because we are the only things that could hold it. Nothing else could. We're the only things that could carry it, hold it, handle it or do anything else with it.

What's very hard for people to see, then, is they haven't got the flakes of soap. But it could be described to them very easily. But you'd first have to, in the Department of Condition, indicate to them that clean shirts were desirable. "Today's man wears clean shirts!" You got that?

And do you know you have numerous agencies propagandizing just the reverse in the field of the mind? "Be glad you have a dirty mind! All artistic impulses come from your dirty mind!" [laughter] "Buy our dirty minds!" It's quite remarkable, but it's true. There's books right out there on the stands at Smith's that – you can at least order them through Smith's –
selling you the idea of how marvelous it is to be nuts. Man's halfway bought the idea, so we've got a long way to start.

I remember some Scientologist that was working down in the middle of Africa... The main point is to know where you start. When you know where you start, you can promptly start. You get the idea?

Some Scientologist working down in the middle of Africa in soil conservation, so forth, finally found out what was wrong with the soil conservation program – is, the natives to which the government was seeking to teach soil conservation didn't know that soil conservation had any value of any kind. Soil conservation – the preservation of their land – had to be sold to them because they were a nomad tribe, and they had already had a solution to it. Every time the soil unconserved, you moved. And they didn't recognize they were running out of Africa to move into. So that had to be taught to them. But that couldn't be taught to them because they were out of communication. So you had to play the condition against the communication against the condition against the communication, and you all of a sudden got somewhere. And they were able to move up the program.

But it was basically a condition – condition had not been seen, viewed, indicated, felt, experienced. But at that level, it sort of has to be by osmosis. You see, you haven't got much communication. That's what takes genius, you see? You haven't got much communication, you haven't got much perception involved with the thing and yet somehow or another – this is what you are up against, you see – somehow or another you've got to get through to the bloke that clean shirts are desirable. Do you follow that?

Well, it's very funny, to – very, very amusing if you come right down to it, to compare Scientology to a box of soap. But let me tell you something: If you were trying to sell the Kohinoor diamond, you had certainly better get into the marts of trade and find out how they're purveyed. Just how would somebody go about selling anything? Do you see? How would you disseminate anything? How would you handle anything? You would have to figure out what the lines were, not in the marts of trade but just what existed amongst man. You'd have to be quite real, otherwise you'd be sitting in a little island, completely divorced from the rest of existence – a very undesirable condition. How many auditors are sitting around the world right now in little islands, totally enclosed and barricaded against the world one way or the other for not being able to communicate, see? All you've got to do is show them how to indicate – to the wog or anyone – how to indicate that a condition of clean shirts is desirable, see? And then show them: org board, clean shirt – zoom.

And they say, "Hey-y-y."

And you wait. Somebody will be rushing in to tell you, "I just had the damnedest idea. Do you know what I've just found out? Huh! You know, when you talk to people it makes a difference."

Big four-star... And now you'll know what you've been trying to process, see? It's worse than this. I'll tell you more about it very rapidly here.

But these are your divisions. These are your six divisions, and those six divisions add up in this particular direction. If you cross any of these lines, if you cross two of these lines, if
you've got communication-dissemination crossing, I assure you that your dissemination out is
going to block your communication in. If you had all of your mailings, for instance, running
only on your org despatch lines you're not going to – not going to hear from anybody. So your
dissemination would have been in vain.

Now, when it comes to organization, if there isn't somebody holding the organization
there financially, mest-wise, its buildings and that sort of thing, you're going to be in trouble,
that's for sure, because there's going to be no place to sit. Now, that doesn't bother an OT, but
this organization also contains, at its left-hand end, raw meat, and they sit down.

Now, if you don't produce anything – if you don't produce anything – and there's no
activity going on this thing, you never wind up with anything to distribute. That's obvious.
But here, if you don't look over the qualifications of what you're distributing and so forth,
you'll wind up with no distribution either. But the funny part of it is that every time you let a
person who trains students examine them, something goes wrong. One of the oldest policies
we have. So we can't cross those two divisions.

Once more in this, let's suppose this fellow, this fellow was crossed entirely with tech-
nical. You know, the Distribution Division made up all of the product. I don't think they'd
distribute anything. Furthermore, if this fellow wasn't actually a Distribution Division and so
forth, he would change the product. Do you see? So actually over here he's got to hold that
product just as it is. That's what he is distributing. That's what's coming off the assembly line
and that's what he's distributing. Do you see? And so that's got to be a held standard and a
distributed action.

Now this, oddly enough, you could – if you understood this thing from A to izzard –
you could probably walk into Gestetner's or Standard Oil or something and start explaining
this to some executive, and there'd be further executives and the vice-presidents and general
managers, and you would stand about eighteen ranks deep in their top officers before you
stood up. Because they look at this stuff and they say, "Oh, my God." You know? "Oh, my
God, yes. Oh, yes!"

Well now, what's all this, "Oh, yes?" You can take your own life on this org board –
you can take your own life, all the (this isn't a completed org board) – you can take your own
life and you can find out what one of your divisions is missing. You, personally! See? What
one of your divisions is missing? Is it your Dissemination Division? Well, what does dissemi-
nation add up to with you? I don't know, but you can reinterpret it into your own actions.
Your Organization Division, maybe that's missing. You know, everything is all chaotic, or
maybe your Technical Division, your service or action or production, or what you're produc-
ing. Maybe you're not making anything. Maybe you're distributing nothing that you have
made. Don't you see? Your Production Division or – which is about the same as your Techni-
cal here. This is just Hobson-Jobsoned over into the Scientology organization, don't you see?
But this is activity.

Now, your next one over here, maybe you're not qualifying what you make. Maybe
you don't say, or maybe you don't pick it up as it comes off the line, say, "That rings, that's a
good one," you know? "That rings, that's a good one." Maybe you aren't qualifying anything
you are doing, don't you see? Maybe as it comes down the line, you say, "That rings," and it
doesn't ring at all, and you don't have any place to put it. [laughter] You wind up wearing nothing but bum things that don't ring. [laughter]

And then after you've got a product – after you've got a product – do you know that some people don't distribute it? You know, they leave it right there. If you ever want to see somebody get stacked up, it's somebody whose Distribution Division is out. And that's pretty catastrophic.

Now, just to go over this very rapidly – and this probably really is several lectures – we got here – we got up as far as purposes, and that was the level six. But the rest of the lineup I will just read rapidly. There is the Department of the Organization. It takes care of financial planning, it takes care of papers and that sort of thing, and balance sheets and records and inventories and all that sort of thing. And then you've got your Department of Finance (our old Department of Accounts) and so on. But what is this thing, Department of the Organization? Now what part of existence does it occupy? Well, it occupies direction, of course. After you – but by level, after you've got purposes all cared for, boy can you have direction. Interesting, isn't it?

And then when we've got the direction cared for, why, direction, going in any direction, requires energy or makes energy, and so energy is your Department of Finance in an organization here. And then, the funny part of it is that do you know you have to apply energy to a body to make the body work something in order to get activity. Some way or another you've got to apply your energy to something, so the body of the organization is the Department of Materiel. Elementary, but that holds all the buildings and places and repairs them and cleans them and cares for things and of course personnel, as a body, is materiel. Not as a thetan, but as a body they're materiel. So you have to feed them and house them and do various things like that.

Now we get into – there's a missing point here which has got to be drawn in – this is Estimation. And do you know that anybody who engages in activity (which is the next step) without estimation is in a hell of a time. Did you ever try to engage in an activity without estimating? Just try it sometime. Reach for doorknobs that aren't there, step for step landings which are one step up from where you thought they were. You're going to have an awful time very shortly.

So you've got to have body, estimation, activity. And by getting body, estimation, activity, production, you determine a result. You don't determine a product. In other words, after the body has acted – you see, after you've estimated and it's acted – what are you going to get? You're going to get a result. Why are you going to get a result? You – why don't you get a product? Well, that's the mistake people make. They think that they get a product. They don't get a product at that stage, they get a result, you see? So here's your result and now we've got to have – and this title here Hobson-Jobsons around – we've got perfection or correction. It could be either way, but correction isn't quite it. We actually have, at this point, review. We've got to review this thing. And after we've gotten through with reviewing it, we then have a product.

Now, we've got a product. And what do we do with a product? Well, you know, you could have a product and not do anything with it, as I said before, so we have to clear it. And
that is the wildest pun that is on this board because, of course, clearing really belongs clear down here. That's OT. But we have to have it there because that action is a case, because at that point we had better start clearing somebody else. And that's what starts the whole thing over again. So it's a self-feeding, circular machine, not a flat one. You follow? We get our Field Staff Member system and so forth. So clearing the product, we get more to clear. So that, of course, is the Department of Clearing.

Now, any function which we have ever had fits rather neatly in this structure. We can put it almost down with the greatest of ease. There's more can be said about this. It can be written up more precisely. Probably be able to read it for a long time. But the funny part of it is, you can take this level, this conditions, communication, perception, orientation, understandings, purpose, direction, energy, body, activity, production, result, review, product, clearing – you can take that one brrrrrt and you can analyze whether you're doing good or bad. You can take that and you can say, "How – where are my activities falling down? Where are my activities falling down?" And you just take that, brrrrrr, and you'll spot one, and you'll be very happy with it until the following day when you find out you hadn't paid any attention to that one. And the next thing you know, it has done a complete analysis for you of the life you are living and what you're doing. And it's just as neat...

And if you're holding a post or something of that sort – do you see, that would straighten up your life, if – and even on – life on a job – but if you were holding down a post, you weirdly enough would have to have here the departmental functions. You, an individual, would have to have each one of the departmental functions in order to get rolling. So the figure on this is six, sixteen. Six, sixteen. There are six divisions; there are sixteen departments, and so each department then has primarily six sections with sixteen subsections, each one of which now may have six divisions with sixteen subdivisions. But it doesn't matter whether you have a staff member, a department, a section, a division, a little unit detached out to take care of the Swami Bami Hospital that the medical profession has just surrendered. There are still stethoscopes and uncoiled bandages lying down on the front lawn from the battle that was fought there, and they've surrendered, and you send a little unit over to take care of this place, you see?

You're going to be able to barely get away with it if you detach somebody from Divisions One and Two, another somebody from Divisions Three and Four and another somebody from Divisions Five and Six. Their lines are going to jam very shortly, but you could just get away with it. It's a good temporary hit-and-miss proposition, but the funny part of it is you really – to hold the place – you're going to have to have six people there. You're going to have to have Division One, Division Two, Division Three, Division Four, Division Five and Division Six represented. You will see how that works out. But if you're going to hold it any length of time and so forth, and if you're actually going to have a going concern, then you're going to have to have their proper departments underneath those divisions. Otherwise you start going mad.

And then if you're going to hold it for a long time and it's going to expand, well then, by George, you're going to have to have the six subsections under each department. And then if you're really going to go for broke, you're going to have to add the sixteen factor underneath that. In other words, the whole board goes crisscross. It's always the same board; it al-
The organization expands in exactly the same direction, and you have actually six divisional hats. You have six divisional hats and each divisional hat knows all the departmental hats. You can train anybody in on this, and you can train people in with a little bit on the other divisions and a great deal on his own division. It only gives us six hats, with of course one staff member hat.

And that is the organization that's going to carry us along the line. Now, it's – you say it hadn't been released. Well, it's been released. We've been working on it for fifteen years. And we had a ball in putting this thing together, and we know more about organization than we can shake a stick at. We've tried practically every form known to man, and in putting this thing together, ways we have jammed, the mistakes we have made are just suddenly coming into view as exactly why they were made and so on.

This is going to be put together and will be released as an actual org board in the near, very near future. And we'd put it out like this: it's going to have classes of orgs, and that merely depends – we have solved the thing. We say there are two admin members for every tech member, and that is how big the organization can be.

You can put two admin on for every tech you put on and if you just keep that up, then it gets up – a certain number of people, gives you a certain class of org, don't you see – but then you just say, "Everybody below you and every function below you is – you're responsible for." We don't say there are missing hats in this organization; we say, "Every hat below you, you're responsible for. Every empty hat below you, you're responsible for at any given time." So it wouldn't matter how big the board got; every hat below them, don't you see?

We've only got one HCO Secretary. She's got three departments under her. God knows, how many other things. And you say, "See all those functions? They're yours." She eventually will get somebody to handle one, and the functions below that person, don't you see, and the functions below that. So it's very simple to work out who, what is where. And it's a functional board, and it crisscrosses, and it should work out rather smoothly.

Be posted here, by the way, in a matter of about thirty days in most organizations. But you will see the public around taking a look at it. And may I recommend to you this org board. May I recommend to you – look over its sixteen departmental significances with regard to your own life and look over the sixteen departments with regard to what you are doing in life. And I think you are ready for a lot of cognitions.

Now you say, "What happens above Clear?"

Well, actually an OT goes through all those upper stages.

Thank you very much.
THE LOWEST LEVELS

A lecture given on 13 April 1965

Thank you.
Okay, how are you today?

_Audience: Fine._

Well, I have to check up on this sort of thing. You're doing all right. Some of you are doing splendidly, some of you are doing splendidly. But some of you doing terribly.

I got a _brand-new_ idea!

_Audience: Oh no!_

Yes! Yeah! I got a brand-new idea. I got a brand-new idea! Why don't you audit your pc? [laughter]

Isn't that terrible? It's insulting, isn't it?

How about that though? How about that? It would be dead simple.

All right.

Well now, you'd probably like to hear about a lot of things, but there are in actual fact some data that you need very desperately. And that is that research is not wrapped up. Contrary to what I've been saying, a new datum has just emerged and research is very far from wrapped up. Research is going south.

Here was a weird, unexplored area of _Homo Sapiens_. And I no more than get it shoved in – into place very nicely, then some more data shows up from the bottom. In other words, apparently unable to go up – apparently unable to go on up without uncovering fundamentals concerning the bottom. That's quite understandable. In other words, the more progress you make into the upper reaches, why the more fundamental the understanding is of what made man tick in the first place.

And as a result, although I'm pushing on up the line with considerable interest and velocity, and as a matter of fact have – just the day before yesterday I think I plotted nearly a hundred GPMs in the lineup and so forth for your eventual use – all very correct this time. That's been a very, very tough one, by the way, to plot.

My God, the number of variables there could be in the reactive mind – almost infinite. And actually we have the fundamental now of exactly what the pattern is and so forth. And I have found out that people are having trouble, even so, they're coming in on top of the bank, you see, through tremendous numbers of locks and lots of track and all that sort of thing, and
they have a lot of trouble trying to sort out which is what, and a mistake in the thing is practically fatal.

And I therefore have been pushing on through. You've got R6EW – it's holding you very nicely – and R6EW S. These are very, very nice processes. And you'd have to run them anyway.

And meantime, why, I'm putting the new capper on R6 of the GPM plot, so that when you get there, why, you'll have a complete, accurate plot that simply... The hardest thing was to untangle the top and the bottom of the reactive mind – that was almost impossible to untangle. Because the top read as the bottom, and the bottom read as the top, and it was a terrible mix-up. And finally got that straightened up and joined up. Anyway, you're walking along into a GPM plot.

R6, for instance, has developed now into a series of star-rated processes. The first of the star-rated processes is how do you operate an E-Meter solo – how do you clean up some PTPs and things like that on yourself?

Well now, it frankly isn't really possible in the lower ranges to engage in that kind of activity. A fellow is too overwhelmed by his bank and needs an auditor sitting there. And the auditor can see and the pc can't.

But when you get up into the VI range, why it should be very easy to handle the thing from a viewpoint of solo. Actually, auditing is too slow at VI. That's the main thing we learn about it. It's too slow. It would take too long. It'd be too enturbulative a process for the auditor and just knock the auditor around. But it's basically that it is too slow. That's the main thing.

Now about as near as I could figure out, it's about three months of solid run – just running the GPMs themselves out if you were solo auditing at a very high-hour volume, very high. That is to say you were auditing three, four hours a day, something like that. But that would be the end of the reactive bank, and you wouldn't have any more reactive mind than a rabbit.

There's people who suddenly say, "What would I do if I got rid of my reactive mind?" Very funny, you know. [laughs] It's like somebody walking up to you, you see, all smeared up with tar and say, "But what would I do if I got rid of this tar?" you know.

Because there is nothing in the bank that isn't calculated to do one in. There is nothing assistive about any part of it, you know.

"Now we're going to help you out. We're going to break your leg." You know? I mean, it's just a reactive bank. Almost psychiatric. [laughter]

When we look this over – we look this over, we find out that it has as its end product, of course, Clear as we've understood it in the earliest days, on up the line. That is Clear, that is no reactive bank – exclamation point! Don't you see? None.

Now I can assure you there's nothing beyond – nothing beyond it worth running out that you'd bother with. There's a great deal of unfamiliarity however, and you run into problems of various kinds. And not least amongst those problems is – how do you pick up delicate objects and so forth? Or how do you handle delicate objects and so on? And – like a body.
And you can knock a body around awful fast, awful hard without knowing what you are doing. You yourself are now measuring and estimating your actions. You see? And they have to learn how to postulate with great rapidity in order to be at all accurate. This is a strange field.

For instance, if you're used to having a meat contact with something – your hand, don't you see? Well, that's easy – you've learned to touch something with your hand. Do you see? And you find that's very unsatisfactory. You find that is kind of silly. It's perfectly all right to touch something, but what you do is postulate it on and off. And it's sort of – how fast can you postulate? It's quite, quite remarkable.

How fast do you say, "Touch. Not touch." You know? Because if you don't postulate it, you get into some very remarkable messes. You all of a sudden find yourself half wrapped around a telegraph pole when you first start out this sort of thing. You have to understand, I'm talking about the behavior of a new Clear. And you find yourself wrapped around a telegraph pole so fast that it'd make your thetan swim, see?

And you feel very bold and brash, and you feel quite good and everything looks very nice and the dewdrops on the roses are very bright indeed. So, you're going to pick a rose, you know. Well, that's not a "no sooner said than done" proposition. It is not that type of proposition at all. First you break down the rosebush. It's been so long since you've had any direct control, don't you see? All your control has been on a via, and your control... I'm not now talking about necessarily being outside, you see. Your handling of the body goes out and you have to settle that down again.

Well, you might say it's a condition of "too aware." You have to adjust yourself to reading people's minds. Worries you, you know. You're talking to somebody, you know he's lying like hell. And you finally tell him so, you know, it's not...

Yes, it's not just first dynamic adjustment, you see – there are several others. Well, for instance, you pick up a sofa pillow, you pick up a sofa pillow with a beam. Let's say you pick up a sofa pillow with a beam, you see. Well, you reach out your hand to pick up the sofa pillow, but you pick up the sofa pillow two inches ahead of your hand, see. Now this is very difficult. Because when you touch the sofa pillow with a beam you've touched the sofa pillow – with the same type of operation. But your hand is cushioned so it doesn't stick to the sofa pillow, but your beam will. Your beam is too much of the woof and warp of this universe, don't you see. And you find yourself all of a sudden in a frantic state – trying to get rid of the damn sofa pillow! Rahhh! And you say, "How did I ever get into this?" You know, "Devil with the sofa pillow!" Thawwwttt!! And you say, "Oh, yes, of course." Let go of the sofa pillow, and that's the end of that. Done by postulate.

You're trying to cross-coordinate between postulating and handling. Now, you've got both systems – and you can use both systems. And frankly you're like a – you're like a little kid that is trying to handle a body for a while.

Of course, you have the beautiful head start that you've got nothing in your road to keep you from learning, so you learn rather fast, but you're not quite sure where all these things fit. You know? What can you do? You're not at all sure of that sort of thing. Things that were very bad to you before suddenly become quite pleasant. Things that were very pleasant appear to be rather odd to you. Your tastes change, in other words.
I suppose right now if you went something on the order of a few miles up or were in an aircraft 32,000 feet – let's not be extreme – you would find it very uncomfortable if that wasn't pressurized and heated. Well, it's frankly very uncomfortable if it's pressurized and heated.

There is nothing quite so pleasant as a nice, icy cold cloud. It's faintly warm to the touch. You see, one is so moved up on temperatures that one is actually running all the time as a thetan at 98.6 or whatever it is, or 98.4. And there he is running away at this temperature. Well, as soon as you start clearing up, you'll find that temperature is just fine if you're using a body. That's dandy if you are using a body. You get it in its proper perspective. It's really quite hot. A proper temperature is minus 273 degrees Fahrenheit. Way down south around absolute zero. The rest of it is temperature, and that means that the air around you is vibrating slightly, with a temperature. Everything is in this tiny, tiny but observable motion – temperature. This is heat. And frankly it's bothersome – because you can perceive it. Therefore you have to familiarize yourself with it, and very shortly afterwards you come back and you can stand 98.6 and the difference is you could now stand 210. You see? You could stand any of these temperatures but it requires a refamiliarization.

And life is full of startling little surprises like this. You see? Like, stoves are cool – red hot stove. It can be cool, it can be hot. You're not quite sure what you can do, in other words.

You never realized your potentials were as great as they are, but you in your fondest imaginings thought they were much greater than they were. You get the weird frame of mind in which you are, you see?

Furthermore, your framework changes quite markedly on what life is all about, and who you must fight. And what you must contest. And I think if you were to take somebody who was Clear and try to convince him that he ought to declare war personally, you see, on the Abaflubians or somebody like that, don't you see, it would just puzzle him no end why. He would start wondering about your sanity, because it doesn't look sensible to him. But at the same time he can give you a solution to straighten it out. You see the difference? He can now give you a solution that straightens out the thing you are trying to fight.

So then there'd be no reason to do something wild and incredible to it. Don't you see? That would appear to be an overestimation of effort. See? Something is running badly, something is running badly. Well, don't break it up or kick it, you see, because all you have to do is adjust this little *whizar-goo* you know, and the thing promptly starts running smoothly.

You can do an analysis of situations that before were just blank puzzles or total antagonisms.

Now these various conditions are not as exclamatory when you first start turning Clear. They're not as exclamatory and as huge as you would believe, because there's quite a few levels above this. When you are on your road to OT, it's a road of familiarity. It's a road of getting acquainted with yourself, you see – the way you were once, and the way you are now – and fitting yourself into some sort of a framework with relationship to existence. Trying to reconcile what has been going on in your life with what you are now, and not really being able to think very straight about how confused you were. It's a negative gain process.
And sometimes you don't realize how confused you were because of course that is erased. So therefore it's sometimes hard to understand why somebody else is confused.

I can see you now talking to somebody and this guy is saying, "But we've got to get the Republicans back in power," see? And this guy keeps saying this and saying this. Trying to wrap your wits around it. "Why does he want to get the Republicans back in power? They're nutty, too."

You find yourself working on how we would devise a political system then that would solve the problems this individual apparently sees. Don't you see? You try to find out what he is upset about. And you eventually will come back to the fact that he's upset because he's not Clear.

Clear is not necessarily a very tolerant state, but it's not a very antagonistic state either. But it's certainly not a negative state. One is far more positive about things than he ever was before. His reactions are far more vivid. I mean, I'm giving you a terrible generality here, you see. I'm just trying to give you some sort of an idea. But all I'm really trying to tell you is: you're moving on upward, and as you get processed and processed and move up the line, you frankly have been moving into that state for some time. As you get higher up the line you move into the state much faster. You don't quite realize when you arrive at it. It's not a fast borderline, don't you see? It's not a sharp thing. But you sure know when the bank's gone – and that will be gone when you've run the last GPM – the last item in the last GPM, there'll be no bank. So, don't make any mistake about the state is suddenly achieved by an amulet of raw asafedity [asafetida] which you put in your left hip pocket, or something like this. Or the type of tobacco you chew, don't you see, that had nothing to do with it. It's a totally mechanical proposition.

What you have to realize is a thetan – a thetan can become aberrated without being implanted or without having GPMs. And we have, in Scientology, been long studying these mechanisms.

What really keeps him down and made him unable, however, were these GPMs which are messed-up GPMs – give him the wrong purposes and smash him so that he really can't have any purpose of his own. All of his purposes are suppressed. His own purposes are suppressed. Well, when you start getting out into the open, your own purposes start to show up. And you begin to see what you would like to do, not what your bank has been telling you you would like to do, and you get a completely clear perspective.

Now, in Scientology we have run on this latter line. We have actually been working with what a thetan wants. And we only fail when we don't continue to work with the thetan.

And that is to say, when we're dealing with people and so forth, when we don't talk to them as another thetan and being, you see, when we start treating them totally as just a reactive animal or something, why then we start running into a bit of trouble on the line because we aren't recognizing that that person can get better, and that person is just simply caved in by some stuff he doesn't want either. All thetans want out, and even the thetan who is fighting down here in an insane asylum and trying to slaughter every attendant that walks in the door and so forth – he still wants out. He's just lost sight of what he is trying to get out of.
Man is basically good and that's one of the reasons he has consented to have a bank because then it prevents everybody else from being bad. I think that is the most remarkable piece of philosophy I've ever heard of.

It is so far-fetched that nobody would ever look for that as the philosophical fundamental back of the aberration of man, you see? Because we figure man is bad, and then we have to do something to make him good, why, then we've got him so reversed that we will never understand him.

In other words, there is a line of aberration – just not to talk at random with you – there is a line of aberration which a thetan can get into. And it's mostly based on his own unfamiliarities or his decisions that he knows something when he doesn't know it – his decisions which are based on no data. These are the various liabilities and we have all of those in Scientology. And Scientology is oddly enough built straight around the thetan and what might happen to a thetan. This is very curious, don't you see. Because what was really wrong with the thetan was a reactive bank and chain of GPMs which gave him reverse purposes. This really wasn't what was wrong with him – the fact is it was more fundamental than that.

He was – in an effort to keep other people good, don't you see, why, he decided that himself and everybody else had better all agree to have a bank that checked anyone from being bad. And then he got this bank, and it's this bank which lies there – and by the way, pictures and all the other things in Dianetics and so forth just stack up on that bank – and there that thing lies across the railroad track, and he can't get anyplace with this much baggage. And apparently immediately after he decided to have and make and carry on with such a bank, those various decisions put him into a condition – this is what's fantastic – put him into a condition where he couldn't conceive of how he had been. So, it was just a cutoff. See, he cut off all familiarity with himself as he was, the moment that he did this trick.

In other words, it was something on the order of throwing a guy in a coal pit and then you try to explain to this fellow there's such a thing as light. Well, just a few minutes before you threw him in the coal pit, he knew there was such a thing as light. But after you threw him in the coal pit something convinced him there was no such thing as light. And you just start arguing with this chap almost in vain that there is such a thing as light.

Now, it's a barrier of that type that made a thetan unsalvageable if you did not know the whole trick. You had to know all about this before you could salvage the individual. You had to know why he was stacked up and so forth. Otherwise, you'd get downright impatient with him. You're disseminating to this pc – this was raw meat, see – and you are disseminating to the raw meat, and you are telling the raw meat, "Well, you see, you're really – you're really a being who doesn't particularly need a body and who is perfectly capable of operating, you see, and you don't have to have all those funny pictures you are carrying around, and your…"

"Oh, no," he says, "I'm – a animal called Jones." You see?

And you say, "But listen. You're just you, you see? And you've got – you got a bunch of cross-purposes that keep you from functioning the way you ought to function."

"Not me. I'm just healthy and normal. My psychologist told me so."
You begin to wonder if you haven't got a cut line here or something of the sort, you see. You begin to be baffled. It's just like you would be explaining to this fellow in the coal pit, "Well, there's such a thing as light, you know."

And he said, "Oh, no. There's no such thing as light. There isn't any. I know. Look, you can prove it yourself. Look around. Do you see any light?"

You say, "But man, you're in a coal pit!"

Guy says, "No. No. This is the place to be. Perfectly normal habitat."

Well, you frankly don't know whether to give up, or -- or bat him one, or -- you see? And numerous reactions are going to show up because your reality is being violated. So, as you come up the line your reality gets very easily violated. And the higher you get, the more your reality is susceptible to violation, but fortunately the more capable you are of standing up to invalidation. So that it doesn't mean anything to you.

For instance somebody gave me today some data that was considered very important, but it wasn't important at all. And the only thing I was puzzled about was how come the data was considered important, see. But it was not important. Do you follow that? But within that framework and so forth, the datum could have seemed important. You know, like, "There is no light." That's an important datum.

You just say to this fellow, "Well, now look. We can run out of your GPMs, we can get you trained up and we can take you up the track and we can get you trained up, and we can get you knocked out here so your visio comes back and then we get out of this damn coal pit, and I'll show you some nice scenery." Don't you see?

Well, when he says, "Ah. You're -- you're fooling me. You're just trying to trick me. I'm going to have the FDA/FBI arrest you because you're telling me lies," and so forth.

You can form a very, very interesting opinion of how evil man is, and how nutty he is, and you could even form the opinion that there were two types of thetans -- very easy to do, you know.

You could get a lot of solutions to try to explain this. But in actuality, to handle it you would have to have the right one.

Now, where the individual is concerned then, he improves on a gradient as he goes on up the line, and it's vital that he does improve on a gradient because his case gain must not outrun his capability of handling the new reality.

And frankly, we're so good, well, we invented a comm system the other day -- Comm-Member system, and the routing in that bulletin, the routings are too good. We finally found out what was wrong with them -- they were too good.

Well, how could they be too good? Well, because they instantly tried to go into the internal communication system when they just had to do with the external communications system of the organization. And it was causing a great deal of trouble because these routings had to be fended out of the organization. Do you understand? Because they were external routings. They were routings to another org. And staff members were so entranced with these routings that they promptly started routing internally. And the bug on the line was, a commu-
nicator was saying, "But there is no – but there is no duplicate post in the organization to use the routing on."

I looked it over for a while and I suddenly realized there was a duplicate post – there's your opposite number in any other department in the organization. He, of course, could be handled by the same routing.

In other words, you don't have to have the D of P Melbourne to the D of P Perth, don't you see, as the only routing. There are other directors in the organization itself, you see, who would – could have the routing used on them.

In other words, we had developed a system which was – or I developed it, take authorship on the thing. I shouldn't keep saying we – it confuses people sometimes. It's a highly authorial "we" most of the time, you know. The old editors in the old South always used "we," don't you see, and it's – it's the polite thing for an author to do so you'll excuse me.

Anyway, what happens in one of these instances is: you develop a system that is just for this and then if the system is too good, it then embraces what it should embrace. In other words, it tries to expand its own perimeter and become what it should become.

We now have such an organization plot. You only saw a fragment of it the other day. That is to say you saw the thing. I just brought it out in very rough form, it's incomplete. More or less what you saw, don't you see? But there were lots of things on it which hadn't been drawn in, which you will see very shortly.

But if you start to go along the road to truth you reach a make-break point. You reach the point beyond which you can't stop the truth. See?

Where we design these four little routings for the Comm-Member system – well, of course, they're just dolls for the Comm-Member system, you see, you just throw it in the communicator's basket, and bang, it'll wind up in the hands of your opposite number in some other organization. There's nothing to that. But the system is too good. The organization already needs some type of nice routing system in which you put down "A" on the top of your despatch and that's it. It follows "A" routing, don't you see. The communicator knows what it is, you know what it is. It winds up in the right basket – bang! You see? It's good, fast routing. What particularly intrigued people is the fact that they didn't have to do anything with some of their despatches that they got which were sent to them for information only – that type of routing. So, you just toss a despatch off toward Joe, don't you see? Well, he doesn't have to do a thing with it. He just has to look at it, "Oh, well, what do you know," you know. And it goes on to files. Do you see what I mean? In other words, he's not troubled by this thing on his communication line, he can get rid of it.

Somebody has said to say hello to him. Well, his whole line is blocked up maybe with people who have said to say hello to him. Now, if he has to turn around and answer each one of these things as a despatch, he goes practically mad, don't you see? So, he's very cheerful that all these people said to say hello to him. But he's now got the hellos, what the hell does he do with the despatch?

Well, the Comm-Member system solves this. The proper routing just lets you dispose of the despatch with no action on your part at all, which is of course you shouldn't take any
action on such a thing. It requires no acknowledgment, there is nothing there at all. Obviously needed, and yet it was relegated to the Comm-Member system only. And when it was applied to the Comm-Member system only, staff members – seeing that that was vital and that it would speed up their lines and make things much easier – tried to put it into the internal communication system of the organization, thereby driving the communicator halfway around the bend because all she could do was reject these despatches when they weren't comm member despatches.

See, I'm just going over this point again to show you here. In other words, it was a good system which was incompletely applied. And a good system which is incompletely applied will immediately try to apply itself. And that's what we've done with Scientology.

And I have seen this in the broader perimeter. If I'm not active right now, and I'm not reorganizing organizations right now, we'll be in trouble. We'll be in plenty of trouble. We will simply cave in. Because if I did not totally devise the thing – the road to truth is one that you can't travel halfway. If I didn't totally devise it and get it explicit... particularly at this point – it is being applied to the degree now where its release of such applications bring about a bang appliance, don't you see. And we've hit the make-break point.

Here we are 15 years after the release of Dianetics and we're on the make-break point here. Now, what do you mean "make-break point"? Well, just short of the make-break point you've got to force your way forward to make it go. See, it's still hard work. And just beyond the make-break point it goes like mad. It's like the – friction. If you push some object over the floor, you'll find the first little push on the thing, the first push on the thing has to be pretty heavy to make it push, don't you see? But then you apply less and less energy to this thing, the faster it moves. You see? It moves faster and you're actually pushing less.

Did you ever have this happen with a chair, or a box? In other word – very hard to start it moving right at the first thing, but the second it started moving it sometimes surprised you by going too easy, if anything, see.

Well, we're in that state right now, I'm having to pilot this thing very close and tight. Because we're at this make-break point.

Now if we released a public book at this time, it would simply cave us in. We went too far with our membership pricing system because it was designed for a public book, and then I haven't released the public book. I haven't released the public book because the organization has got to sit there to take care of the traffic.

How is it going to get people? How is it going to get expansion? How can it expand? I already saw something like this happen in 1950, I'm not afraid of it. But I also saw that it just – it wasn't grooved. And because it wasn't grooved, it practically blew up in your face. It just made so much of a confusion it overworked everybody so hard that almost near chaos resulted. Now, that's an interesting observation because we can press the boom buttons anytime we want. All I'd have to do is write a new public book and advertise it around someplace, knowing what we know about interest and lines and so forth, and this thing would all work like a bang.
Well actually we put in the membership discount system here just a little bit prematurely because it was matched up to catch a public book. And then I had a technical – I actually had a technical breakthrough. And that's a funny thing to have happen to your line: to make a sudden advance, that was an unexpected advance, which antiquated and outdated your planning. But that's just exactly what occurred.

All of a sudden undercut the case you've been running at 0, very successfully - has a couple of levels below him. The cases that wouldn't run successfully in Level 0, and those cases take you right straight out into raw meat. They also take you right down to the bottom of the spinbin. They take you anyplace there would be cases, you see?

And I'm so close to the edge on, well, I've got one level below communications and I've got it mapped and taped. It's complete. It'd actually would empty out every insane asylum in the world, but it isn't a psycho process. But I don't know whether you ought to be using it or not. I don't know that yet. The thing is fantastic as a process level, see.

But I now know there are two – there's a level below it. I know that there's at least one level below it. That makes two levels below 0. I know there's another level there.

Well, auditing a case on this below 0 process is a walk in the park. But we've done something very peculiar. I don't know yet – and this is what is stacking me up – I don't know yet that it wouldn't take a Level – a Class VI to run it. It's a complete walk in the park, you understand? I mean you could see this thing, oh, you audit this – whoa! Nothing to it. Sit there and yawn, see. The pc's needle just flies like mad – like mad. I don't think you could run it in a co-audit.

The stuff that flies off the case flies off so fast and furious that you'd have to be a Level VI to understand what was happening. And I think out of pure terror or something of the sort, if you put this particular proc... I don't know these things, you see. If you put this process into a co-audit or a PE or something like this, don't you see – the human being in front of you runs like a startled gazelle. He's not affected by this, he's just getting better, better, better, better, better, see, and he gets up to a point where he's at Communication. But he's getting better.

There is a long way north to get to Communication. It was quite a jump. And when he does that jump, I should think it'd require a very skilled auditor. I think we found a process whereby only an upper level auditor could run it on a lower level person, because it frankly applies to almost any case that you're having trouble with, that won't get TA action. It's the no-case-gain.

I was busy solving this case with justice and ethics, and then all of a sudden solved the case technically. Been studying the case quite a while, it's quite surprising. It's the no-case-gain. What happens with this? Well, of course, then it didn't just take in cases you were having trouble with on a enturbulation basis; it took in cases that you just were having trouble with. Do you follow? And it just went that far south.

Now, I've now got a low-level process apparently which I don't know that I could trust it to the hands of a guy who just walked in off the street and you put the two guys together
and have one run it on the other one. I think the one running it on the other one would just get his head blown off. The case is getting fast – a fast gain. Don't you see?

Now, I don't even know this point – I don't even know this yet. I don't know that a case wouldn't have to be audited quite a ways to be run on this low-level process. You say, "Oh, what the hell are you talking about?" Its almost a gag, because frankly it would run on almost anybody if it were well run. But it would have to be well run, and it'd have to be finished and it's got some technical points in it which are quite startling.

The end of the process does not come at the end of 25 hours, it comes when an exact state is reached by the case. And you give about three more commands beyond that exact state and that is the end of the process and it wouldn't run any more – I don't care what you did with it – and that's liable to happen in two hours, or 25 hours or 35 hours. It's going to be a finite period. These are the new Conditions Processes. They haven't been released. There are three of those processes of which only one has been run. That is to say only one has been released. Its release is very narrow.

But below Conditions there is – you see, there is Communication, then there's Conditions below that, and below that is Existence. Now we tap sideways on Existence when we use mimicry. It shows somebody something exists.

There is a California school teacher out there is mimicking children's stuttering or something like that, and the stuttering disappears, either because it's suppressed or because it blew or something, I'm not quite sure why. But the main thing here, here is a level. Here's this level called Existence. And that level – we're already reaching into the very tough case – but this level of Existence undoubtedly reaches way out into the public – it's your very resistive case. These things have got to be adapted to dissemination, and the existence of these levels make it very, very hard, I assure you, to write the public book.

It should be quite obvious to you why it'd be very hard to write a public book. You're sitting there looking at a couple of brand-new tigers with which you don't have much experience yet, and you know darned well that this public book is going to go like a bomb, it's got to include those tigers, and you don't know enough about those tigers yet to do anything with them. See? So, of course you're not about to write a public book. You follow?

So, that made our pricing policy and membership policy premature, then that backs it up on the orgs, don't you see?

Now, I'm probably going to give them some shocks in the next few days here on altering their course of existence. It won't be an alter, it'll be a cutback. And we'll get them to get their organizational plan in and get things organized better and get their old sign-up line in so they don't have to learn a new sign-up line, too. And let them carry forward a little smoothly. In other words, I cut it just a little bit too quick, you understand? Just a little bit too soon. Now we know with this experience on the thing and a technical breakthrough.

A technical breakthrough at raw meat level, a technical breakthrough at the insane asylum level, a technical breakthrough south. And when two levels have shown up gratuitously – I think that's all of them. I wouldn't have said that about Communications, by the way. I already knew there was the no-case-gain case. I already knew that there were some
cases below this point, don't you see? But as far as I can plot it out, there isn't anything else that will show up on a plot that gives levels for those for lower actions except what we've already got.

A person would have to recognize something about existence. And we've seen this mysteriously occur when we've asked somebody to find something really real in a room – and that's a one-shot process, the moment they have found something really real in the room, they sometimes experience the most remarkable recovery.

You possibly know the old process, "Look around here and find something that's really real to you."

I've seen some very remarkable things happen at that level. Well, that is the level of Existence. That's where that process fitted. In other words, this process was a wildcat, it was a wild one. It was up in the upper technology and it shouldn't have been – it was way down here at the bottom technology. A basic auditing command might be, "Are you?" You see, something like that.

It's probably a familiarity without contact or communication – and without an awareness of what familiarity is arriving. You get the shut-off because as you've gone south, you've dropped Orientation, you've dropped Perception, you've dropped Communication, you've now dropped Conditions and you're in Existence. Now that existence must be without any of the other things.

Now, how do you audit it? Now, that I can ask the question, I can tell you because I'm experienced in handling me. If I can ask the question, why, habitually I'll find out the answer will turn up ahead of me out here in another 25 feet. Don't you see? Sometimes only two inches, but sometimes it's 25 feet. I can ask the question, see. You know, what is this level? See, what is this level called Existence? How would you audit something without understanding. Let's go up one, see – Understanding, Orientation, Perception, Communication, or the Recognition of a Condition.

Now, dropping all those things out of the auditing lineup what do we have left? Well, I can't answer that at this particular instant, but we will have the answer to that.

Now, the other thing that has happened on the way south, is we've got an organizational plan that's just like this little comm member routing plan. This organizational plan is the all-devouring monster. You can't keep an organization out of it. It hasn't been posted on the board at Saint Hill. There have been a few things released, we have talked about it, but nobody can keep this thing from going in.

You will find executives around here are using it this minute. And they sometimes don't pull back and say, "Hey, there isn't, you know, a Distribution Division yet." Or, "There isn't a something-or-other yet." Or, "No appointment has been made from that post." And it suddenly feels sort of a uhhrerrrrrr frustration, you know. Ehhrre, ehhrrr. They feel blocked, "Well, we'll do it some corny old way, you know – Woouufffa-pffazz!"

We've got an expansional organizational plan that is sitting up partially done on the drawing board which you saw in the last lecture. People simply aware of this thing. And it's unlike any org board anybody ever saw before, it's a whopping big magnet. It's just – it's just,
"Zup! Here we go." It actually is trying to take the existing departments at Saint Hill at this moment and put them on it. And I don't think it could be prevented. I think if I never posted the org board, executives one after the other would snarlingly say, "Well, it's not been posted yet. But you really are the Qualifications Division. You better make up your mind who is the Director of Review." You see? Because it works.

And one of the reasons it works is it's the first parallel-line org board that ever existed I think in this universe. It's a parallel-line org board, not a vertical-line org board. It's in parallel.

And the very funny part of it is, that it operates to the left and right, and it doesn't operate up and down. Even though there are officers up, it operates left and right.

It has very many peculiar characteristics. One of them is, is each repeating department, as you go across the board from the left to the right, will have nothing to do with the functions which follow it, but includes all of the functions which precede it.

Now, that's the silliest thing you ever saw in your life. Try to squeeze into a department – comfortably – some action which follows it on the org board to the right. Yeah, you're having trouble. Every time, you're having trouble. Something's going to go wrong.

In other words, you try to get into the Orientation Department something about Understanding. You see, has it Understanding, well that has its own departmental functions. But there we have Understanding and the next one to it, to the right would be Purposes.

Now, let's put under Understanding, Purposes. In other words, we're going to have Purposes before we had Understanding, in other words. Hehhhhhhhh! And so it works out organizationally. If you try to put something about promotion under Understandings, why, people will just sit around and understand that there should be some promotion, and that would be the end of that. Do you follow?

Therefore, I've had to be very careful not to drop any of these functions. And it's been working with the org board which suddenly displayed that lower levels existed. The thing is not an org board at all, it's a philosophic machine to which an organization is easily adapted. But then anything is easily adapted to this philosophic machine and here we are at this late state suddenly whipping out a philosophic machine, see? And the machine is too good. The development of the machine is derailing some of our intentions.

In other words, actually what has happened is, it's pushed us forward on the track perhaps two or three years of development. It gives us answers to questions that we have routinely had trouble with in the past, such as personnel.

I'll give you an idea what this machine does from the standpoint of personnel. I just talk about it jokingly as the machine, you see. Without any executive doing anything about it at all, personnel come in and get hired and get put on the post. You say, "But that's – that's – that's – that's a very dangerous situation. You just going to have anybody go to work?" That's right. They can walk in the front door, and sign their name – they go to work, even if they make an "X". 
How are you going to do that? Well, that's pretty easy. You keep an ad out all the time that you hire people, and we don't care what conditions we hire them under. Sometimes in some areas it will be for money, sometimes on an applicant basis without pay for a couple of weeks.

We keep this ad out. Any person that applies is simply put on a purchase order, which is sent to authorities for an okay on financial planning. But it's just okayed; it really has nothing to do with financial planning, but that's where it's sent. And it skids back down the line to the communicator. And the communicator calls the person up, and the person comes in, and they're given the PO and they're routed through an E-Meter check point, and given a slip to sign which is the fact that they agree to their terms of employment, which is about all. And then they're routed to the department head that has the allocation. It sounds very dizzy, doesn't it?

And, at the end of two weeks they are sent to Qualifications, in Review. Because when they walked in, they were also given a staff hat, and when their department head receives a despatch that they are to go to Review, the department head simply gives them a little chit (on the same chit) and he just says whether he wants them or he doesn't want them. That's all. And they disappear out of his view. They go over to Review; Review examines them – very rapidly – maybe now gives them their OCA and APA, and maybe does something-or-other with them. But they're equipped to handle people en masse, don't you see? They can give tests of various kinds.

Well, this person passed his tests. Maybe they even gave him a little check on his staff member hat, you see. They made an examination of this person. We've now got two weeks of experience with this person.

In the meantime, whether that person has followed orders or done their job or not is the subject of a different report system in the organization – again which has nothing to do with any executive in the organization. So, Review has all this data on this person now. It's been accumulated and Review can now okay this person or give this person the deep six. But we don't just give the person the deep six, because the truth of the matter is, he never leaves the organization. He remains an applicant. You understand?

We've wiped out a thing called dismissal. Apparently the only way to get dismissed from a Scientology organization is to become OT.

Now, let's see the immediate effect that this sort of thing happens – let's follow this through. Blitz receives – he's reading the paper and he sees that "them Scientologists," or "them 'Sin – tologists' is advisin' fer – fer people to come and work at 'em." And so he comes – he phones up.

"You still got a job open? I'm a – I'm a good laborer. Do you still got a job open?"

And the communicator is not looking for any post at all, see? They're just looking for any application. And she says, "Oh, yes. What's your name?"

"Blitz."
"All right. Initials? Thank you very much. What is your address? You got a phone? Can you be reached by phone? Thank you very much. We will let you know in a day or so."

And he says, "What, no interview?"

"Well, we'll take care of all that in a day or so. Thank you."

And a day or so, he receives a phone call and he said, "Yes, you can come to work."

Again no decision – no judgment on it at all. Just, "You can come to work."

And the guy comes to work. And he's taken along the line, and he's given the PO and just routed – like a despatch. And he's given a PO. He's given the PO and he goes through, and they put him on an E-Meter.

"What's that thing?"

"Well, nothing."

And they just take him off the E-Meter. There weren't any questions. They just read the tone arm – the only thing that could reject him.

And then the boy who did that says, "Well, sign here."

And, "What is it?"

Well, let's say he's taken on as temporary. "It's your wage for the first week, and this is what wage you're on. You're going to be on temporary status, and your position has to be re-viewed in a couple of weeks."

"Okay. That's fine," he says.

Couple of weeks later, he's busy out digging the garden. Somebody comes up to him and says, "You're supposed to report to Qualifications, and so forth, to see whether or not you become upgraded and kept on and so forth."

"Well, that's about time."

So, he walks over there and they ask him a bunch of questions. And then they tell him that he has got to improve his employability before he can be taken on. And he's shunted through into Review and Review tells him exactly how to improve his employability, straightens him up like a startled gazelle and shoots him out into the public. But he has not been dismissed from the organization, he is simply waiting to do that.

They also call the labor exchange to see if they can't get him onto other employment right away. In other words, they take care of this personnel. See, no ARC breaks because this boy was dismissed, you see – because he hasn't been. He was told he needs some more prepara-tion before he can have this job. And of course, he's never had anybody take any real inter-est in him before, whether he ever had a job or not. Well, he considers this pretty interesting.

And he doesn't get a job for a few days and he comes back and he says he's not able to get a job or this area doesn't have national assistance or something of the sort, don't you see? Well, Review has a Displaced Persons Section in it. They can hand out meal tickets. They can hand out all the things that you'd hand out to somebody in distress. They can give you money enough for a cable, for postage stamps. They take care of people, don't you see – on the little
of – the people that get into sudden binds and emergencies and that sort of thing. They issue this kind of stuff. They take care of this person.

Now, you can coax that person up the line. They can send that person to a PE Course, they can make sure that he gets into a co-audit. They can do this, they can do that. They can give him something to study.

They have got him in their files. You need a sudden crush along the lines of laborers. Well, this person's advance and so forth has been reported. You look him up in the files, you find out you've got two or three of these boys. You simply call them back on from an applicant status, move them back onto, this time, a Provisional Status, and they will be with you – they can be with you a year, at which time they are made Permanent.

Now, that's an interesting lineup to have happen on employment. And you say, "What the hell are you talking about, man – you're going to have an organization with thousands of members!"

That's right. Because the only way the machine won't work – if somebody won't hire people for it. That's an incredible fact. If you fill none of the posts, it won't work. About the only way you could keep it from working. And it would just go on and work.

Now, its promotional lines are very clean and clear. The funny part of it is, that its employment is one of the heaviest promotional lines that London had years ago. London had beautiful promotional lines. And they'd try to put on typists and wind up with the person moving into the HCA. London, in vain for years, tried to have a non-Scientology staff and it never made it. That is because they were teaching all the basic and elementary things that would take a person up from raw meat into becoming a Scientologist. And they seldom missed. And it frankly is quite a procurement line. If you looked on it just from that point of view, you would find out it would turn into a procurement line.

Now, an industry starts getting to look at this machine, don't think they aren't going to send somebody over. Well, that costs some money. The same thing – the exact same thing happens – but you don't call the guy an applicant – you call him an intern. It costs somebody money for him to do this. You understand?

Audience: Mm-hm.

I know it sounds dazing when you first look at it because it seems to be a shuffle of this and that. And you say, "That's an awful lot of bureaucracy and so forth." No, it isn't bureaucracy because the lines are all designed to flow. The lines are designed to flow. If there's anything comes near the machine, it flows. It doesn't stop, it flows.

And it has just one job as an organizational setup and that's so to change people for the better. And that's all it's doing. So, of course, anything that comes near it gets changed for the better. Whether it agrees or not. The all-devouring monster.

What's interesting about this type of thing, though, is I early detected this tendency on the part of this new organizational structure. And I had to shift the emphasis of the forward line of approach, I had to change it slightly because I saw that it was going to get advanced faster than I had intended it to advance originally. I was working too good, see. So I'd have to
refine the line in a few places where we had already begun off in another track thinking there was another prediction line.

We got to get the machine in before we can release the field staff member program. Have you heard of the field staff member program? You've heard of that, haven't you?

_Audience: Mm-mm._

You haven't? Gee! Where have you been? You've been on course, that's what!

Well, all the auditors that were ever trained are now going to be staff members. There are no more private auditors. That finishes it. Now, this hasn't official release because it gets released in _The Auditor._

We were just waiting for the day when we were technically flying high, see, until we did this. They have just been on wait. So, in very short order as soon as that _Auditor_ is released in a couple of weeks and so forth, you'll be a provisional field staff member, and your pay on the thing is simply the 10 percent of the fee of the person you send in.

Because I've spotted the one thing that you can do absolutely fatal that will finish you as an auditor. It is the same thing which I tried to do and almost finished me. I was smart enough to get an organization to back me up. I found out that an individual auditor, or two or three auditors sitting around in the field will go for a short length of time with a wild burst of enthusiasm, and then fall on their heads. Because they haven't got any business pinning themselves down by processing anybody. They've got no business at all!

You can give somebody an assist, you can cheer them up, you can handle the family, you can do this and that and so forth. But as far as going into a thing called private practice, it must be wrong because the medical profession uses it and is failing. It must be wrong, see.

All right, so therefore if you're a part of an organization, you would only have to be part of the organization to the degree the organization is wide open for paying you on this basis. You just pick up pcs and send them into the organization. The organization instantly turns around and sends you 10 percent of the pc. That's all. Whatever fee they collect, they give you 10 percent of the fee – _bang! Immediately!_

Well, that means you could whip up quite a PE, couldn't you? You could tag people, left, right and center. Without the liability of having to process them. Now, it takes quite a team to process pcs – to handle and administer things and handle the rough spots. It takes quite a team to pull a psycho off of your neck that some family has wrapped around it. It takes quite a team. And that team is possible in an organization, but is not possible in individual practice. I learned that the hard way, and I've gone over this with a very fine look. The field in general, and that is said advisedly, was reviewed once and found out that they mostly wanted to be members of the organization. They wanted to be part of Scientology.

And the ARC break in the London Academy at the rising prices, reported to me after research, to be that all they were getting trained for anyhow was so that they could become members of the organization, so they didn't feel they ought to be charged such high prices for it. And that was the source of the ARC break. The rest of the communication might interest
you is: "Their Instructors are all Class VI, Saint Hill, and they adore them. And they just keep on taking course after course after course."

Anyway, so, what happens to somebody? Well, he can scrounge up pcs or he can give PEs or he can give talks or he and two or three other auditors can go around and talk to people about this.

Well, now, this was hard to do a few years ago or even a year ago. Supposing you had technology that anybody you tagged immediately became a Scientologist? You had to apply a certain dissemination technology and the person you talked to, if he could talk at all, immediately wanted some more Scientology. Supposing that didn't take you very long.

Well, that's quite interesting because that technology exists as of this minute, see. It's been in existence for two or three weeks. I haven't got time to write down everything that has got to be written down to square this up so some of these things don't get released at the instant they're dreamed up. But there is a system by which this can be done. It's a rather easy drill. It'd take you a few hours to learn this drill and down to a fine, feathered frenzy.

The person who flashes in your face, the person who says, "What is Scientology? What is this stuff? Blah-heh-heh. I understand you're a Scientologist."

Boy, he's just bait. He's just bait. He has announced himself aboard with this technology, man. He's resisting and protesting. That's all you need.

In other words, we had to figure out this item called "salesmanship."

Now when we go down low on processing levels, we're going to tag people with that wild abandon, we have that much command or control of to whom we speak, we certainly had better have the technology very desperately and definitely in line to handle a case once it appears. And we'd better not miss on this one.

So, as soon as I got this other dissemination data I started going south and making sure we had that all neated up and found there were two more levels which we could handle them with. Well, it just wouldn't matter who walked into the organization. It just wouldn't matter who walked into the organization. If it's going to be up to the field staff member, or you, to send in anybody that you tag, then the organization had better be capable of handling in the first three minutes of play, anything that is sent. Otherwise, there would be a jam there, don't you see? Field staff member will be in continuous trouble – continuous, continuous trouble – because he is sending in psychos, or somebody in the organization is saying so anyhow. You've got to wipe out that as an argument, don't you see? That has got to be gone. Not by simply a postulate gone, it has got to be gone technically.

So, this person slides into the organization, caroming against both doors, dead drunk, been an alcoholic for years, skid row special and so forth. Well, the guy who's right there in the HGC doing the technical work, who's in the – what would be the Department of Estimation – guy just looks at this boy, and says, "Well, that's it. And there's an auditor in room so-and-so, and well, there's the cashier, and so forth. In room so-and-so you'll find the auditor". Pilots him down the line, routes him in. We've got to have a nonalcoholic on our hands in a few hours. You understand? Whether he was drunk, being processed or not. See, this is what it really demands in extremis.
Now, that is – would be the total demand. Now, how well that can be met and so forth is a horse of another color. They'd probably develop a technology by which he is made to sober up. They don't let him communicate to anybody for a day or two till he kind of steams out, because it's easier to do. And he wakes up and says, "Where am I?"

"You are in an auditing room. Here is the first auditing command." [laughter]

All right. To handle things of that particular character requires that you have a considerable command of mess and space and buildings and you've got to be able to acquire these things fairly rapidly. You have to have a good command in your community, so the organization has got to get up fairly rapidly, and there will undoubtedly be a point of struggle of the organization trying to get up to speed and trying to get squared around so that it can get into this kind of a condition.

Now, the field staff member is a provisional grade. All you have to do is write to your nearest organization and say, "I accept the appointment of field staff member". Because you are being appointed – it's just up to you to accept it. Technical detail. And you get an immediate appointment as a Field Staff Member Provisional. And that's Field Staff Member Provisional and there you are with a staff member rating, with the privileges of a Provisional – which are considerable by the way. They're up above intern, applicant and so forth.

And now you – the method by which you operate and you go about it from there: If you know any pcs around that are giving you a hard time, well, send them into the organization, see. And if you know any students, why, send them into the organization.

If you are running a center, why, just give PEs like crazy and send them into the organization. Stand by, because you are going to be tapped on the shoulder to be a new organization for that organization very soon. Do you follow that?

In other words, a center is a nucleus organization. And if it even moves vaguely in the direction of an org board or anything and so forth, it'll wrap up into becoming an organization so fast, you won't know what happened to it. Don't you see?

A little organization should basically devote its time totally to PE, promotion, taking care of contact work of this particular kind. You'll find it quite remunerative – probably far more remunerative than doing it themselves. Don't you see? Just do a promotional line, a promotional line.

Now, in the first place, as time goes on, this will get much easier, because there will be a public book, dissemination drills will be more broadly known. And the public book coming out, all of its addresses will be available because you are a staff member. In other words, you're not being asked to talk to, or write or meet or something, people who are unknown. The point is that you've got a tailor-made audience, and it is shoved straight towards you.

Well, you are given about 150 cards, and all these people bought a book, and they're probably sitting around wondering what to do next, and so on. Well, all you have to do is tap them. And you say, "This is what you do next." And the route is all figured out, and you get paid for doing it quite adequately.
Now, your field staff member, of course, is a bona fide staff member. At the end of about 10 months or something like that, why, he ought to apply to the organization to have the provisional status removed and he becomes a general staff member of the organization.

The chances of anybody remaining outside the machine very long, if they are a trained technician, are quite remote. The way this would go, you would have tremendous demands. Well, you'd be getting nagged all the time about, "Why don't you come in and take over as Director of Field Activities," or something. Or "Why don't you come on tech staff and why don't you do this." Because these organizations are going to get desperate, they're going to get desperate for personnel. And we haven't got enough personnel. That's why we've got to open up our personnel lines – widely. And you'll find out a tremendous quantity of raw meat will be working in our organizations, where it's just been a little Scientology club in some places. I see somebody knows of some.

The main point is, is the appointment is made. Nobody is shoving it down your throats, you have to accept the appointment and write in and say you do. And it doesn't change your other activities, even vaguely. There is this kind of a clause connected with it which is quite interesting, is you would be field staff members of Saint Hill. That would be your point of operation as a staff member, see, you'd be a Saint Hill staff member.

And while a Saint Hill staff member you could also be on another organizational staff. You see, you could be something, like you could be D of P of let us say, Washington, and a field staff member, Saint Hill.

Well, the trick of the field staff member is to select people for clearing. And that's what he is doing: he's trying to select people out of the society and send them in to straighten up. There are many things that he can offer in this particular wise. If as a field staff member of Washington, you selected somebody to go to Saint Hill, the percentage would be paid to Washington as an organization, so everybody could share in your selection.

But if you were operating independently and so forth, and not as a member of another organization, as a field staff member of Saint Hill you would simply get 10 percent of whatever fee was paid in here as a result of your selecting people to here.

The game is simply a very easy game, it's just a matter of selecting people to be cleared, that's all. And you give them a selection slip. The administration of it is very easy. You give them a selection slip. Actually the administration can be this rawboned: You give them a selection slip that has your name and address on it, and tell them to be sure to present that to the Registrar or Cashier at Saint Hill. That's all, and this will let them in.

Now you, of course, can put a piece of carbon paper under that (and probably should) and keep a copy for yourself and undoubtedly should put another piece of carbon paper under it and send a copy to Central Files, Saint Hill. That makes it neat.

But nevertheless you'll still find yourself with nothing to write on but a napkin and that's a perfectly good selection paper. In other words, it's not a fragile proceeding.

Now, that means that you would be free to select anybody for training or processing. Now, it'd only be possible for you to select people for Saint Hill who of course – for training, who were already trained auditors. But you could select pcs – any type of pc – for Saint Hill.
We normally would get the roughest ones – if I know anything about it, the organization gets the rough ones. And the biggest organization or the best organization gets the roughest ones, see. And the HGC here would be wide open for the selection of pcs.

The new gradation program calls for the road to Clear, simply get processed up to Grade IV and then shift over – whatever the grade numbers are – and then shift over to training, and as a Release to be trained up through training and then go on out through the top on solo. This is a very simple thing to explain; it's a very simple thing to map.

You just tell some individual, "Well, you get audited up through your Grades. And then you get trained through these Levels, which are the same as the Grades, but now you know how to do it. And then you get up to the top end of this and you reach the state of Clear through that particular road."

"How long does this take?"

"Actually it takes two years and two months of steady application."

"Well, how many years does that mean?"

"Well, that's – all depends on you, but it would probably take five or ten years or something like that with the present technology."

In other words, this can probably be shortened, too, and will undoubtedly be shortened here and there. Because as processes are grooved in more solidly it may not take that long to get a Grade certificate, you see. It might not take three or four intensives to get a Grade certificate. We might be able to wrap one up sooner.

Also it might very well be that if a person were a Release and in pretty shining-good shape before they started to be trained at all, they would go through the training very much more rapidly and they'd only have to have the experience of processing somebody. Naturally, that's where your review body of applicants comes in. You've got to have a review body of applicants for students to practice on. So this thing all cross-works in various ways, and that road to Clear is one that the people have wanted to follow. And it is the one that you want to follow.

Well, it's only – my job is to make it as easy as possible, as fast as possible and to find out what are the snags on the road and get those snags removed and move them on up the line.

One of the snags on the road, of course, is economics. You'll find that some people don't have any money and so on. Well, there is an oddity, an oddity. A little review which is going on is particularly with some of the new processes as they are applied, are actually returning more earning power to the individual processed than the individual spent for the processing. In other words, he made more money than he spent on the processing. In other words, it was profitable to be processed at a fairly high rate, you see.

That's quite interesting. You say, "Well, how would anybody do that?" Well, I don't know. How does anybody live at all in the wog world? But they do experience various increases. They go up in jobs, ratings, responsibility areas and so on fairly fast.
It has been a road that has not been particularly open because we didn't have the Grades in exact lineup and it was hard to get an individual up to an exact state. Well, each one of these Grades now has a state to get the individual up to.

And you've been having some fun with these things lately, but actually at the present moment you have only one Grade which is totally written up and in shape. Now don't become alarmed because a person can only be examined on the processes which he has been trained in.

And also a checksheet can't be changed in progress. That is to say, when you're on a checksheet, it can't be changed till you are off of it. The next student coming right in behind you – these are the new regulations, I've been working pretty hard on this trying to smooth the road for you – the student coming in right behind you might be handed an entirely different checksheet for the same Grade, but that wouldn't influence your checksheet one iota, nor would there be anything added to your checksheet while you were going through the Grade even though new bulletins existed on the subject. For your own benefit you probably would care to read those new bulletins or something of that sort, but it nevertheless wouldn't impede your attaining your Level, and it also wouldn't impede for a moment your being able to claim the Level as yours, you see.

Because there is another policy on the thing is you can't be retrained for a Level which you have already attained. Those policies already exist. Very often people do not inform you of what the policies are.

You basically sometimes see a breakdown where you think there is a breakdown, because just nobody has told you what the policy is on this particular thing, you see. It has not been a custom to broadly issue central organization policies to people, or training policies to people. This has not been a custom, for one of the reasons why is it was too expensive to do all that mimeographing, and another thing, organizations were in a formative state and there was no particular way to formalize this and finalize the issue of it.

Within a year or so you're going to see what you call Hat Books, the "Divisional Hat Books" which contain every policy there is in the shop, and those are fixed with a loose leaf binder type of arrangement so that a little clipbook can be issued to you and you can snap it into that particular Divisional Hat Book, and you will know what all the policies are in that.

There's a great deal more to the administrative technology of Scientology than the usual auditor has ever really known.

For instance this business about that, you're being trained on a course right now which is covered by policy. There are a very many policies and two or three of those policies were recently violated. And you saw me blowing the roof off around here. Probably was a great mystery to you about why I was getting so excited about something or other. Well, you see a snarl on the board, don't you see? But it's just that a policy or something has slipped, don't you see? Or, a new policy is desperately needed for this particular line to straighten out the thing and to let it go.
But there are various policies. One of those things is that a student cannot be retrained for the Level he has already studied on. You can't retrain a student for something he has already got. Don't you see?

Now the only reason under God's green earth that you are in training at this particular moment at these lower levels is they didn't exist when you were trained. And there was no gradation where you were.

Now, exactly how you fit somebody in who shows up here as a perfectly valid Class III, Grade III person – well, that becomes a little rough piece of policy. Because supposing that some part of this wasn't done well, don't you see? Something like this didn't happen well. Well, this is a Review situation, and it's merely a Review situation for the protection of the individual.

But somewhere up the line here in a very short space of time you're going to see the courses dropping out of the bottom at Saint Hill. In other words, these courses at the bottom are going to start turning up missing.

And the only reason that the Saint Hill Course is at the state it is in right now, is because the broad training of the Scientologist has not been standardized in the field, so therefore we have to train him all over again. And we make better auditors for doing so. But, it is a very funny thing. The Saint Hill Course began originally only for one reason, and that was to improve training in the field. And we have pretty well made that grade. And people who are coming in here trained are trained pretty darned well. I'm very proud of the way they are done.

In other words, Saint Hillers have gone out, taken over training facilities, which is exactly the way I planned it some years ago. And all I was interested in doing was showing them how to train, and showing them basic fundamentals of auditing. They went out, they took over Academies and so forth. Academies improved and improved. Then the people who started coming into Saint Hill could audit better, then we could upgrade the auditing here, don't you see? But then you going out, you're going to improve those Academies even more. And the next thing you know, because you've been through these various courses at these various levels, you sure know how a level course is supposed to be trained. And along about that space of time, why, it is not any longer going to be necessary, don't you see, to teach that level. That's what we are fighting for. Soon as we can get that straightened out, we're all set. People will come to Saint Hill for VI, and that'll be that!

And then, about 1948 we'll get rid of VI see. We'll get rid of that at Saint Hill too, because that will be well taught out in the field by that time, see. Toward the end of 1948, I imagine you will see most continental organizations teaching VI.

Now, where do we go from there?

Female voice: 1968!

We haven't run out of anything, don't worry.

But I'll tell you very frankly, very frankly, there are something like -- there are at least 12 levels above VI, and Saint Hill will be teaching those. Do you follow?
This is how we're picking up man by his bootstraps. This is the plan on which you're operating, if very often you don't understand particularly how this goes together, particularly if you're not on a Central Org intimate line whereby it's being engaged in.

We sometimes make a slip and a miss and we try to straighten it out as fast as we can and so on. We're dealing with living beings. We are not making coke or iron or toys, you see. And dealing with living beings requires an entirely different operating structure and man has never tried to deal with them before, so he is a complete infant. So, we've got to feel our way all the way along the way and we are doing things, of course, man has never done before. And we're just making it just fine.

And one of the reasons we are making it just fine is because you are doing well and you are carrying on and you are doing fine.

So, thank you very much.
A lecture given on 27 April 1965

Thank you. Thank you.
Well, you look better today. Sorry to have to tell you, but you look much better today.
What's the date?

_Audience: 27th of April AD 15._

All right. Twenty-seven April AD 15, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Ah, dear I haven't really – I can tell you with great honesty, I haven't the least idea of what to talk to you about today. This was simply a Tuesday in which a lecture came up.

I have been working extremely hard trying to handle a – what amounts to a false report which had come in over the world and didn't know I was handling a false report until just last week. And that was a false report on rates charged by organizations. Nearly every organization in the world had covertly, unreportedly reduced its rates so that when the new pricing program went into effect and they were asked what their rates were, they simply gave their advertised rates. They did not give the rates they actually charged. In fact, I would go so far and could add somewhat cruelly as I don't think the top executives in the orgs knew what rate was really being charged.

So, on the basis of this false report given last autumn, a pricing program was arranged with national councils through the world, and they happily and pleasantly agreed to a price increase that amounted to 400 to 1000 percent above their 1964 prices without saying a word.

As a result, the public was considerably shocked. And the funny part of it is, I couldn't even find out what they were shocked about since according to the pricing program and the reported rates that were being charged by organizations, the pricing program, frankly, reduced several of their advertised rates. But that was only on paper. In actual fact, the public at large knew very well that this had not been the fact. The rates, therefore, were enormously increased and as a result, why, business slackened up and activity damped here and there and about all I was aware of is the fact that when I came back from vacation, why, they all had a down curve, except Saint Hill. And they all had this nice down curve and this was reported to me somewhat late in the report – and I got onto it as soon as I found this out and started to solve this problem.

And it took a long time. It took the – a long time for me. It took – it took the better part of three weeks to finally find the engram necessary to resolve the case. And that engram was a false report and it was a universal false report – each org had done this. And we were very fortunate to have found this before we began to expand, because frankly at the rates they
were charging and for the service they were going to give for the rates, had I not pulled them up and standardized prices and found this engram they would have expanded into insolvency. Because the rates they were charging would not have covered the costs. And if a thousand persons had been driven down on the org for training and processing, don't you see, and if they had trained and processed these people at the costs which they were really training and processing them at, it would have cost somebody, a nonexistent somebody, don't you see, several thousand dollars a month that would have gone into the red.

In other words, the organization would have expanded into the red. And for some reason or other, nobody really had courage enough, I suppose, in these national councils to say, "But, Ron, uh – heh, HAS Course, you know, only – only gets two pounds, hub-hub, in our area," or in perhaps Los Angeles, "Ah yes, but, we're – we're charging – we're charging only fifty cents for ten thousand hours of processing plus – plus a promise to Clear and OT." Do you follow? Do you follow? An incredible situation, then, had existed.

But what we discovered is not the fact. We discovered that an organization can be pounded by the public in the form of one, two, three, four suppressive people, you see (this sounds like the public, you know – these are the blokes that specialize in "Everybody says!" "Everybody thinks!" don't you see) into believing that they mustn't charge anything for their services. And there was therefore, in extant, a tendency to downgrade service.

Well now, that is the surest way in the world to wipe service out, because it costs money to run an organization or an auditor or a staff and so on. And "if you could just pound the income of Scientology down far enough, of course, there would be no org there to help these nasty people we've got to get even with." Do you follow? And the tendency, then, was to reduce prices covertly by strange and peculiar discounts which were then not announced or put on the line, do you follow? So that these discounts and so on, mounting up, gradually would take the price of the service down below the cost of the service. And what we gained out of it was the recognition of the fact that there was this tendency and that it required an extraordinary effort to hold a price line once set. And so we can make that extraordinary effort.

We're now – my desk is covered with cable traffic and telex traffic right at this minute which is readjusting this whole situation. But the public in the meanwhile has been informed that all organizations have fallen back to their 1964 prices, and they're at this moment mailing an HCO Policy Letter out to the public at large which returns to their 1964 prices.

So that was the end of that. And we just wiped out the engram, you see? The basic idea of the 1964 program was not pricing. The basic idea of it was simply that we take all membership monies and all book monies, and we put them in a special account and then we use that for advertising Scientology and Scientology books. And that was the basic idea. And to that became added, then, pricing complexities and so forth by this person's objection and that person's objection, don't you see, and counselor action of this kind or another – it got into a pricing mess. Well you see, the basic idea is quite sound and will, of course, be followed. But the pricing situation and so on was what was out, and that was what caused the January-February slump of this year in most organizations.
And I – right now, as I say, I've got a desk covered with the most incredible figures, which are the most incredible departures from anything ever reported before you ever saw, because I sent the HCO Secretary this morning in every org in the world down to Accounts to ask Accounts, "What is on the invoices of 1964?” Not what's in the literature, but what's on the invoices. And I tell you the things that are on the invoices would fry your hair, see? One month of training: Ten rand. Oh, yes! Marvelous. Yes, that's what it was. So, of course, the public was suddenly confronted with this tremendous price jump, and this get – made them all very nervous and so on.

But it's very interesting to read the Ad Comms. Here's the boy on the ground. See, you read the Ad Comms and all the Ad Comms ever hit were locks. They never said there was a price jump in January. They said, "Well, price changes are what drove things down. The fact that we changed some prices drove things down." You see? That's not true. The fact that we increased prices 400 to 1,000 percent is what drove things down! [laughs]

Now of course, we can actually retain those 1964 prices and just fool everybody, see? All I'll do is re-tailor the service to fit the money, and that will be that. It takes some gymnastics, but it's held up the release of your org board because I was not about to release an org pattern of some kind or another which might require adjustment, and instantly released, instantly adjusted – the devil with that. So until I got this whole situation, this basic engram, cleaned up and figured out, I knew I'd better not go ahead and publish that org board. Now I can go ahead and letter the thing. But it's quite, quite laughable when you get to thinking about it.

I suppose a Registrar hearing suppressive Joe and suppressive Pete, and so forth, walk in and say, "Oh, the people are bhahl-hmho-orrра," you know, and so on. He's being asked for ten shillings for a week's co-audit, you see, or something. And, "Oh, that's too much money! And blah! blah! blah!"

And pretty soon, she gets the idea, "The public will not pay any money," see? "Well, let's see, how can I covertly reduce the price?" you see?

So in a casual conversation in a coffee shop, you see, with the Assoc Sec, she says, "Everybody thinks that…" you get the idea – she just passes on the same engram, you know? "And therefore the HAS Co-audit and so forth really ought to be priced a shilling." You see? Well, that's fine, but you can't have an Instructor there. Do you follow? So this sort of a tendency – this sort of a tendency had to be spotted and cleaned up. It's something that you should guard against very carefully in your own individual activity and so forth.

It's very amazing, but I can go back over the years on the subject of prices and pricing and I find this peculiarity also isolated out: In those orgs where I was functioning straight on in direct management and so on – in those orgs, staffs always made good pay. You can go back and verify that. That's Washington, London in the days when I was riding them straight to and close to and so forth. You look at it; it's above the average of what they would get on what's called fixed pay. In other words, their unit pay was above their fixed pay. Now, when I moved off you would say offhand, "Well, management wasn't so good; it was more careless." No, when I moved off somebody changed the prices. See, they would figure some method.
I'll give you an idea. This idea of scholarship. Scholarship was something that was handed to the field auditor to give to a friend. You see? Now this was a very happy thing, because the first genus of it is, of course, he wants somebody to help him where he is, so he gave this scholarship which he was sent as a field auditor – he just signed it and handed it over to somebody he wanted trained. Therefore, that person could be trained cheaply and go back and help the field auditor.

Now, that line collapsed up to the front corner of the Registrar's desk, so that anybody who walked in the shop is just dealt this scholarship, see? You got it? See, it was never intended for that at all. It was intended to help out the field auditor and it had very little to do with money. It just had to do with the fact that this bird who the field auditor wanted to have help him, you see – this guy could be sent into the org very cheaply. And this guy in the field, you see, why then he had somebody to help him who was trained and it wouldn't break their finances to get going in that immediate area. And that was what the scholarship was all about.

See, but it got upgraded more and finally got up to a recognized discount. And then it moved up on the Registrar's desk and then, of course, these things just got dealt. Well, of course, that immediately cut the price. I think it was something on the order of – the price of an HCA Course in London was seventy-five pounds and the – scholarship or something like that, cut it to thirty-six pounds. So then it's – the price of an HCA in London, reported at seventy-five pounds was in actual fact thirty-six pounds uniformly. Now do you get the picture, see? It was never sold for seventy-five pounds.

Now, why anybody would tell the public that an HCA Course was seventy-five pounds while as a matter of fact it was always thirty-six pounds, see, I wouldn't know. That would be a wonderful way of knocking business apart, see? Gorgeous, see? You say, "Our prices are very high!" to everybody out in the field, you see, and so on. "Well, we have very high prices!" But the second somebody comes in, they say, "Have you got ten cents?" [laughter]

So I – I'm very happy to have run this engram and it's in the process of running out now and the preclear is doing very well. And I'm very proud of the preclear for sitting there quietly now and answering up. I've never had anything answered up so smart in my life as it was just last night when the telexes flew out of here asking for the vital data and actually it's all sitting on my desk and has been there for hours. In other words, they really answered up on this engram. So that was real good.

Morale in organizations is out through the roof. I mean it's in terrific shape. I've never seen morale better because one of the things is I've been telling them to do this and to do that and to do the other thing and they've been getting Sec EDs and they've had a heavy policy letter line during all this period. There's been lots of policy letters, but they all refer to the new organization, you see?

These policy letters are simply being put with them so that they won't be in the dark when they get their new org board. And they've been running not on policy letters, but on Sec EDs. Well, I just skipped the policy line, and although you're getting policy letters, what you're doing is the Sec ED, see? And the policy letters go into effect when the new org board...
But anyway, they've managed to look under the corner of these policy letters and look at some of these figures and department and division numbers and so forth on them, and they managed to sort of put together what the org board must look like, don't you see?

But they're running on the Secretarial Executive Director... Now, Secretarial Executive Director is an issued by air letter or wire or cable or telex which is simply issued to HCO. HCO types it up at once in the form of an order, and stamps it as official and posts it or circulates it through the organization and that operates as an immediate order.

As a matter of fact, something could happen at eleven o'clock in the morning in an organization, and usually by three or four they could have a Secretarial Executive Director out on it if things were really running hotter than a pistol, you see? So there is no such thing as a "remote management." It's not very remote. It's right up there. These Secretarial Executive Directives are issued for all organizations or for one special organization. In other words, you can issue one for Saint Hill only, let us say, or for Johannesburg only or Los Angeles only and then you can issue a general one.

The other thing which they had done in – throughout organizations was quite marvelous. They had not complied with an order last autumn to compile all their mailing lists and to cull through all their invoices and get their organization mailing lists up. And very few had done anything about this. So when we started to send out Auditor 8 – which is, by the way, quite an issue – when we started to send this out we asked for addresses for all their inactive and active lists.

Give you an example: Auckland reported eleven hundred names on their mailing list. For a Central Organization? Eleven hundred names? What's this? Their congress list? See? And Johannesburg, which has been having a dreadful time and so forth, reported five hundred names. Five hundred names? We just never heard of these figures, don't you see?

And you know, it's "what wall?" because we have this datum in our background: That when the London list of about six thousand – I've forgotten the exact figure – it was something like six or eight thousand Certainys going out to six or eight thousand people, you see, each month. When that was cut to save money on the magazine, see – "Magazine mailing cost very expensive, you know. We've got to save money" – when that was cut to seven hundred names, secretly, all of a sudden London's business hit the skids. Nobody walked in the front door. That was it! And when I finally got back to England and picked it up off the ground, it was twenty-two thousand pounds in the red and going into the red faster every minute. And boy it took me a year and a half to put that organization back together again. I picked it up and got it going again and kicked it into line and we eventually put it back up where it could stand. But that was just because seven hundred names was the only mailing, you see?

Now, you get out a bunch of promotion or information or data and then you find you've only got an audience, you see, of maybe five hundred. That's nothing! See, that's exactly nothing. So they're culling through their addresses now and they're culling through their invoices.

And New Zealand went back through its past invoices for its mailing list – you see their names all appear on their invoices – and they've picked up three thousand just like that and will be up to four, they think, before they're through. There'll be about four thousand
names. Well, that was actually the field of New Zealand. Well, of course, that's got to be much higher than that, and I've set them some various figures and other ways of doing this and so on. They're gradually building these things back up again.

The only trouble we're having, a little bit of trouble with Johannesburg. Johannesburg keeps insisting they have got all of their addresses and so forth. No, an organization couldn't be – couldn't have lived over those years and still only had five hundred names, don't you see? It couldn't have. So we're about to do a terrible thing to them. We're about to send for all of their invoices ever since they've been in operation, by air freight. We'll tell them we'll give them to them back. But either they don't have any invoices at all... see? There's another fib there.

What we're operating on – Johannesburg will do all right and they'll survive – mostly because I said so.

But here's the main point: is over a period of time, I tried to – I just dropped everything, I think, in 1963, January 22nd, when there was a considerable amount of governmental attack and so forth. I just dropped everything, and in the ensuing year, why, I did what would have amounted to maybe ten years of normal research. Pushed it right straight up to R6 materials and so I could look on the other side of it and see where we went with OT, you see? I did nothing but that.

I just said, "To hell with it. Go ahead," I said, "Go broke. Die. I don't care." See? I know this: that there's only one answer to government attacks, see, and that's to complete the research. That's the only thing they could do us up with – they get us so involved one way or the other that we couldn't end the cycle on the research line to a total, finished, OT product, see? So that was it. And of course, we've been paying for it, because I came back on the bridge, you might say, in April of 1964. And I had all the material there. I didn't bother to round off all the material. As some of you R6 students notice, the material is not cut or edited in various places. It's all there, but I didn't bother to polish up the material or finish up the line or anything like that, because now it was in a shape where it could be finished up and would finish.

And I went ahead, then, into the field of management and started in on organization to save the bacon of some of these organizations who had begun to slip. And they had slipped! And that inattention for that period of time was, of course, dearly paid for. But nevertheless we're bringing that right out into the open now and straightening that on up. It was a calculated risk. I knew very well how far they could go.

It's something like you've got two kids, one sliding off one side of the boat, one sliding off the other side of the boat – calculated risk of which one do you save, you see, knowing very well that you can reach three feet deep in the water for the other one and get him by the collar before he goes down the third time, don't you see? It's that type of calculated risk and so on. This was – this has been very tight and very, very, very closely played in the last couple of years, and they lost. Now we've just got the thing of straightening up orgs.

But it was very funny to have a great big engram sitting in the middle of the recovery line. That's of course why they didn't recover fast. There was this big engram sitting there, hidden, unsuspected and so on.
The main difficulties that you run into in handling Scientology, and so forth, are not with Scientology organizations; they're with the public. And the poor organization sits there and wherever the public impinges upon the organization, you can count on that point enturbulating. That – you'll know exactly where an organization will erode. It'll erode exactly at the point where the public impinges upon it, you see?

Well now, this is very, very curious. How we got this far, I'm sure I don't know. There was good luck and good management and a lot of dedicated work by staffs and that sort of thing, and they've – they've really done a fine job. Having scolded them and snarled now about their covert pricing, don't think for a moment that I'm mad at any of them because I'm not. I see exactly how it arose.

But at those points where the public hits or where they impinge will be the most enturbulated points. And it is the public which is in a confusion and we're trying to put a stable datum called a Scientologist or an organization, you see, into the middle of this confusion. And frankly, an individual cannot stand alone with Scientology. He will just get knocked appetite over tin cup by the public. I can tell you that by vast experience – vast experience. If he's not backed up organizationally – if he doesn't have an organization – then he can't get off the launching pad, get his case gains and so forth up the line. Because, of course, every Scientology in the world and every organization in the world is connected with a suppressive thing called the society. Do you see? So they're going to go appetite over tin cup, bang, if they are left all by themselves to fend.

Now, you take one of your pcs and you send him back home, and he was bright and shining and so forth. The chances of your picking up that pc, bright and shining in just another month or two months in the same condition as he left your session and so forth are so remote as to be nonexistent.

That guy is going to be batted! He's going to lose part of that gain. This is the frog who climbs up three inches in the daytime and falls back two inches at night. And it's that chug-chug type of advance which you can count on your pc making. He will make it to the degree that he continues to have confidence in you, oddly enough; even though he's a long way away from you, he's now got confidence in you. He's got ARC with one human being in the world. Do you see? That's his auditor. I'm talking now about a field situation.

Well now, that auditor is being knocked around, of course, because he is a public front gate. Now, if he can't himself lean back against a stronger entity, such as an organization that will support him, why, he once more gets knocked around. Now, if the organization once more cannot lean back against a stronger entity – a larger organization, you see – why, it gets unduly knocked around. And then, of course, the larger organization with good handling of all organizations is a pretty big organization, see? And that way, why, you can lift man up by his bootstraps. You can get this thing off the launching pad. But you are dealing in a psychotic society.

There are thirty-two levels below zero. And the average public is at least fifteen levels below zero at an average. And neurosis starts in at ten levels below zero. Neurosis only goes a few levels and then it's psychosis. Psychosis is an inability to observe, an inability to be aware of anything but the wrong thing. And that's your public.
And I took a look at it the other day. And I've had two interesting experiences in the last year, personal experiences, that you yourself may someday run into.

When I first had a total reality, last year sometime, on the exact character of the reactive mind, of exactly how it was there and exactly what it was calculated to make an individual do, I just said, "Oh, nooo!" And I sort of sat down and I looked at that, and I thought, "Ah, that's just too gruesome." It was a sort of an ARC break. And I said, "Now, if anything – it – the truism is if somebody is shocked by something (and this is quite commonly true) if someone is shocked by something, it – normally there's something wrong with what he's shocked with." Don't you see? So it was – that rule applied to this. I said, "Well, I must have something wrong with the structure that I have got here for the reactive bank." So I promptly went all over it. Suppressed it good. ARC broke it. Turned on enough somatics to blow your head off and so forth, and then finally ran out all the suppressions and challenges on the thing, and that was still it.

The shock was not actually with the reactive bank, but the pretenses that had been made about the character of man. And amongst those pretenses is, "Be glad you're neurotic." And I thought, "My God! Something that makes a man an obsessive murderer, and he's got to have this in order to live or be artistic?" Ughhh! And it was a considerable shock to finally confront this thing called a reactive bank and see exactly what it consisted of and exactly what trash one had been led to believe was vital and valuable in the business of living because it couldn't make anything but bums, criminals, dogs, don't you see? And it was a shock! It was a shock. And I got over it in about forty-eight hours and so forth and finally said, "To hell with it."

And as a matter of fact my case has gone – I'm having an awful time trying to get you the data right now. I'm trying to hold onto the case long enough to get it plotted. But it's blowing. And I now can't get a tone arm to rise. And I'm afraid that just behind that the needle action is going to go. There's plenty of mass there and there's plenty to be run out there. There's plenty of this and that to be handled. You understand? But it doesn't have enough effect. Do you understand?

For quite a while now my cognitions – "Oh, so that's why people..." you know, had no cognition of "This is why I am..." That has gone sometime since. I used to have a ball with that. "Oh, that's why I so-and-so. Oh, yes. Mu-mm!" I haven't cognited like that for ages. But I've been very carefully holding the bank there in order to get you the exact proper plot, see? And I can't hold it there. It's disintegrating, and it's gotten now to a point where the tone arm won't rise and it's sitting down around the Clear read and the needle looks awful funny. It's very floppy. Reads very well. This stuff reads nicely still.

I know the symptoms. First the tone arm action goes out and then the needle action goes out when you're really flattening something. Don't you see? First you lose the tone arm action. Well, that's gone. And what I did was contact the fundamentals below the GPMs, and they're what's blowing. And I'm trying to plot the GPMs when I don't have to run them. And that's quite serious. Of course, it'd ruin somebody to do this. You know, I mean, you bypass all the GPMs and try to run out the lower stuff. He'd go colder – he'd feel like he was in an icehouse and the somatics would tear him to pieces and so forth. But you actually, theoreti-
cally, could run the bottom pinning out of the bank and the rest of the bank would disappear. Well, unfortunately I contacted the bottom pinning and the rest of the bank is blowing. I can't stop it blowing. So if you never get a complete plot on this, why, you know what happened. [laughs]

It's not that I'm in fabulously marvelous shape at the particular moment – handling all this stuff and working day and night on it and that sort of thing. But the main – the main thing about it is, it doesn't have any particular effect – it's having an effect on my body now. The masses move in against the body and make an impression on the body, and I know that, and I can feel that and I can see these things and that sort of thing.

I haven't got any time track anymore. And that's awfully disorienting. I miss it, miss it terribly, I can assure you of it. It's like missing the tin cans after you've eaten. You sort of say, "What the hell happened to the tin cans? Huh? Where's the garbage?" But whereas previously I used to be able to think of, "Well, now let's see. What did I read in such and such a text at such and such a time," and so forth, I'd get a beautiful picture of it – gorgeous, you see – and even be able to read it and so forth. Nah, I don't get any picture anymore. I just know what it said. And it's disconcerting only if you look at it in retrospect. Seems perfectly normal, but you look at it in retrospect – you say, "Well, some somatic like that would come from some cracking big engram." See? So you say, "All right, where's the engram?" There's no engram there, you know? A GPM that's half discharged sitting in front of you, see? And you say, "Oh, that. Oh. Well, where's the picture?"

Or you – sometimes you will notice the fact – the tail end of an engram, see, and it's sitting down top of a GPM that hasn't been contacted or plotted, don't you see? And you say, "Golly, look at that G..." Of course, you remember what it was all about, but – it doesn't leave you in a mystery – but you haven't got a nice billboard picture of it anymore, don't you see?

Now, the funny part of it is you could turn around and make a picture of it. See? You could – you could turn around and make a picture of it, and you could probably even put it on automatic and hold it there, don't you see? Next day you say, "What the hell am I doing with this picture?" Throw it under the bed, you know?

But pictures of course are completely unnecessary for any kind of a recall at all, which is probably about the only change there has been from the definition of a Book One Clear. The other change is that a Clear apparently is the – oh, not apparently; it's true – he's the original electric eel, so on, and apparently affect physical objects without half trying in that state. That is to say, you can warm something up or something. This isn't phenomena that you would consider even very good phenomena; I mean, it isn't very advanced, don't you see?

Now, you can see very easily that throwing a lightning bolt couldn't be very much of a trick. It merely depends on practice in holding your position. If you could hold your position very accurately, why, you could throw a lightning bolt that'd probably char the Empire State Building. But that's beside the point. That's just – that's just theoretical.

What you've got here in actual fact is that things – that by staring at things you can make them warm, and things like this, you know. You pick up a – here's a glass with some ice in it, you know? You stare at it for a few minutes and you haven't got a glass with ice in it. It's
the warmest Coca-Cola you have ever had anything to do with, don't you see? This is – this is very, very low-scale phenomena. It's just monkey business. But there isn't – I was just giving you the departures.

On the one hand the eidetic recall and that sort of thing, considered desirable and so forth, actually vanishes. You just get knowledge. And you can put it back there so you can read it again, but why? Do you see?

And the other thing is that there is an energy phenomenon which was not forecast in the first book. I'm just bringing you up to date on the data. There's energy phenomena – is forecast – not even mentioned until two or three years after the first book. Then we began to mention energy phenomena of some kind or another. But you apparently can do various things in this particular direction. It's a long way to go. You start reaping benefits from this sort of thing way before you start reaching any kind of an ultimate condition. And those benefits are sometimes quite amusing.

You suddenly realize that you no longer have "bang-bang," whatever it was, you see? And you say, "Why, I'm not – and as a matter of fact, I haven't had it for a month." You know, negative gain. You stop hitting yourself on the head with a hammer and then you pass up into your gains. In other words, the basic phenomena of case gain is negative gain. It's apparently a negative gain which also takes place in terms of positive ability. And the ability seems very natural to you, and you don't miss the headache. See, on the one hand you don't miss your headache, and on the other hand, why, you don't question the fact that you have regained an ability.

So people going up the line like this are not in a case of startlement or "Golly, look how much better I am!" you know, and "Gee, yeah! Gosh! Yeah! Boy, am I getting wonderful!" you know, and so on. They're not in that state of mind at all. If a person... you saw a person in that frame of mind and saying those things and so forth, why, you begin to wonder if he hadn't hit an end word that says "wonderful" or something, you know?

On the one hand he takes his renewed abilities for granted. His new energy level – that is to say his new ability to act or move or reason or ferret things out – he takes that for granted, you see. That's just natural. See, and it's been natural for a day, you know? And – but it's just natural. And on the other hand the hole in his stomach and the pain in his back and so forth, these things are gone and of course, like mother-in-law, you don't want her back. But you wouldn't think of it coming back because you haven't got them. Do you follow?

So, you see, on the one hand you have an undetected negative gain because it's a gain by absences, and on the other hand you have an undetected increasing ability because it's natural – because it's your ability anyhow. There's nothing unnatural about the two actions so an individual sometimes has to get down and think rather hard. And you say, "Well, have you had any case gains lately?"

And he'd have to think about it, and he'd say, "Well, yes, I've had some case gains lately." Yes, he knows that.

"Well, what were these case gains?"
"Well, let's see." He sort of has to mock up what was wrong with him, you see, last week. What was wrong with him last week? Let's see, what did he have last week? What was he moaning and groaning about last week? Well, it's hard to remember because, you see, he doesn't have to worry about moaning and groaning about it again, because he knows it isn't going to happen to him again. And he suddenly remembers, "Well, since last week I've been able to see. Yeah! Yeah, that's right. I couldn't see before last weekend. Yeah, I've had a case gain."

But it's taken for granted, and that is the factor you want to look for in case gains. If you think as an auditor your pc should always be patting you on the back in a high degree of euphoria, that's just what it is – euphoria: meaning gleeful happiness about something, you know? "Oh dear, you are a wonderful audi...!" I always look at a pc when he starts telling me about that, man. [laughter] "Oh, you are a wonderful auditor You are so magnificent. Oh, auditor I worship you!"

"What the hell have I run into here?"

And one of the things I know about it is that in three days it's going to collapse. That's a – that's a bank phenomenon and it is simply going to destimulate. You know, everything destimulates in from three to ten days ordinarily, and so on.

I remember the first pc that ever did this to me, you know? I felt rather uneasy about this, you know. They felt so "wonderful!" you know, and I "Ooooooh," you know, "What is this?" And three days later that pc couldn't have been scraped off the pavement.

But anyway, your negative gain proposition makes it sometimes rather difficult. But sometimes, now and then, you will get a positive mechanical phenomenon which is suddenly called to your attention. You say, "This tone arm doesn't rise anymore" – like I just told you a few minutes ago. This tone arm is blowing down now only 2.5. That's a blowdown. The needle throws a dial wide at sensitivity 2 but returns." A meter doesn't act like that, see? You – suddenly, you will get – you'll get an outside or external measurement, you see? Probably there are lots of these things.

You'll probably get up along the line and get Clear as a bell so they ping you and they – you'll ring for hours, and you'll be talking to somebody rather excitedly and explaining to them how you really don't take all the garbage cans and put them in the basement; that you put them outside. And he won't quite understand what you're talking about, and then you realize that the person has got a red flush on his face. Person is quite feverish, as a matter of fact. You'll suddenly say, "Oh, I shouldn't talk to him quite that sincerely." And say, "Well, that's all right. Just remember after a while – you know, put the garbage cans out back," and you go walking out. You go on talking to him very much longer, you're going to have a fried Homo sap. [laughter] You got the idea? Be too much for him.

And you'll, in other words, get an external measure. See, that will be the external measure of the thing, see? You'll be running a machine and this machine will be – not firing on something, you know? "And so it's not firing on this and so on and that's that and so forth. Ooooh, it's just that. That's it." Then the machine purrs off and you sit down and you say, "What the hell did I do?" See, you get the external phenomenon sometimes feed back on you.
But you begin to be able to perceive external relationships and see the difference in their relationship to yourself between the reaction of things to yourself and so forth. You'll notice such a thing as you're talking to a group of people and they're all listening to you very nicely and they're all very interested and very cheerful with you and so forth. And you'll notice one of them starts to talk to the same group and they don't listen. Got the idea? They start chattering amongst themselves. He's saying things quite as interesting as you were saying.

Well, what's this? You sort of scratch your head. And you could say – be very reasonable about it and say, "Well, he isn't as popular as I am." Ah, let's not pat yourself on the back so hard. His communication level isn't as high as yours. You see, you're probably going out on three, four, five communication channels simultaneously, see? He's going out on one vocal communication channel. Do you understand?

I mean, you're starting to run into some other factors that you don't quite yet have a grip of. You don't quite know what these things are but you notice that there's a difference, see? You notice there's a difference between you talking to somebody and another person talking to the same person, don't you see?

And you'll notice all of a sudden that your room is neat and didn't used to be. You might notice this comparison, don't you see? But everything seems to be in apple-pie order all the time.

Then you begin to notice that you've got more time, but then you'll also notice that you haven't got enough time. You begin to notice something is wrong with your time factor. And that's because you've noticed other people acting in the same time span, and you yourself are acting in a slightly different time span than they're acting in. In other words, your perception of a second has become different than their perception of a second, don't you see?

This doesn't throw you into any disagreement; it's just something that you see. You just notice this.

And these things will flick across your awareness or your consciousness – oh, every few days or few weeks you'll run into one of these things, you see? And they aren't all good. They aren't all good. You maybe have not looked at some sphere or some dynamic someplace in existence. And you just have never looked there. And then you will look there. And you say, "Oh, no!" and you'll feel sort of ill and for a moment, you know, you feel sort of like withdrawing, you know, and don't want much to do with that. Don't you see? Then you begin to look it over and you understand it better and so on, and you very rapidly get familiar with it.

But you get little starts – little shocks. "Well, how in the name of God could they be so cruel as that!" You see? You've never noticed that there's a tremendous cruelty going on in some section or another. You've not been aware of the fact that that is apparently standard behavior in that activity. You say, "Wow!" Shocker.

The other big shock that I had was just a very short time ago. I sat as innocent as could be. I was happily plotting away and working out the logical reduction for common denominators of behavior, and I found out the common denominator of behavior was degree of aware-
ness – which you can put down if you want to as a very interesting datum. It's the degree of awareness is – there's a thing in common to all life.

In other words, there is no level called "Aware" see, or "Awareness." That's – it's degrees of awareness. And the difference between Person A and Person B, regardless of the other phenomena, is their degree of awareness, so that A is not as aware as B or something of that sort, don't you see? Or he's aware of different things. And then man as he advances up along the line therefore goes over across certain points. There are certain things of which he would become aware in order to get a case advance. In other words, if you skip one or two or three of those, then he can't become aware of this higher one.

So I was just plotting it all the way down to the public. I was plotting this scale of awareness. Which is what it takes – you know, your old Know to Mystery Scale and your sub-zero Tone Scale and all that sort of thing – I was using this kind of thing and running into these things and replotting it and straightening it out, trying to get this Bridge down to *Homo sapiens*.

You see, you're not aware of the fact that you've advanced anywhere along the line particularly. You're hard at work, and you've got a lot of things to do and a lot of responsibility and that sort of thing, and you're just working along, and you don't – aware that you've been opening a gap. There's a gap occurring behind you. See? You're not noticing these negative gains, you see, and these positive gains. And this gap is getting wider and wider, and then one day you say, "Well, happily, happily, we're turning around. Let's plot this down. Where does this preclear lie?" And you reach, and you reach. Say, "What the hell? He's not on any scale I'm doing here. All right, let's do a theoretical scale of all of this, and let's run it right straight on down, and let's find out where this thing is!" And boy, I got thirty-two levels below zero.

Give you some kind of an idea – this is not the final scale at all. No figure to make. It's just this is research in progress. But the twenty-eighth level below zero is criminal. See, so we obviously aren't there because he's still functional. He's to some degree functional. See, he drives cars and smokes cigarettes and he does this. [laughter] But there he is. He's twenty-eight down from zero – so he – I can't tell you that this is the – this only goes thirty-two. That's all I've been able to strain my brain to look, see?

But I was figuring out these things, and I was replotting what we know in these lower sub-scales and upper scales and so forth, and what were the various phenomena meeting up with this, and I went into another one like I went last year I suddenly found myself looking at the human race and it was a horrible shock. I never had quite looked, see, not to that degree. And I felt rather weird. And I guess I went around in the doldrums for about twenty-four hours, you know? I didn't like this.

I finally got used to looking at it, and I got over it to realize that you could process a dog, then. That sounds like a funny conclusion doesn't it? And it didn't compare the human race to a dog. But I had to immediately relate it because – look, look, look, I was dealing with the average public preclear at ten or twelve levels below communication. Well, it was more than that, but you're at least ten or twelve levels below communication. *Oooooohhh!* Well, how the *devil* are you going to give this individual an auditing command? How – how – how can...
you grapple with this thing at all? Don't you see? And that was part of the aghastness. Is –
well, if you haven't got communication then your communication processes won't reach him,
and then no matter what auditing command you gave and so forth, why – you see, all of a
sudden you don't have an auditing command that you can give. Because you couldn't give an
auditing command because you haven't got a communication line. So how in the name of
common sense do you process him?

And Anton was talking last night about running Give Me That Hand on a dog. We got
talking about dogs. And that little Vixie that you see around here – of course, the society at
the present moment is going to do to Vixie, if we don't watch it, what they normally do to a
psychotic who starts to get well. Because these bands through which they come up are not
social bands! See? There's a few propitiative, unaware, caved-in bands mixed up amongst
them. They're sort of resting places, you see? An individual is kind of inoffensive, you know?
"Yeah, yeah, yeah." "Well, he's a good boy now," you see?

They get psychotics this way with electric shock. One psychotic that had been dis-
played as a marvelous cure and so forth on a stage before a whole hall full of psychiatrists,
and so forth – and a newspaper reporter asked him, "Well" – you know, your newspaper re-
porter had more sense than the psychiatrists. He said to the guy – he said, "Well, how do you
feel about all this?" And the fellow said, "Well, I bloody well learned to keep my mouth
shut." [laughter, laughs]

So start to make a game – we had one like this in New York. Some field auditor up in
New York would process this girl and bring her up to a point of where she was just tearing the
whole place apart, see? And I mean literally, you know? And the family would instantly insti-
tutionalize her. And they'd get her some shocks and knock her down again. Field auditor
would get ahold of her, process her up the line again, you see? And she'd just start tearing the
place apart, you see? And the family would institutionalize her and put her in a straitjacket,
you see? And then she'd get out finally and the field auditor would get ahold of her – some
other field auditor, see – and they'd run some process on her, and they'd get her up to this
point again, you see? And they could never get her up to a point of going into what would be
motion for that particular level, you see, without the family suppressing it.

So little Vixie is probably running into this band right now. Because I'm trying to
Teach Vixie how to talk. And of course Vixie's idea of talking is quite boisterous. And she's
gotten so that she will talk about most anything but it's always in the same bark but it's very
loud, and her increase in communication is expressed, of course, in the amount she will com-
municate and the duration of the communication, you see – the volume and duration. So she's
getting better in terms of volume and duration. Here's this little dog – this very short, tiny lit-
tle dog – little corgi; dwarf. She just has gotten from a point of, you know, of purring slightly
and so forth when she is very pleased or something like this. Well, she's gotten to a point now
where she runs into Mary Sue's room, looks demandingly at the mantle where she knows
some candy is kept for her, you see, and then just barks like the devil! See? She's saying, of
course, "Give me some candy, damn it!"

And I brought a cat up along the line once. Old John W. Campbell Jr. and so forth was
really the source of this because he hated cats and he used to kick this cat, and this cat was a
nice little calico cat, so forth. So I just simply processed the cat up to a point where the cat, every time John W. Campbell, Jr. would sit down, would go over and tear his shoe laces open, you see? And then if John made a motion with his foot, why, the cat would just score his ankles up gorgeously. [laughter] And finally that cat had him in full retreat.

Actually, I brought the cat up to a point where the cat would obey commands which is almost impossible with cats and so forth. It came when you whistled and do various tricks along this particular line. It had very good recognition level and so forth. Very, very – self-determinism of that cat just went up through the stars. But it was just run on a reach and withdraw basis, and I got the cat to reach more, and got the cat to reach more, and got the cat to reach more, and got the cat to reach more, and finally the cat was coming up tone all the way.

I know these things about processing, then, an inarticulate person who is relatively out of communication. And when I say "person," just take it as what I intended: a complete short circuit. Because you're looking at somebody who happens to be able to erect a machinery because of vocal cords to say things which are no more meaningful than a dog's bark.

I know this brands one as a antisocial-type activity. No, quite on the contrary, because my worry was mainly about "How do you reach them?" See? How can you – because I'd suddenly seen, "My God, there – you know, that gap behind is too big! And how we going to bridge that gap?" Well, we've already got them. We've got Give Me That Hand. We've got Body Mimicry. We've got – we can perfect a bunch of reach and withdraw things.

But more important than that, we know now exactly what various strata the public will respond to. They will respond to such things as suffering. They will respond to various other things. Hope is very high scale. And worsening – there's a whole band there where an individual would become aware of the fact that worsening could occur. And all you'd have to talk to him about would be worsening. And this would perform a very, very difficult feat for an auditor if an auditor didn't have this scale.

And therefore, the scale is going to take a little time to completely adjust. I'll release it in an unadjusted form but when you're getting down the line like that, you – these – these levels tend to jam. They're hard to recognize: Which one is the upper level? Which one is the lower level? When you get down toward the bottom, exactly how do these things fit? Well, experience will tell exactly how these things fit and it – the – the pattern is more or less correct, don't you see?

But you get way down there and you're liable to have trouble. You know, skip a band accidentally. There is a band there and you've skipped a band. And frankly, it's very easy to handle because it's merely awareness. Of what can the person be aware of?

So if the person is at band – well, just some artificial number – band A, you see, why, then they would improve in case if they could become aware of band B, and then become – improve in case again if they could become aware of C, don't you see? So it would merely be means of making the person aware.

Now, we could get carried away with this sort of thing and become far, far, far too enthusiastic, because you've got such bands there as hysteria. And this band "suffering" is quite an interesting band. An individual gets up to a point where he can suffer. And that's fairly
high-toned. A lot of institutional cases are lying around complaining mainly about the fact they can't feel anything. Well, they must be just below suffering or they wouldn't be aware of the fact that they weren't reaching suffering.

So you're processing in that particular character – without putting the person under duress. But this is why the psychiatrist when he has any luck at all with electric shock is being fortunate. You see, he's just accidentally picked a person out of these many bands – picked the person up whose next band for increase is suffering. So therefore, he gives – makes him suffer and the person has a case gain. Do you follow?

But if you took a person who was up here on the upper, what we consider Scientology, bands and you made him suffer, he jolly well wouldn't have a case gain. He'd become quite upset. Do you follow?

So anyway, looking at the broad panorama of the human race and so on, one is apparently on a gradient scale that goes down to nonarticulate unawareness of various lower, lower, lower, lower, lower degrees. In other words, the awareness is getting less, less, less, less, less, less, less, less. And I realized afterwards that we had it pretty well whipped. Because all you have to do – it is a Scale of Awareness. This is what you have to know about it, you see? It is a Scale of Awareness, and therefore, if you find a person anyplace on that Scale of Awareness then the next action which you have to do in order to give him a case gain is to make him aware of the next level above that.

Now, it doesn't say, then, that you would necessarily sit down across from him and process him. Do you follow? You wouldn't give him auditing commands or something. You might – you might – it might be as dim as you sit on – he – he's sitting on a bed and you're sitting on an – on a chair and whenever he makes an accidental move of some kind or another, you make the same move – something like this. This would increase an awareness, but that would be about as low as you could get with a process. And that would be a type of mimicry, you see? He does something, you do something. And therefore he becomes aware that he's doing it because he sees you doing it. "Hey, what do you know," he said, "I very often nod my head. Ah, ha, yeah. Ah, what do you know? Hm, hm, hm!" – case gain, see? He's a little more in control of this thing.

Oh, but below this there would be – there's all of the phenomena of awareness applies, and that phenomena is not the phenomena of communication but the phenomena of an increasing perimeter. Awareness is always a matter of an increasing perimeter. Now, it can increase into delusion, which is one of the things that bugs you. In other words, he can become more and more delusive, further and further away from him, see? Well, that would be an inverted awareness. So that sort of upsets one. Then he doesn't quite understand what is this scale, see, called "awareness"? Because this fellow sure is getting more and more delusive, and here is this person that thinks that every time he thinks the wrong thought, why, thousands of people die in Poughkeepsie, you see? Well, that's certainly a long reach. Well, yes, it's a reach into delusion. But then you have to state that what you mean by this is you've got to increase their awareness in the direction of sanity or reality.

In other words, you've got to increase their awareness in the direction of a real increase of awareness. That's the thing of don't invalidate, any more than you have to, a reactive
bank, you see? Don't worry about that reactive bank. Get the reality on the line. That's an old rule. Don't process the person in the direction of getting more and more unreal. I process him in the direction of becoming more and more real. So you see, having nightmares every night would be an improvement if he had it – had them only once a week. Do you follow?

So he – his awareness would be changed by the degree that you could simply increase his perimeter of actuality or his perimeter of reality. So it still holds to a real perimeter. And what do you mean by a perimeter? It means an expanding circle, concentric circle. You'd have a circle – a pc is, let us say, imagined to be standing in the middle of a circle which is one inch in diameter. And by expanding the perimeter, you would mean, well, you now have a circle two inches in diameter, you see? And now we get – can get a circle that is one foot in diameter. You'll find that a psycho quite ordinarily is unaware of anything beyond the reach of his fist. That's very peculiar but the real... he – if anything is further away than the knuckles of his fist from him, he is not aware of it. Beyond that point delusion sets in. So what you've got to do is increase his awareness beyond those knuckles. Don't worry about the fact that he can only reach to the knuckles, you see? Don't try to do too much about that. Just try him – to get him to reach as far as an extended finger.

In other words, awareness has to do with perimeters, an expanding perimeter. The person is more and more aware of more and more inside a bigger and bigger circle or sphere. Do you follow? Well, you've got an individual who could only be aware of what was going on, on his – well – around the skin of his face. Well, you might be able to get him up to a point of where he would be aware of a – of a – a wall which was close beside his head. Do you follow? Well, that would be an increased perimeter, see? You've only got that few inches from the thetan to the skin of his head, then we increase it that extra inch, see, by having him become aware of a wall which is one inch further away than his head. You got it?

Now, we could increase that again by another inch, don't you see, and you'd get some sort of an... Well, I'll give you an idea. In 8-C for instance, which ran with the person's arm further and further away from him when he touched the wall. Do you follow that? You flatten a two-foot 8-C, see, and then you flatten a three-foot 8-C and then you flatten a four-foot 8-C. Don't you understand? It'd just be how much further the walls were away from him and then you get an expanding perimeter of awareness.

Well naturally, he will come up through, then, the bank from the bottom right straight on up to the top, and oddly enough so would any living being. And there's not much communication involved in it because in 8-C or Give Me That Hand or some such process as that, if he does not execute the auditing command – you speak it, but if he does not execute it – then you execute it for him with his body. And you can keep doing this, and he suddenly gets a communication here and he recognizes that there is some connection between your speaking and his acting, you see? And that would be a tremendous cognition. And unfortunately you could take many a grocer's clerk out here and find out that that would be a great cognition for him. That there is – there is a coordination between the customer's order and filling it. He's doing it all the time but he's never noticed this.

So the other thing we get is you can have action without awareness. And we've had that around for years. We've said, "social conduct" and "social machinery" and that sort of
thing. Actually you can have action without awareness. Sounds pretty wild, but you could have – you could have a person who ate and dressed and went to the office and did work and so forth, and never knew anything about it. Didn't know a thing about it. And we'd call to his attention that he was going to the office and going to work and nobody has even noticed this about him. A sudden sort of blankness would have occurred across his eyes, you see? It ticks the next level of awareness of some kind or another.

You'd say, "Well, a fellow like you day after day going to work and coming back home again must get pretty bored with life and so on." It's – all of a sudden you get a sort of a dull look in his eyes. "Huh. Never occurred to me." You called it to his attention that he's doing a repetitive action. He's never considered it a repetitive action before. In fact, he's never noticed that he was doing it.

Well, you take a person with a bad tic; they quite often do not know they have a bad tic. And sometimes when you mimic a tic something – the tic vanishes because the person becomes aware of the fact he has a tic. They very often do this.

Somebody will come in who – with a – with a – with a broken leg and complain to you about his headache. He hasn't noticed he's got a broken leg. Do you see? And this is awareness. It is, what the individual is aware of and what the individual is doing are not the same thing, ever. You got it? That was why man couldn't make any forward progress in the human mind in spite of fifty thousand years of headaches. Do you follow that?

Therefore, the observation of conduct of the person will not diagnose the person unless you have a little secret scale of your own. In other words, you'd have to know the secret of what the MEST universe dictates as a gradient scale. Man, of course, didn't have that. So you follow this? An observation of conduct will not lead you to a solution of a situation.

I think it's quite remarkable when you get right down and look at it because it's one of man's most fixed ideas that all you have to do is observe conduct and you know all about it! And he just jolly well keeps falling on his head with that conclusion. Homo sap can't get anywhere as long as he's got that stupid conclusion.

So that you get all their mental healing sciences and that sort of thing, so-called and so on over the years, were based on observation of conduct! That was, the doctor was supposed to observe the patient's conduct and then diagnose that and then cure it accordingly. And in some instances they happily cross-sectioned something that illogically fitted with something else, and they would call it something because they could produce a slight effect upon it, don't you see? But usually they just observed the conduct and labeled it and then, of course, they couldn't do anything about it.

So what's had "mental science" (quote) absent on this planet, and in this universe, actually, has been this fact that by observing conduct you cannot establish an accurate diagnosis. And if you, uniformly, diagnose inaccurately, you can't, of course then, have any sort of a remedy to apply to the situation. And if you did have the right remedy and did all your diagnosis by conduct, you would wind out never applying the right remedy to the person. You follow that? And that would be what the situation has been.
You cannot watch Joe Blink activities and then know that Joe Blink is a "bang-bang" or know that he is a "paranoid dipso dementia praecoxo," see? Or a "psychiatrico nutto" or something. See?

The reason this girl keeps going to the water fountain is she's thirsty, you see? And you base this diagnosis on the fact that there's a – there's a "gymnastico potto" is a firebug and is uncomfortable when they are absent from water. And so this person is seen to be going to water rather routinely, so you say he's a "gymnastico potto." You see?

No, that had nothing to do with the case whatsoever. The case happened to be thirsty. Case is stuck in an engram actually which is in the middle of the Sahara Desert, and they're a member of the French Foreign Legion, see? And they know at that moment they are a member of the French Foreign Legion, and is awfully thirsty, and that their water bottle has run out, see? And the trouble with this person is this person can be aware of all – all that they can be aware of and so forth is privation. They can be aware of not having anything. See, that's the diagnosis, you see? Well, they can at least have water. And the remedy of the case might take an entirely different thing than water or thirst or fire or something associated with water. That's just that. It's just something else. But the conduct would not be a direct entrance to it. As a matter of fact that one is too direct.

Trouble with psychosis is it's psychotic. It's very hard to understand. But the moment that you grasp this one principle about psychosis and about neurosis and about other mental disabilities, and so forth, or about being a Homo sapiens, you get this as a stable datum and you've got it: That – don't diagnose by conduct ever. Don't. Don't draw any conclusion from conduct. This – just skip that, because that's going to be a blind alley.

What you want now, if you see some conduct that you didn't expect, then all you know at that moment is that you don't know about something. See? But that is something to know! Now, instead of jumping in there with a bunch of pretended knowingness and say he's a "gymnastico psychiatrico potto squigo," you see, and "That's what's wrong with the case, see?" with great pomposity and,"Why, he's a 'gymnastico potto,' you know, and so forth. And you will find that written in the text of Mr. Wumphgulum, yes." Damn it, the person is still in an institution! You get the – but this terrific false pomposity, you see, of giving them some beautiful label because they have some conduct or another doesn't lead to a solution, and it's bad science.

The physical sciences have gotten ahead because they long ago left the various schools of astronomy and so forth which said, "There couldn't possibly be an eighth planet because seven is the perfect number" That's actually true in the – in the annals of astronomy. That statement was said. All kinds of wild things.

Well, when science departed from that and says, "Well, when you don't – when something isn't working you haven't got the answer." That's all science had to find to become science. And from that moment on, why, the physical sciences have advanced by leaps and bounds. Because when they find something doesn't work or the situation didn't resolve and so forth, they don't sit back with great pomposity and say, "Well, that's the Einsteinian 'poco-moco.'" They say, "Well, hell, that must be wronger than a three-dollar Confederate note. Let's see, what is the reason behind this?" See? "What law is applying here?" you see? They
have the advantage of having the workable thing right out in front of their face, and they can see whether it works or doesn't work, you see? But you start substituting an authoritative utterance, you see, for a resolution of the situation, an – you can go mad, and that is psychosis. And that's where the mental sciences were parked when we came along – right there.

Now, this goes further than that. When you're trying to find out about some pc in order to run some process on the pc or straighten the pc out somehow or another, and you base what you do on the conduct of the pc other than his good and bad indicators – good and bad indicators, conduct: That's the visible fact of are you going the right way or the wrong way? That's just a few little road signs. But you base what you do on what the pc is doing and you'll go –

you'll go round the bend right along with the psychiatrist.

This pc is nattering at you, so obviously conduct would indicate that you must have done something wrong. This is one of the hardest things that an auditor has to learn. The pc is nattering at him, "Nah, I've had better auditors than you, and so forth, back in the co-audit. Nya-nya!" See? And we get all this mad dissertation and so on.

Well, if the auditor – can take that as an indicator, see? Now he knows that he doesn't know. There is a datum there he doesn't know. Just forget about the missed withhold aspect of it. There's something he doesn't know about this pc. You just ask this pc, "Is there something about you I don't know?" You don't have to worry about the mechanics of missed withholds, you see? You've uttered the utterance which is true, and that's the truest utterance. He is behaving in some way which you didn't expect, so therefore, there is something about him you didn't know!

Now, the remedy of the situation is, "What about you didn't I know, brother?"

"Well, nyah-nyah! Well-well-well, you could put it that way, and so forth. Well, I ate your lunch today. That's why you couldn't find it! Ha! Ha!" [laughter]

So, when you see – when you see conduct that is not understood by you, don't give it a label! Don't give it a label; know this thing now – know this thing about that: Know that you don't know. And learn to be humble enough to admit when you don't know something. Otherwise you'll just go on being authoritative and pomposity will rampant itself all over the place. Do you follow?

If every time you saw some situation that you didn't understand and, because you had to maintain your dignity or your classification or something, you promptly said, "Ah, that is 'gumbo potto gymnastico,' ye-e-s, hmmm," you're being a fool, because the situation isn't going to resolve. That situation will not resolve. Because the only thing that keeps the situation from resolving is the unknownness or unawareness.

So if the scale of sanity, of course, is awareness all the way up, then the scale of aberration as you go down is degree of increasing unawareness. So the nuttier they are, the more unaware both that person and yourself would be regarding what's going on! And the more unaware they get, why, the harder they are to handle because it is hard to get their attention long enough to find out what you don't know! Not to find out something to know, but to find out what you don't know. You understand?
You get into a tremendous blur of the "don't knows," man, are sky-wide and deep, see? Your – when you got a person that's way down at the other end of this Scale of Awareness, why, the degree of unawareness, you see is fabulous! So just trying to get – you're just trying to push at the person enough so that he will become aware enough so that you can find out enough to find out what you don't know about the person, do you understand – would be the entrance point.

Now, the gain would be, is "What can I now find out about this person, and what can this person find out about himself?" And by increasing that awareness scale as you come up the line of course the individual will get saner and saner and brighter and brighter and come back to battery and become more aware, be himself, and his old abilities will come back, and he'll lay aside some umpty-ump trillion-trillion-trillions of pure mud. He all of a sudden will be himself.

But as, of course, he comes up the scale and becomes aware of something, he'll hit various dynamic situations that he becomes aware of, see? And sometimes these are a little bit hard to take.

Sometime somebody who has been howling around about his family and how his family was mean to him and that sort of thing – one fine day wakes up to the fact that it's a great probability that his family never even saw him in all the years he was with them, and that all of his propitiation and figuring and striving and struggling was all in vain because he was dealing with mama and papas, and sisters and aunts that never would have seen it if it had turned into a thousand dollar bill under their noses. See, they never would have become aware of Johnnie.

And when you realize how far one might well have taken his life off of its normal course in order to do something that somebody like that would approve of, it's a horrible shock to realize that such persons would never have noticed it to approve of it. And then this becomes even more complex as they very often would have approved of things that hadn't happened at all. Give one a tremendous sense of unreality. "Dear Johnnie, I'm so very glad you have been made a general lately." And the guy was just dismissed with a dishonorable discharge, you know? It can get that gappy. Sometimes one doesn't detect them and one sometimes falsely pretends on these things and accepts things or statements from people which have no bearing or reality on what is going on.

So this study of awareness of what can somebody be aware of is quite a subject. And what you – you have to eat humble pie, you see, to begin this subject at all. You have to know that there is something in the universe you don't know, and that, for a person who is way downscale, is the most dangerous utterance that he could possibly make, because he's already totally sealed off from everything, and if everyone realized how blind he was and so forth, of course, they'd just eat him up!

So he compensates for his unawareness by automatic mechanisms of pretense. And you'll find some bird that's way downscale like that and, my God, the things he knows that he doesn't know are fabulous. And the last thing in the world – he wouldn't have courage enough to say, "Well, I don't know anything about that." And yet he can't resolve any situation until he says, "Well, what do you know! I've got an area where I don't know!" See, at that moment
he can make a tremendous amount of progress because then he can start pulling on that area and taking a look at it, you see, and he'll all of a sudden find something in that area that'd be quite surprising and quite interesting and quite necessary for him to locate.

So, when you see somebody behaving oddly, why, the first thing and really the only thing you know is that there's something there you don't know. There's something both you and he are -- there's something you're certainly unaware of and there is something where he is probably unaware that he is unaware of it. Now, he'll cover that up with a pretended awareness which doesn't exist and you get these various delusive things.

This becomes a very fascinating study, and you have to keep yourself very steady on this and you have to look at -- look at -- over a situation. And it's going rah-rah-rah-rah-dhu-dhu-dhu, bop, plop, you know, and it looks like one of Yellowstone Park's geysers, you know, about to explode and so on. It's going to explode. You don't know. You don't know what's going on. But there is a way to know something about it. There is a way to know something about it. And this is quite a trick. After you've gone through the valley of despond and despair you can come up on the other side and here's a -- here's a new trick. There is something you can know about it. About anything that you confront, there is something you can know! There is something you can know about that thing! You can know that you don't know, and that is the first thing you should know about it.

So you know now there's something about the situation that you don't know. So, now you will take the action to find out and just in the process of finding out, the whole thing will clarify. It's the most magical thing you ever observed in your life. That's that first thing.

So there is something you can know about anything. There is something you can know about the internal government of Russia. Never read a textbook on it, never looked at it, nothing; but there is something you can know about it: You can know that you don't know what it is. Now, knowing that you don't know what it is, and so forth, why, you can get ahold of a little textbook or something and you can also know this: You can know that that guy doesn't know either. [laughter]

But here's the amazing thing about aberration and here's where you come in and where's -- here's where this is very, very valuable: If you did find out, the internal government of Russia would either go Clear or collapse. That sounds utterly impossible, but happens to be true.

So running an engram out of organizations, running an engram out of the individual, running somebody Clear, and so forth, would be to simply continue to pull into view something he didn't know about. And the only way you could fail to pull something into view and so forth would be consistently to suppose that you knew all there was to know about it and there wasn't anything else for you to learn at all about this, because there'll always be some curve on it.

Even though you knew the whole bank, the end words very often have become upside down and backwards and reconnected -- although they will run straight according to plot, and so forth -- the upside-downness and backwardness of the arrangements the way he's got them squashed up will make quite a different situation. You don't know what he's got stacked up
where. That's one of the things you don't know. Do you see? Well, you can find all these things out.

So, on the basis of it, this has been very well worthwhile. And becoming Clear, you might say, is a process of becoming more and more aware, and you become up to a point of where you also become aware of where you are unaware, and you see that rather quickly. And then when you notice one of those, why, you either decide that it is – you should find out or it doesn't make any difference, you see, whether you do or not. And if it's some area where you should find out, you can pull on it very quickly, and magically will appear into view the dog-gonedest situation that you never suspected before and when you pull that situation into view it quite normally collapses all by itself.

Now I suppose as some of us cross this band and get onto the other side, we start asking questions of the human race – we're not quite sure what will happen. But that won't excuse you from studying to get there on your own steam. [laughter]

But a great deal of reali... revelation does occur. It's not always palatable; not always nice to find out these things – but the clearer you get, why, the shorter time you find it distasteful and the more familiar you can be with it.

Well, I hope it'll help you out somehow or another in handling pcs and processing and understanding the human race to realize that they go thirty-two levels below zero and I don't think I've hit bottom yet. We probably are merely to the upper class of the society. But then I'm just being snide.

Thank you very much.
Thank you.

Thank you. Well now, I think that's probably an appreciation to the release we made today. You're living in a – you're living in a different world, and right now, than you were a couple of weeks ago, and we get even with people these days, we release them! [laughs]

Anyway, we've been knocking them out here, left, right and center with these new Power Processes, and of course I've been D of Ping straight down on this line, Mary Sue's been doing the folders and so forth. And it's nothing new for me now to come in the office, and all of a sudden somebody tears in and says, "Well, we just made another one!" see? And as a matter of fact in the last two hours I see Mary Sue sitting there telling me, "We just made a Release, we can't do anything with her, her needle is just floating free, and it's at Clear read and that is it!" And this is starting to get very routine. These things that we worked for for months in the past, and so forth, the state of release, is of course the old state of Keyed-Out Clear. And what we used to work for in the past and get sporadically on this person, that person and so forth, we now get one for one.

They walk in here, they've had it! In something – in something under fifty hours they'll be a Release, and that's it. And this is quite astonishing. And that's why I say the Bridge is open. And that's for sure! And not only that but it's walked back into the public thirty-four levels down. We know we can audit anybody who is thirty-four levels below Zero.

That chart by the way doesn't say that there aren't additional levels – the new Grada-
tion Chart – below that point, but I have not had time to do scout work in a – in an institution to look at cases, and I tell you if a psychiatrist can agree they're nuts they really must be! [laughter]

But anyway, to make a long story short, these are very, very exciting times, and you haven't really begun to see the tidal wave yet. I'm just seeing it now, on my desk, in amongst the few of us who are in there slugging on the Case-Cracking Unit of Review, and so on. The auditors' doing a marvelous job, and Mary Sue's doing a wonderful job on this, and we've been working day and night this last week to get out there confidential bulletins upon these particular subjects.

You say "Confidential?" Yes, because some Class W Auditor auditing these things would just – well he'd not only just mess up, he'd mess up himself, too. The weird part of it is
it's too simple. It's too simple. It's – it requires too pure a rendition, you see, no additives, no monkey business, no this and that, see. You've got the processes that take people up the line, and on fairly average cases as a matter of fact, our – these new Power processes which are the Class VII or the Clear's processes on the aberrated person and so forth are just wham! Crash!

And I've seen – I've already seen an auditor try to audit these things who was not himself up in a terrific case state and he just went wham! himself. Got the idea? He can't audit them. Case isn't far enough advanced. But, this is it, man. This is it. Now we know we can make Clears and so forth, that's up there above VI, and OT, that road's been open now for some little time. People have been slugging away at it, and that sort of thing.

But the news is, is thirty-four levels below Zero, straight to release, in under fifty hours – crash! The only way you can get that, by the way, is become an intern on the (commercial!) an intern at Saint Hill for Class VII after completing your Class VI work. And I would advise you very much to do so, but if you do so you will have to work in an organization because we're not about to tear the public to pieces. You understand? We're just – we're just going to release people, and this is one we don't spoil.

The road is wide open for the human race, until we find somebody out in the backwoods of Montauk, I won't mention any names – like Horner and Berner, [laughter] because that'd be libelous and so forth. These characters grabbing ahold of somebody and trying to run end words on them. Oh, for God's sakes, how silly can you get, see? And trying to show some bird in the raw meat, you know, "Well all you have to do is sit down in front of the meter..." and the next thing you know the guy is wrapped around a telegraph pole and it takes four derricks and seven Class V's to dig him out of it, see. Bah!

That's a vicious – that's not a careless thing to do, that's a vicious thing to do. And I don't think it's intended any other way. It's "Let's fix them up so they can't go." Well, the way to do that is to grab some upper-scale process that is overwhelming the guy, and overwhelm him but good, and we have – catch them once in a while, that have been overwhelmed by upper-scale processes, and then we start to release them for the first several hours while all that pours off of them is the upper-scale processes they couldn't dig. Do you follow? And they just pour off as terrific locks, right on present time, the guy is just boxed in like mad. His own case hasn't been touched, don't you see?

So these things have to be handled with some skill. And we've got it made, and we also have got the horsepower necessary to make it stick. And we sure jolly well intend to do so.

I had good news today, most orgs are resurging on the State of Emergency which they've been in, and one or two orgs which are still down are arguing with me about putting in my administrative policies. But they're still down. I wonder if there's any coincidence? [laughs] Anyway, anyway, these are great days to live in.

We're going to see quite a few new students, and some of you who have been hanging fire around here – I just opened up the trail for you and so forth. Took Clay Table out of your road here in the last 24 hours. You may not have noticed this but I have swept it off the line as a process.
No particular reason to have it as a process, you can put it clear down to Level Zero as a demonstration. Process is marvelous stuff with which to demonstrate a definition, and that sort of thing, but I've taken it off the road as processes. When people start to process raw meat with Clay Table, and so forth, they neglect one small point, but they neglect it so uniformly around the world, that we better take it out. Because Clay Table, peculiarly amongst all other processes, requires that the auditing question be answered. And — [laughter, laughs] it's sufficiently uniform that auditors in HGCs have not been able to get it answered, that Clay Table is the one they fall down on hardest. So I was looking for things to take off schedules. It wasn't that Clay Table was bad, it's red hot. But I was looking for things to take off so I swept Clay Table out of your road.

And also cut your auditing checksheets to ribbons, just last night. So there's only a few processes left on your auditing checksheet. So, you should be able to move up through the top fairly rapidly now. Doing everything I can to clear the way for you, and I think that you will find it fairly clear.

The situation internationally, also, has improved enormously; I might make a little bulletin on that effect. The attack on Scientology in the United States has disintegrated into a rout for the government. They are now being attacked — not mildly put — by the United States Senate, and by — and very shortly the House is going to open the ball on the FDA. [applause]

Australia, their report from the inquiry has been delayed so long — the usual course of those reports and inquiries they have down there. They seem to do this quite routinely, in Victoria, they have inquiries, and then they forget about them. And the last three inquiries, as desperate as they were in progress and so forth, all wound up in no legislation. And so that one will undoubtedly dead-end, too. Because its report isn't even due in Parliament for months. And Parliament is recessing. And all of that kind of thing is happening. And if we can find Victoria, why we will set it to rights, one way or the other. If we can find it.

You know, you're only dealing with a tiny little postage stamp on the face of the earth and what seems to be bowling everybody over, down in — in Australia is this fantastic news which keeps coming in to them from the United States, you see. Government runs up white flag, you see. This sort of thing. They seem to be very hungry for that news. Actually it's been very hard on the staff down there, mainly, they've been knocked around and knocked around and knocked around.

True, they're so far off-policy that they set themselves up to be knocked around. But nevertheless they did get knocked around, and they're — they've had it pretty hard and heavy. And they'll be snapping back along the line.

Most HCO Secs and Assoc Secs in the world — I don't think this — you know this — are being flown into Saint Hill over the next many weeks, and so forth, routinely, one right after the other, for briefing, for releasing and for jelling in on the new org board, and so forth. I mean, we're getting ready to roll. We mean business. And this will completely change a lot of peoples' viewpoints in a lot of ways, and get a lot of questions answered and so forth.

It's very funny, these people fly in here, and their own area concerns are so terrific, you see, that they — these things have got to be answered right away. And they're rather impatient with this idea of being put off, and that sort of thing, and could be jelled in. But what —
what they really don't know is that the new organizational setup solves all the problems they brought in with them, see. And this – that is the cue to that.

But anyway, things are moving very hot, and very heavy, and you're very fortunate right here at this particular time not to have graduated last month! [laughter]

Anyway, the – there's a lot of you that I'm looking at right this moment I want to see go through this new Class VII Review Unit, just as soon as you get through with VI. So let's whip it up, huh? I could let you in on what else is going to happen but I've talked about enough here, now, and so forth.

Probably people thought I was exaggerating or something of the sort, when I said we were going to take the planet. But I've always meant just that. See, I haven't meant anything else. And the plans are now taking shape and form, with which to do this exact thing. And the big difficulty on this is you've got to do something like this so that it doesn't overweight somebody's plate. An executive, for instance, who is – who's got so many lines coming in to him, and he's so crossed-up and he's got so many jobs, expansion to him begins to mean simply overwork. And he begins to say, "Oh, no! We're not going to get any bigger because I can't do any more!", don't you see.

So we had to set up an organizational plan which would relieve an executive of this – this terrific burden, and which permitted the organizations to go up in size. We have that, and we are right now in an organizational phase where we're just at the end of Dissemination – I know that sounds odd, but it's not at all. We've got to hand out the materials we've got, in the way which we already have planned, you see. So Dissemination as a phase in Scientology, although it will now manifest itself; is actually toward the end of its action, see.

For instance, I could tell you what to lecture to a bunch of people in a PE that would sound to you to be about the easiest thing that you ever did in your life. You'd say, "But that couldn't possibly have anything to do with a PE," and yet they would all be enthusiastically howlingly for you, right straight there – from that straight on. For instance you've seen the gradation scale. Well, if you lectured to PE about the need for change, you see, things should be changed. You of course could lecture by the hour, see. And you could say the most banal things, you see, like, "Your home life really needs to be changed," see, "World affairs need to be changed." You'll find the world press is instantly right in your pocket. Because that's the only message they have to sell.

See, the really hot-shot reporter is simply selling the world on the idea that it needs to be changed. Of course, he's got the idea of how bad it is "over there" and so forth, but nevertheless your world press does this, it – they jump aboard the bandwagon – they'd go down as far as disaster, they do this, that and the other thing, but they'll come right back and say there should be a change, you see. And that's the featured news, you know. "US should get out of Vietnam." Well, it's in need of change, don't you see. I mean, it's all covered. You find your leading, hot, front-page news stories are always the need of change, you see. "People shouldn't be so careless to set apartment houses on fire," don't you see, "because of the..." You know, I mean it – whatever they're saying, it's a protest. And of course every revolutionary group in the world has only this message: "We need a change!"
And frankly, revolutions are popular up until the point where you give them the change that is to be made into! Then they tend to cool off; don't you see?

This is a – therefore you find yourself on the lines of world press on the basis of agreement with world press. And if you simply – somebody asks you as a reporter – says, "What do you – what is this Scientology and what does this Scientology stand for?" Well, treat him as a beginning Scientologist not an HPA, and you say, "What do we stand for? We stand for change. Change to a better existence for man, that's what we stand for" And he'd say, "Dogooders, huh?"

"No, no, we're not really trying to do good, we're just trying to change things." [laughter]

And if you could hold the fort at that point, and just keep putting out that message, he eventually would become very satisfied that you are all right and you are very newsworthy. You see?

"What change do you propose?" and so forth.

"Well, we think that everything should change!" [laughter, laughs] Just go into big generalities, and so forth. Play it by ear! You don't have to tell him anything. He'd wind up in total agreement with you.

What you haven't had is your minus-zero levels. And that scale, which I'll give you a lecture on one of these days, if I ever get around to it, is actually a scale of awareness, and you've never had that scale before, and you very possibly in looking at it believe you're looking at the old scales, and you're not. You're looking at a brand-new scale, and it's the scale of awareness. The scale of what he can be aware of. It's what the person can be aware of or the group can be aware of or the civilization can be aware of. So that is an awareness scale, and that opens the line right up the line to release on study alone. Because it has a trick: If you can locate what a person is aware of on that scale, you only have to tell him about the next level, and he'll become aware of that and experience case change. See, the basic discovery of that is case improvement by education. That's a brand-new technical thing.

People have sort of believed that might possibly exist. But it isn't executed as shown by the fact that in Johannesburg when we were testing children we found out the further they advanced in school the lower their IQ was. So they must have been educated downhill in some way. So you could practically educate a person uphill or downhill. But that is an awareness scale. And the next time you look at that scale I call it to your attention to wrap your wits around that very carefully, and examine that fact or very carefully because you're going to get it confused with conduct.

Now that a person is being hysterical does not put him at the level of hysteria. He's dramatizing hysteria, but what is he aware of? Do you follow? It's what is he aware of? It doesn't show – conduct was the wrong answer. You do not estimate cases by conduct. Only estimate cases by what they can be aware of. And you will have parted company with the psychiatrist and the psychologist, and all the rest of the -ists and -ips of history. Because that's awareness. And after all, we're dealing with a living thing that can be aware and that is the
thing that we can know about a being without any argument at all. And we're dealing with that being's ability to be aware.

Now when we say aware do we mean analytical or reactive? We mean analytically aware. Now that puts people down pretty doggone far. It also makes it a little bit hard to detect. We have this guy flying around and everything he touches turns to disaster. You see, if we were dealing by conduct we would say, "That is disaster. His level is disaster." Nooo, no, no, no! Let's go down, down, from disaster, because obviously disaster is an overwhelm. See, he's dramatizing it, so it must be – a disaster must be higher than he is. Now where below that is he aware? What is he aware of? And we go down several levels and we will run into what the person is aware of. By our experience with the person, it's what he talks about or seems to be alert to.

There are lower levels than minus thirty-four on that gradation scale, by the way, and they are also reachable by the Power Processes which we are using now to release people, but I had to get the scale out. And that's why you see on that particular one that the bottom line, where I have turned the bottom levels sideways and so forth, don't even go to the edge of the paper. That's by design. There are two levels below that, there's – there's reasonableness, and there's false causation. They're two known levels below that. And marvelous!

You take reasonableness – that everything is reasonable. No matter what anybody would say to the bloke it appears to be completely reasonable. That's a well-known phenomenon that we've talked about before. But it's down there below uncausing, and false causation of course is below uncausing. This guy has gotten tired of never having any cause for anything, so he invents them. And can go down scale from there.

But anyway, you'll find – you'll find the human race lying toward the end of that scale. You won't find them toward the top of that scale. In other words the fellow who's aware of being hysterical is probably pretty high-toned. You see, he's a pretty high-toned bloke. But you – how many preclears have you run into that are aware of uncausing? They're aware of causing nothing. Well, how many times have you tried to pull an overt on somebody who says he hasn't done anything? He's never done anything, anyplace, to anybody anywhere. It's impossible to pull an overt because the person is at the level of uncausing, don't you see? There isn't any and he never has!

It's hardly even fate causes anything, it's just – it just happens. That's – we even had a song in the United States not too long ago, "What will be, will be." Not caused by anything, you see. One of the reasons religion has gone out of vogue is they've gone below a perception of God. Wouldn't that be a popular sermon for a church? And isn't it true? I don't know where you would go to get a perception of God. Since by definition he's invisible!

That by the way is the greatest ARC break operation that has ever been pulled in the history of the human race. The God who is everywhere, has no mass, a God of total generality and total unlocatability – who has total power and total causation. One ARC break coming straight up, thank you! Think it over. It's perfectly true!

Well now, this lecture which you're going to get today, starts now! [laughter] Oh, you think you've had a lecture? Oh, no, they're just some casual comments! I'm going to give you a lecture now, and you better peel your ears back because I do mean – anyone and everyone
that happens to hit this one. I'm going to talk to you about ARC breaks and present time problems. And the preamble of this lecture is as follows – I know I gave you no comm bridge between these two, the remarks and the lecture but now the lecture has started. Got it?

Will you please differentiate between ARC breaks and present time problems! Because, please note that about ninety-five percent of the "ARC broke pcs" (unquote) that you are doing ARC break assessments on are not in an ARC break. They're in a PTP.

Now when you lost sight of that, why you also lost your grip on smooth auditing. Because you can take a pc and say he is ARC broken when he's in PT problem, and you are then in the situation of trying to fix the car when it's the radio that's broken. Worse than that – worse than that, the ARC break is usually after a present time problem unless it is a flagrant case of bypassed charge.

Now let me – let me clarify that, that takes some explaining. What is a present time problem? A present time problem is postulate-counter-postulate. This means, then, that an individual is at war. Don't get the idea of a PTP being something that somebody just worries about, you know, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry. He doesn't! He's again something. You got it? He's again it. He isn't sitting there, even though he's worry-worry-worrying, he's still worrying about something he is against, something he doesn't like, something which is counter to his postulates, which causes him to worry, worry, worry, and go into apathy and all that sort of thing.

Now let's examine this very carefully. We have a husband who is having an argument with his wife. One says, "I'm going to go to the movies" and the other says, "You are not going to go to the movies." Well now you're looking at warfare. You're not looking at an ARC break. But very shortly afterwards they will both of them appear to be ARC broken.

Now if you come along as an auditor and you find this girl who just walked off from her husband, looking all sad and weepy, and that sort of thing, and you try to pick up the bypassed charge, well you'd probably find some, which is the fooler, but she wouldn't get any better. You see?

Now if you tried to find on her the problem, she would snap out of it at once. Do you see? "What's the problem?"

"Well, he wants to go to the movies and I don't want him to go to the movies." You follow? "And then we had an argument. And then he wouldn't talk to me."

Well now, look at the sequence on the track. ARC break, argument and then breakup of the comm formula. Now you put this person on a meter and you say, "Now, has anybody not acknowledged your communication?"

"Grrow!"

You say, "Oh, that's very good, yes, who was that?"

"Well, it was my husband."

You say, "Oh, fine. Now do you feel all better?"

"No."
Why don't they feel all better? Well, it's very elementary, that wasn't what was wrong with them!

Now, if you go around patching up people for broken legs when they've got cracked skulls, you're going to have some case failures. I just wish to call to your attention that this is not the right end to approach the case, don't you see. If the case has got a fractured skull then you do something about the fractured skull, see? If the case has got a fractured postulate, do something about the fractured postulate, you know? Don't do something about their bypassed charge. Elementary.

Now, what is the real condition of somebody in a present time problem? ARC broken? No. At war. They're going to get even! G-rrr! Brrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr! [laughter] See? Postulate-counter-postulate.

When England went to war with Germany, it was because Germany postulated one way and England postulated the other way. And that was a great big problem. Lasted several years, very recently. And there was no auditor around, there was only guns. And nobody took their guns away from them. Do you see?

Now, I assure you it would have done no good to have run Hitler on an ARC break. You would have had to run him on a PTP. And who knows, if some auditor had been there and run him on a PTP that might not have been the end of the war? Although it probably would have taken a Power Process.

But all right, now let's go back and look at a thing which we had, we call overts. Now why does a person commit overts? There's only one reason a person commits overts (because we now mean intentional overts, not accidentals). You can accidentally drop something on somebody, although you'll usually trace that one back to an intentional, too.

What is an overt? An overt is a solution to a problem.

Now when you define an overt as a solution to a problem, you open up the ordinary, run-of-the-mill, even the very low Level case, wide open to solution. But when you define an overt or a series of overts as an ARC break, you close it to solution.

So I'm tired of seeing you get loses. I'm very tired of seeing you get loses on pcs by this misdiagnosis. I know you have good heart. I know you feel sympathetic. I know that your heart is torn to see somebody standing there weeping because somebody has been mean to them. And you want to help them out. And I know the mildest thing you can say to them is, "Do you have an ARC break?" and the roughest thing to say to them is, "What overt have you committed?" But the resolution of the case is not, "Who has been mean to you?" The resolution of the case is, "Who have you been mean to?" Process the pc at cause, always.

Well now, because it's so impolite to ask them, "What have you done?" and because a case is usually having a very hard time struggling along, trying to get his bearings and so forth – particularly if he's low on levels or something, and can't cause anything and never has, and so forth – this case then is going to have a very rough time trying to answer this question, "Have you committed an overt?" Because he's never committed an overt, because it was all vitally necessary. It's totally justified.
Well let's ask the more penetrating question. And the more penetrating question is, "Why is it so vitally necessary that he commit this overt, and why is it so totally justified?"

Well, it is those two things simply because it was a problem which required solution.

Now what throws you is that the problem is on the backtrack someplace, lost in the limbo of God-knows-where, that has in many cases nothing whatsoever to do with present time.

Well, let's take somebody who's been married seven or eight times. Do you know they're probably still solving the problems with their second wife when married to the seventh one. Do you see? And many a person in life, coming up against a marital partner, and finding it completely impossible to understand why this person believes these things and does these things, commits these overts and so forth, doesn't realize that that person is still solving the problems related to an earlier relationship. The problem does not exist in present time. Therefore, the pro... person seems unreasonable. And yet, to that other person, it is a present time problem and can advisedly be called a present time problem because it is present time for him. Because there hasn't been any present time ever since it happened. That was the last present time he had much to do with. See, he hasn't been with us since.

And a person's overts are solutions to these hung problems. And it's very hard to figure out how having an automobile accident, routinely and regularly, banging up the car as a habit solves any problem. But if you carefully examine the case, you would find out that it solved a very pertinent pressing problem which went back to postulate-counter-postulate. Maybe it's with father. Maybe father never let him use a car. So therefore the way to solve this problem, and so forth, is to make a car unusable.

You say, well that's – that's crazy. That's right! [laughter] You take it back a little further, and you'll find more sensible problems and it actually, if you go very far you will find out that it all makes sense! In a giddy, stupid way, it makes sense. It is not a senseless thing you're going into.

Now let's find some fellow, he's around a plant and we can never discover this boy. You look for him, you page him, you put him on the intercom, you send messengers for him, and so forth, you never seem to be able to catch up with this bird, although he is at work! Well, for the last few lifetimes he has handled the military very effectively by desertion. And the way he handles life is by not being there when he is there. He's still got one solution, see, which is desertion, but actually he's on the job while he has deserted. Do you follow? So he's in a continual missingness. You look for Joe and he's gone. You look for Bill, he's gone, you know? Where is this boy? Where's he disappeared to? Well that was his solution.

Now, it's obviously a solution to getting out of work. So we bawl him out, see, obviously that – so we bawl him out and we say, "It won't do you any good to keep cutting out of here," and so forth, "you've got to work and earn your pay, and you must work..." And then you find out this is somehow very wrong, because somehow he manages to get his work done, too. And that doesn't – doesn't remedy the guy. He's still all fouled up. He's still all messed up, as far as you're concerned, even though you told him straight out. Says, "You're just trying to get out of work, that's why you disappear" Well, that was the wrong as-isness. So it wasn't an as-isness and so the question... if you said, "It won't do you any good to desert, you have to go
up on the lines, just as you're ordered," he would have sighed deeply and gone into a sort of a frenzy and gone anaten and after that wouldn't have had this.

In other words, if you told him the right problem – this is just hazarding a guess, I'm not giving you a technique [laughter] because the devil himself could never in – never, never dream up what problem this bird is actually in, don't you see. If you could hit it right on the head, why, bang! That'd be that. And he'd change his conduct right there. Be nothing to changing his conduct, see. "Oh!" he'd say. You get what you'd call a cognition. "Oh, it isn't going to do me any good to desert. Oh. Well, I don't know why I would desert around here, anyhow." And it'd suddenly looks silly to him, you know. "And I, furthermore, well look, I haven't deserted! I'm here!" And yet that would be the end of this phenomenon of missing-ness. Do you see?

Now you look on a lot of things as overts which are in actual fact vitally necessary solutions to urgent, immediate problems of survival. The only thing wrong with them is when. [laughter] That's what makes them look daffy.

Now you could go back and use old Dianetic technology on this line. You could say, "When I snap my fingers the date will flash." (Don't bother to have any date flash right now, I'm not auditing you.) [laughter] "I snap my fingers the date will flash." [snaps finger] See? Bang, there goes the thing. And he says, "Five." You – if you were to have said at that moment or if you said at that moment – this is, you know, the old file clerk, flash response, all right – and "Five." Five years, you know, bang. Of course it might have been the year Five, too, we're never sure. And you say, this fellow says, "1932," or something like that.

"What problem did you have in 1932?"

Now, I'll tell you you'll get many, many manifestations. But amongst them won't be disinterest! [laughter] He is absorbed! You put him right there on the time track where he is solving that problem.

Now, to try to get the major problem that exists on somebody's time track and so forth, may very well require Power Processes and so forth. This is one of the manifestations which shows up. But it doesn't require a Power Process for you to become clever at this. Because if a person has some fundamental problem in his life, I don't care when it was or where it was, it has formed innumerable locks. And those locks have moved on up to PT, and those locks are the overts and the withholds which the person is committing right in present time. So those formed locks are a perfectly legitimate target for an assist, they are perfectly legitimate bait for any auditor in any session. You don't have to ask for the overts, if you ask for the solutions to the problem. And then if you're very careful that you got all the solutions to the problem.

So the old process of; "Tell me a problem." "And now, what solutions have you had to this problem?" By the way, that was a slight misnomer, see, "What solutions have you had to this problem?" No, "What solutions did you put into effect to solve this problem?" would have been a closer question, you see. Well, that old process was nibbling around the edges of overt-withhold processes. And you actually could work this in such a way as to run O/W on the person by just saying, "Tell me a problem. Now what have you done to solve that problem?" Or, "How have you attempted to solve that problem?" Or, "What would have solved the
problem?" Or, "What action of yours was a solution to the problem?" Do you see what I'm getting at?

Because any action they took to solve the problem was an overt to some degree because it was against another postulate. Do you follow?

So therefore, when you keep sailing in on somebody, asking him for ARC breaks, you're not talking about what's wrong with him in the majority of cases. An ARC break is a charge which has been restimulated on the backtrack, which the person hasn't had move into his total consciousness. It's just a borderline consciousness, you understand? Now he's – he's had an accident. And you come just near enough the accident to clip it against the outer fringes of his consciousness. Now he instantly starts to avoid this accident, and becomes very upset, and a charge has gone into effect on his backtrack which hasn't been identified. And that is what an ARC break is. An ARC break is bypassed charge. Hasn't really anything to do with the solutions to problems.

Now, an individual who is failing to complete a communication cycle, because somebody won't acknowledge it and so forth, only has really the bypassed charge of a missed withhold. It was an inadvertent missed withhold. It's a very spooky thing to be auditing a pc, and look for overts and withholds, and keep getting a read on a withhold, and the pc starts going around the bend trying to think what this withheld is, only to discover that it is an inadvertent withhold. He didn't intend to withhold it, just nobody would acknowledge it! He never intended to withhold it at all. Inadvertent withhold.

Now, an inadvertent withhold will cause very near the same phenomena as an actual withhold. Preclear's sitting there trying to tell his auditor the answer to the question. And the auditor says, "Do birds fly?" and the pc says, "Uh – big birds do," see. And the auditor keeps asking him, "Well, what sort of birds?" "Well, big birds." "Well, what sort of birds?" "Big birds." "What sort of birds?"

All of a sudden the pc (quote) "ARC breaks." Well, he actually doesn't ARC break, you have really put into effect the mechanism of a withhold. And so, of course, he gets nasty and nattery and choppy, and so forth. But you call it an ARC break. Do you see? That's a slight misnomer.

Now, the only reason that it's an ARC break is you've bypassed the charge of his answer. So that much of it is an ARC break. But the better part of it is is you've given him a problem! He's now trying to solve it. He's being told to answer the question and he is not being permitted to. Which is again a question versus an answer, or a postulate counter a postulate, which won't resolve, so it sets up in counter-opposition, and that is a problem. If you get a pc who's been chopped up, and so forth, by not having his answers acknowledged or accepted by the auditor and so on, it's very interesting that it will solve quite rapidly by asking him about what problem he has had in auditing. He'll give you this problem and that problem and the other problem and so forth, and all of a sudden. "Well, the problem of getting somebody to listen to me!" And that will be the end of that problem. Do you follow?

Now if you wanted to get his overts against auditors, you would say then, "Then how did you go about solving it?" and he gives you a whole string of overts which previously had been completely out of sight. Well, he comes to session late, don't you see, he reports auditors
to supervisors, he – you see, when they haven't done anything. You see, he could go on and on and on and he'd give you a whole bunch of these little overts, don't you see. Do you see how this put-together goes?

Now you could easily be misled, because there is a bypassed charge there, immediately in the session, which does respond to some degree to an ARC break phenomena. So you say he must have an ARC break. Oh, yes, he also has an ARC break, but that ARC break doesn't happen to be clean-up-able. It would be pretty hard to clean up that ARC break as a surface manifestation because it doesn't have anything to do with the problem. He only had an ARC break because he had a problem. Now if you were to clean up the problem and the problems he had had in relationship to his auditing, why, a whole string of ARC breaks will blow – so-called! See? You get rid of a lot of them and also a whole string of overts.

So the way to approach it was not by finding out this little tiny piece of bypassed charge that occurred in the session. The way to knock this thing apart was to find out that colossal number of problems he has had about auditing. Do you follow? "What problem have you had with me about auditing?"

"Well, very often you didn't seem to listen to me." See?

"Well, how did you handle this?"

"Well, I stopped telling you right answers."

Now the reason this is solvable is that problems and awareness of problems, is down below minus thirty-four. Problems is way south. And cause is way north. So of course, you try to pull problems directly with O/W, the pc would have to already be so high-toned they wouldn't have any effect on him if you did pull them. But you can discuss problems with most everybody. If you go into a spinbin, and just stop the first person you meet and say, "Do you have a problem?" Oh-ho-oh, brother, does he have a problem! But he's liable not to tell you about it because you'll order him to being electric shocked or something. Yeah, he's got problems. People seem to understand this, way down south. It seems to be on the basis that where there is life there is a problem.

So, your proper approach in making your pcs smooth, in making the life of your fellow Scientologists run like a well-oiled dream with auditing, is the approach through finding out what's the postulate-counter-postulate situation, when a pc feels all – or looks – all downgraded or upset, and attack it from that quarter. And you suddenly will have the magical result of somebody coming up shining!

Now, this does not say there isn't such a thing as a pres... as a bypassed charge, and an ARC break. Brother! If you want to see a good, nice, healthy ARC break, just throw an end word or something into restim on somebody that he is not aware of; and here is this total, howling generality in full play, back down his track but outside of his zone of awareness. And brother, he will ARC break! And now you really see an ARC break! Do you see? Here you've got this total generality. Because the whole bank is a total generality. Which is the most total generality that one can state, that is still true.

Oh, yes, there is such a thing as an ARC break. Very, very definitely. His affinity, reality and communication go right by the boards because he cannot locate the source of. He
cannot locate where this 'orrible feeling is coming from. He cannot identify the threat. And he goes z-z-z-z-z-z! He feels terrible. It isn't because he's sick at his stomach, it's because he doesn't know what's making him sick at his stomach. [a loud jet plane flies overhead] (Somebody get a broom and knock that down, would you?) See, it isn't that he is feeling terror, or something like this, it's because he hasn't a clue what's making him feel terror. You inadvertently list a series of end words or goals on somebody and then abandon the right one. In other words, he didn't notice that on the list, don't you see. He put the list down, and then you go right over the right one and you give him a wrong one. Well at that moment you're going to have a lovely ARC break. His affinity is going to drop, his reality is going to drop, his communication level is going to go to pot and it will happen on such a steep curve it looks like a Stuka dive bomber. ARC breaks be damned, it's an ARC smash, you see.

Now his understanding of the situation will go completely by the boards at that exact second, and in R6 you can see a person go from about Tone 40 to about Tone Minus 40 in the flash of an eye, if you goof on a bypassed charge because this total generality, he knows not what of now, has got him in a total grip. And he's spooked! And he goes, "What happened?" see? "Rroaw!" And instantaneously becomes rather irrational about the whole thing and so forth. Now you – if you've ever seen that one happen, that's a real ARC break. But this business about some Instructor bawls somebody out, and he now has an ARC break. Oh, b...! [laughter] He hasn't got an ARC break, he's got a problem! Instructor thought one thing, he thought the other thing.

Now what goes into view here, he's probably got a little series of overts against this Instructor, too, and at that moment he contemplates a few more! [laughter, laughs]

Now some student grabs ahold of him and gives him an ARC break assessment. And nothing happens. Nothing happens at all. Well, of course nothing's going to happen because you aren't running the right process, see. You're fixing the piano leg when it's the sofa pillow. And you know, it's just the funniest thing in the world, you're going to repair all the pianos in the world without fixing any piano stools. If you go around and make a habit of addressing the wrong item to repair, consistently and continually, people will get an idea that you're a pretty poor mechanic! And you'll get an idea you're a pretty poor mechanic, too, if you keep repairing sofas and then go over and play the piano to see if it plays any better but it doesn't play any better and you come back over and repair the sofa some more in order to see if the piano plays any better but the piano doesn't play any better. You can keep that up for hundreds of years. I know nobody would do that.

But in the field of auditing, remember we are dealing with things which are not visible to the naked eye. You have to know about them and you come to know about them by experience and subjective reality. And so your subjective reality on the thing will tell you this is true when you've had it happen to you a few times.

The trouble with ARC break assessments is they very often give an auditor a win. And he gets stuck in a win. And this is very often a fateful thing to happen to somebody. He's got such terrific sudden relief on the pc when he did an ARC break assessment you see, that he says, "boy!" and he's still hunting to do that. So he does it on the people with present time problems, too. And he doesn't get any wins on those, so he begins to wonder where is this
win. He begins to feel around like the guy who needs spectacles but can't find his glasses, see? "Where is this thing?" you know? "It must be around here someplace." "Well, we'll do some more ARC break assessments," and it – just nothing happens. Well, he just happened to get the fellow who – that had an end word in restimulation or a piece of the reactive mind in restimulation, and just happened to knock the thing out, don't you see? Accidentally knocked it out.

I mean, if we're doing something very innocent like an ARC break assessment on Level Zero, see, well, they had bypassed charge, the fellow had an engram or a secondary or a GPM or something key in on him, you see, and it caused an ARC break and then we did an assessment and we picked up the key-in. The exact – the exact key-in, the moment of it, which keyed it out, don't you see? Boy, it's one of these things, it's like throwing – it's like this stuff they play on the stage here on the London Palladium, the – throwing some of those balls into the circular holes, and so forth, trying to match something up, you know. And the hole is – the hole is the wrong shape and tipped the wrong way, don't you see. Like at a carnival. Did you ever go to a carnival and waste your money trying to throw rings on canes? And did you ever notice that the canes are placed just so that no ring fits on any of them? But that sometimes over at the side the one that you're supposed to be able to get, that will catch it. That's the one in a thousand, don't you see?

But you could get that exact instant when you had a key-in of a heavy bypassed charge, key that out, and get this fantastic resurgence on your pc. And you say, "Boy, these ARC break assessments, boy, they're the most!" And you go around then, for the next year, trying to find your glasses! "What happened?" you see, and "I must be a bad auditor and I should have to study a great deal more so that I can learn how to do this." Well, what you haven't learned how to do is run a problem.

Now, for a person who is in the world of livingness you find out that running problems is much the safer bet. And if you were to bet on these two things one for one, you see, if you were to bet on them, the thing to put the bet on is the problem because that would occur far more often. You'd still miss, occasionally, because the fellow really was in an ARC break. You see, it was bypassed charge from the back bank got in and the moment of key-in, if contacted, would pass out, don't you see? But it will also pass out if you handle a problem. Don't you see?

So these light session ARC breaks that you get on a Grade I, II, III pc and so on, they're actually most – most uniformly handleable on the basis of problem. You save your ARC break ability and so forth for when you really need it, because there is no problem of any kind whatsoever would ever touch a GPM. That would have to be the charge, you would have to find out, was it an end word, was it a GPM, was it an item, was it a this, was it a that? Have we thrown a wah-wah in restimulation? Because of course that's so overwhelmingly huge in its ability to overwhelm the pc that he isn't aware of that being a problem at all. That's just a total overwhelm.

It's like saying, "Do you have a problem with internal revenue?" Well, you couldn't possibly have a problem of internal revenue, they just throw you in jail! [laughs] So you could call that a sort of an ARC break. You get the idea? You get where the borderline switch oc-
curs here, you see? When a guy is so overwhelmed, and the charge is so tremendous, and so on, that – well, you have to key out that thing, but then that thing is easily spotted, if you know what it is.

Then this tells you of course that a person occasionally can go around in an ARC break that you couldn't touch at lower levels. And that's perfectly correct. Because most people low on the Tone Scale are in a continuous ARC break with existence. And the way to handle that ARC break with existence is to handle their problems and find out what little continuing overts they have to do all the time, all the time, all the time, all the time, in order to keep even with existence. And if you did that you would very rapidly achieve a state of un-ARC-brokenness, apparently, until the next ARC break. Do you see?

ARC break is a manifestation of a lowering of affinity, reality and communication. It's just that manifestation. If this has occurred when you're doing R6 auditing, if this occurs along that line someplace, ah well, you haven't any choice but to go down and get that item. Once in a while you can do a session ARC break assessment when your pc is very ARC broken. You will hit the exact instant when you keyed something in. But if you think that it was something that happened in the session that caused the ARC break, you're very badly mistaken. The session inadvertently brought into view someplace on the backtrack something which was not acknowledged. A heavy charge on the backtrack moved in, just to the fringes of consciousness of this pc. And he reacted. And his affinity and reality and communication went by the boards.

Now if you were to do this little session ARC break assessment, and one of them "bings," like "I didn't acknowledge your question," you can say, "I didn't acknowledge your question," and this thing will go back and lie down and be a good dog, see? That doesn't mean it won't key in again tomorrow.

Now, there's something else that must have it keyed in, too. It must be that he's already in a postulate-counter-postulate situation, in order to be pulling bank in on himself like that.

Now, here's an old thing that I don't particularly think that you ought to experiment with, just for the fun of experimenting with it. But if you think of yourself as expendable someday, well just try it. This is an experimental process. I underscore, it is experimental and is not therapeutic in any way, shape or form. But it is highly educational. Run on somebody or yourself; the process, "Invent a problem." And after a while you're going to see some black masses start showing up in your vicinity.

Now, this isn't because you are pulling in backtrack. This is because you're really collapsing your bank. So, you invent a problem and you invent another problem. You'll see – if you're lucky in this experiment; this is the usual result – you'll see a mass moving in on you, and you invent another problem it'll move another two feet closer to you, you invent another problem and it'll move another two feet closer to you, see.

Now, if you keep doing this and if all of the problems you invented were brand-new problems, which had nothing to do on the backtrack, why you'd eventually get in a ball.

Now, also, if you invented a solution, invented a solution, invented a solution, invented a solution, and if they were all invented solutions, you similarly would get the mass
moving in on you. But if you accidentally, as you normally would do, gave a problem which was on your backtrack, if you thought of a problem, and thought of a problem, and thought of a problem, and thought of a problem, and thought of a problem, the problem would move away from you. Have you got this, now? In other words you're getting less problems.

You'll see that black mass in the mind moving out because you're running old problems, really. Thought of a problem, thought of a problem, thought of a problem.

Now, if you want to see it move back in, invent a solution to it. See, there'll be some kind of a representative mass. Now, invent a solution. Make sure you invent a solution. Something that you could do right now in present time to solve that situation. "Well, I could hit it." "Well, I could as-is it." "I could run flows on it." Don't you see? And you'll see that thing coming closer and closer, and closer and closer.

In other words, any inventedness, totally new inventedness – this is the trick – has a tendency to collapse the bank. Totally new inventedness, whether problems or solutions. But if you started knocking out a bunch of whole track problems, you would find the problems going away from you. If you started knocking out a bunch of whole track solutions you would find the mass going away from you, too. Well, why the near-far? And that's all I'm trying to teach you here. You can play this eighteen ways from the middle. It's very interesting to see a mass, and you just invent another – you answer the question again, see. And it's closer, see. And then, bang, you answer the question again, and this thing is closer. How come it's closer? Where is it coming from? How come? See? And you do an as-is-ness on the subject and it moves away. It's quite amusing. You'll see this thing move.

Eventually, if you go on, and get problem of comparable magnitude, problem of comparable magnitude, something like that, why, it may not move away or it may move up. It just depends on whether or not you're as-ising problems, you see, or inventing them. But, you normally would see it move out because it's almost impossible to invent a new problem you haven't had. So, it – you'd see this thing go out, out, out – you'd finally say, "Well it's out there a couple of; couple of light-years! That's a long way away, I can't even see it anymore." You'd say, "All right, good. Now solve it. Thank you. Solve it. Solve it. Solve it. Solve it."

"Wait a minute, it came back!"

"Good. Solve it some more. Solve it again."

"Hey!"

Now, if you really wanted to be real mean to somebody, why just say, "Well, solve it." And he'd say, "Well it's about five feet away," he'd say very cheerfully, and you say, "All right. Dream up another solution to that."

"Erk?"

"Dream up another solution to it."

"Well, wait a minute! It's right up against my face now!"

"Good. Dream up another solution to it."

"Ow!"
See? He starts feeling crushed. If it's a psychiatrist leave him that way. If it's a Scientist, why pick up some of the things you've been doing and move it out again. (You didn't get that joke.) Probably too bedazzled with this experiment. You understand this experiment?

In other words you can move mass in and out on the basis that you get rid of problems, or get rid of solutions, or invent problems or invent solutions. Do you understand?

Now the usual thing is to put up the representation or experiment in this way. Run a problem of comparable magnitude: "Think of a problem of comparable magnitude, think of a problem of comparable magnitude, think of a problem of comparable magnitude," and you'll see that mass moving out, out, out, out, out, out, you see. And then you'll say, "Think up a solution. Think up a solution. Think up a solution." And you'll see it come in, in, in, in, in, in. You got the idea?

But the main message here is that you can move mental masses around with the idea of problems and the idea of solutions. Why? Well, it's a basic definition of problems and solutions.

A solution is an effort to bat it away, which normally fails, and it's a postulate-counter-postulate to begin with. So just the thought of a problem will find the opposite postulate across from you in a hurry.

This basically proves the definition of postulate-counter-postulate. Now, how does this fellow get that mass away from him? He feels – you see, this is happening to him in livingness, it isn't just an experiment which I'm giving you which you could run. This happens to this bird! He has a problem and life sort of moves in on him. How's he going to get rid of that? Well, his effort is one to bat it. To push at it. To do something to it. What's it? The problem. Well, how come he calls it "it"? Well, because it's represented as a mass to him. Because it is a mental mass. Because if he kept on getting this problem it would squash his face in! Postulate-counter-postulate.

On the backtrack every time you had a fight with another thetan, why, he hit you with a beam and you hit him with one, don't you see? So people have this trained in as quite a mechanism, here. One of the oldest mechanisms there is. Postulate-counter-postulate.

So whether he sees it or not, when he has a problem show up he gets a mass show up. And whether he realizes it or not, the thing he tries to do about it is to do something about it to move it away from him. But his effort to move it away from him will move it closer to him. So he's in a situation when he has a problem that he has to do something about something, in order to get rid of the something which is moving in on him. Do you follow that?

If you don't, you're just trying to overread too much into it. If a guy has a problem he's usually got what the problem is.

Now, sometimes you can have a problem with missingness. It isn't there and there's nothing to confront. A problem of missingness. That is the problem of "where is it?" which goes into a rather total generality and at this moment your problem fringes on the basis of an ARC break. And that's why they appear to be cousins.
So the "It's gone" as a situation, and "Where do I find it?" and "Where can I look for it?" and "Where can I get another one?" In other words, problems of this character, you see, are borderline to the ARC break. In other words, the nothing-thereness will come into a close cousin to the generality of an ARC break, do you follow? He can't locate it or find it and so forth. Do you see? So they come a cousin, so it's very easy for you to make a mistake between them and I don't blame you for making a mistake between them.

But I should have thought by now that failures to solve ARC breaks would have pointed out to you that there must have been something else wrong with the pc. Because you have quite routine failures in handling ARC breaks. Somebody's turned over to you to run an ARC break on. Well, right away, that is the wrong thing to do. Is to tell somebody to take somebody to run an ARC break on them. The diagnosis has already been made. And it is a misdiagnosis.

Some student is nattery, and choppy and upset about something or other, so somebody's liable to come along and say, "All right, do an ARC break assessment on that student." See? Well now that would be a completely improper direction. As a matter of fact it comes under the heading of job and reputation endangerment, because you very well may have been set up! A problem that can't be solved because it is a problem, not an ARC break, you see?

Somebody has told you to run an ARC break assessment, when as a matter of sober fact they should have told you, "Straighten up that student!" Do you follow? And then what you ought to do – what you ought to do when you find something like this is to ask the person if they have a problem. And you'll get rid of it ten times as fast as anything else, on every process except R6. On R6 you see somebody all caved-in and chopped up you jolly well better get your bypassed charge list for R6. You better break it out and go down the line. Because that's the problem. It's again a problem of what's there which is impinging on the consciousness, don't you see, but nothing under the sun will ever find it but an R6 assessment.

You see all these other things are just locks on the reactive bank. And that is the reactive bank. There is no other. It maybe never has occurred to you that there's no other reactive bank than that. A fellow just doesn't go on making a reactive bank unless he's under an awful compulsion to do so. And the basic one of the – fifty percent of the reactive bank is devoted to a compulsion to make a reactive bank! Do you follow?

So, if you're running R6 or something like that, and your boy gets into trouble, and so on, well there's nothing you can do about him but find the bypassed charge.

On lower levels, why, ARC break, oh I don't know, I would finally occasionally use an ARC break assessment on some pc. Particularly if I'd known I'd goofed. If I'd catch myself going by, and so forth, and realized I hadn't acknowledged the pc and the pc was getting rather urgent, I'd realize I'd failed to acknowledge the pc and I'd key it out right away quick. I'd say "Have I failed to answer an auditing – have I failed to acknowledge an answer you've given me?"

"Yes, you did."
"Well, when was that? All right, I failed to acknowledge an answer." And the pc'd cheer up and the session would go forward, don't you see? That type of ARC break assessment, you see?

Well, I'm afraid I wouldn't sit down with a long list, and go on for two or three hours of assessment by elimination, unless I were doing Auditing by List. You could probably get somewhere with that. That old Auditing by List is kind of interesting. "In life has anybody failed to acknowledge you?" You know? You'd get some answers to that question! [laughter] Quite an interesting theory, don't you see?

But normally, normally, you see somebody who is nattery, chopped up, unhappy with their auditing, unhappy with you, unhappy, well, just handle it as a problem and it'll blow away. Don't foist off a problem on them if they don't have one. But you actually will not find an individual who is choppy or upset who doesn't have a problem. They go together like Pat and Mike in the old jokes. They're side by side. This guy's going, "Ohhh, I don't want you to audit me anymore, I – noo – no – no – noooo..." Well it isn't advisable to say, "What overt have you committed against me?" Nor is it advisable to say because he – it wouldn't be there if he knew – "What engram are you dramatizing?" See, these are perfectly correct questions if they were answerable. But they don't happen to be answerable, you see?

Sure enough, he's dramatizing some engram. These things are perfectly true. But the question is how can it be approached? Well, the way it can be approached is, "Have you got a problem?"

"Oh, boy, have I got a problem!"
You get an almost – [snaps fingers] bang-bang answer, see?
"Oh, I'm so ARC broken. I'm just so ARC broken."
"Good. What problem do you have?"

"Oh, problem! Well, I got just tons of problems," and you'll find the person'll pick right up. ARC break assessment can be as idiotic as – you don't even take them and put them on a meter – you say, "Have you got a problem?"

"Oh, yeah."
"Whatcha doing about it?"
Hmm, you see an insane glee come in some peoples' eyes! [laughter]

You understand what I'm trying to tell you, here? I'm trying to tell you that you don't have overts in the absence of a problem. People do not commit overts for nothing. When they commit overts they are solutions to the problem. The problem may be daffy, the problem may not have been in existence for the last trillennia, but it is still a real problem – to them! And their overts are efforts to solve that problem. And that you could unburden their case very easily by finding, well, problems and solutions. Run almost in any way of the hundreds and hundreds of different ways I know of to handle problems.
"What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you very much. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? What part of that problem could you be responsible for?"

"Tell me a problem of comparable magnitude. How do you solve that problem?"

In other words you could go on, and on and on and on and on.

You got the idea? I mean there's just dozens of them. They're perfectly mechanical. See, they require no insight of any kind whatsoever

"Do you have a problem?"

The guy says "Uh-huh."

"What part of the probl..." he hasn't even told you what it is! [laughter] And you'll be tremendously successful in picking somebody's tone up, don't you see? You don't have to know anything, you don't have to do anything! You don't have to be clever, you don't have to even read the meter!

So I want to know why you're working at it when you do. What's the sweat? It's just too easy.

You'll find out that if in – some person has a tremendously fundamental problem in life. You ask them for a problem, and you say, "All right, was that your problem?"

"No, really the problem was something else. The problem was so-and-so and so-and-so."

And you say, "All right, is that your problem?" And they'll say, "No, my problem is really..." They deny each problem as they as-is it! And they keep coming up and they keep giving you these problems, and giving you these problems, well what's happening here? They're as-ising the problems! And they of course are getting down to the main problem. They can keep this up for a long time, too. This individual can tell you, "Oh, yes, I have a problem!"

Well, don't think you've arrived anyplace when he's told you, because you've just got the one on top. How about the five hundred and eighty-five thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine trillion that lie below it? They're all locks on some fundamental problem. This guy was still trying to get out of a pyramid in local – in lower Upglop. See, something is happening, somewhere on his track. And he just keeps adding stuff on top of it and he will articulate this.

The basic mechanism of the mind – the basic mechanism of the mind is that it needs a problem situation to lock up time. You mustn't forget that. If a person is locked up anyplace, or is out of present time, it must be because of a problem. There isn't anything else can stop him on the time track but a problem.

Haven't you noticed that all the stories that appear in your color magazines every Sunday and on TV and so forth, and we are looking at a journalism which is apparently stuck in World War II! They fight World War II every few months, here! [laughter] Well, why?

Well, because there was a postulate-counter-postulate, and it was all pulled together with a whole bunch of solutions, and there it is, tied up on the time track. And the civilization
to a marked degree has not moved off that point of the time track. So that if you opened a cabaret up in London which consisted of a deep cellar with a lot of arrows pointing, and your hostesses were all wearing air-raid wardens' uniforms and hats and so forth, and what people did was go in there and sit down on the floor and it was sort of dim, you would probably, if you charged fifty bob for entrance to the place you'd probably make a fortune as it's an air-raid shelter people could go to! [laughter]

You'll find any point of the time track where a civilization is stuck, why they will buy that period as more real than any new period or creation which you could give them.

Now, similarly, you want to know how to get your pc's attention, if your pc doesn't seem to be giving you very, very close attention, well, you can immediately assume that the pc is locked up someplace in the back – in back time. And if you want to get his attention you have to enter that back time period from your time period, and the way to do that is to trigger the back time period. And you instantly have his attention because you're right there with him. Obviously you're saying to him, "Do you have a problem?"

"Oh, yes! Yes!"

"What?"

"Somebody else here! Hadn't somebody been here for years!"

"Very good!"

"Yes, I've got a problem! My problem's so-and-so and so on. Well, those two saber-toothed tigers, they're sitting over in the corner, that's a hell of a problem I'm sitting here with."

You'll find him very glib. He'll answer up right now! You very seldom, even on a very daffy person, find there's much comm lag in giving you a problem. Because you've entered that point of the time stream where they are. They're stuck.

Now, all you'd have to do would be to release in a huge mailing, "Tell me your problem." You'd get an awful lot of mail! That is the auditing question.

So therefore, why anybody would go around asking people if they had ARC breaks, and losing, when all they have to do is ask them if they have problems, and win – well, that's it. I wouldn't even bother to give you a process to run problems today. I can – there's just been too many of them. All of them effective. Every one of them had some effectiveness. Even old mock-up processing had effectiveness. God forbid, knowing the reactive bank, now!

Now, if you're trying to get overts off, so you say, "Well, I know he's got overts. I know he's got overts. I know he's got..." Well, you could say that about anybody, you see, and, it's perfectly true, but how do you make it stick? Well, you can't go up to a person at "un-causing" and say, "Do you have an overt?" But you can go to that person and say, "Do you have a problem?" and "What are you doing to solve it?" And he'd give you his overts.

Now, to get him to realize they're overts is of course quite impossible, because they're necessary solutions! You got it?
Well, you see, I did have a lecture to tell you about today, didn't I? [laughter] And what I was talking to you about was all froth, wasn't it? But the lecture wasn't. Now I hope you can use this. I hope you can use it. I hope you can press it to your bosom the next time you see some pc looking all *duuh*. Restrain this feeling of saying, "You poor fellow, who has done you in?" and just say, "What's your problem?"

"Oh, well, *r*r-*r*r-*r*r-*r*r "

You've got him in communication. You've got him answering up the auditing question and all you have to do is remember now to acknowledge, and so forth, and don't give them a further problem of finding out they're talking but not to anybody.

All right, well, I hope you can use that. I've lately – actually don't think that you're just being stupid, because you've missed this in Scientology. Any technology has alongside of it a channel of communication. It is how things can be phrased, how they could be communicated. This in actual fact – somebody might have – may have known some of these principles someplace on the track, but he never communicated them. So the communication is the better part of the thing because only when communicated is it of use. And, I have found recently by experience with cases how to communicate this to you so that you could understand it. And I trust I have done so.

Thank you very much!
Thank you for forgiving me.

What's the date?

_Male voice: May 18, AD 15._

May 18th, AD 15, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill, England, Earth, Espinol Confederacy, "This part of the universe is ours!" You don't know your address? [laughter] Well, I like to give people their address and location.

Well, I – again, today I'm just filling in time. There's nothing much to talk to you about. Hardly any data. As a matter of fact, it's quite the reverse.

Some poor HCO Secs around the world are beginning to stagger under the burden of new policy letters and that sort of thing that have been coming out, and I should let you in on what that's all about. Very simple. They are the staff status policy letters which add up to the equivalent of about eight staff statuses.

And on the new org board we are going to remedy an old, old evil in organizations by putting on the org board the fellow's certificate initials after the name of the staff member, and then his classification as an auditor, and then the Roman numeral which is his grade as a pc, and then that is followed by an Arabic numeral which will give his staff status. And his staff status simply depends on what studies he has completed on a staff checksheet, and it says, then, for what staff rank he is now qualified.

Now, the way it happened in the past is, in trying to appoint somebody at a far distance, I was utterly unable to plow through all the fog and unknowns and so forth to find out who was there. But under the new system we will be swapping org boards around through the organizations at a mad rate. And these org boards, of course, will be direct copies of the org boards, so that in filling posts and that sort of thing, it is very simple just to look at the org board and to find out, well, who's qualified for promotion, see.

And in that particular way, you'll probably see something like this start appearing on an org board: "HGC staff auditor, HGA, VII, 9," see? Staff auditor. What the hell is he doing as a staff auditor, see? You'll see one of the secretarial levels, and so forth: "BS, blank, blank, 1." Of course, you'd never get anything that bad. It'd have to be a deputy of the deputy of the deputy, don't you see? But nevertheless, there is a slot missing on the org board, and here's somebody fitted by training, and that staff status also includes a factor of experience, you see?

Now, to get it – to be a general staff member on the new org board, a person has to have – to become a technical staff member – has to have a basic technical certificate, and that
is earned in the organization, and it simply has to do with some of the basic and fundamental facts of the organization. That's all. It's a very, very simple thing.

And for an administrative staff member to have anything more than a temporary rating, they have to have just their basic certificate, which is just the basic organization certificate. They know where the comm center is, you know? But nevertheless, have to have studied for those things and passed the little checksheet that goes with them. Then they're qualified as Provisional.

And a Provisional would be a Staff Status I, and a Provisional, of course, can be shifted. Now, a Provisional can be shifted about, don't you see, to balance up personnel and that sort of thing rather easily. You don't have to ask his permission to do so.

And after a period of time, if that person gets his provisional status checksheet filled for his next one, why, he moves up to a general staff member. And at that time, why, he has equality, privilege and fraternity, don't you see? And you have to shoot him in order to transfer him. You get the idea?

In other words, he has worked for and attained a position where he... well, he could be pretty sassy and still have nothing happen to him. But then it goes on up from there. There are the ranks in an organization – just the same old ranks there have always been. There's In-Charge: a rank that we have called from time to time, this has popped up and disappeared, and so forth, we've called something an officer. Well, an in-charge would be the head of a subsection or something like that. It's like Address In-Charge; you've seen that on boards, and so forth. Well, that's your first and lowest executive rating.

And then there is the officer rating, which is simply the section. He's in charge of a section. Like you have here the Cramming Section. Well, that would be the Cramming Officer.

And then you move up and there's a couple of – or three designations that don't have any status as such but they are merely titles. So you understand that there could be quite a few titles on a board which aren't associated with status. Well, there's this thing called a communicator. That doesn't have any rank or status; a fellow is a communicator, see?

And there's this thing called a deputy. You see deputy in front of a name, that doesn't mean there's anybody appointed to it. A post can also have deputies that has a regular appointee. You may see two or three deputies down from an HCO Exec Sec. You see? Deputy HCO Exec Sec. Well, it doesn't mean a thing.

If the post is assigned locally by an organization, why, it may only be assigned as a deputy. If it is appointed from Saint Hill, why, then that becomes an Acting, which is the first rank. And for a while the post is held under an acting status, and then is held in a full status. The "Acting" is simply removed. But you'd know then the difference between a local and a Saint Hill appointment. Don't you see? Your local appointments are all deputy where they are executive appointments. If they're Saint Hill appointments, why, then they are Acting or nothing in front of it, you see?

That would be, for instance, say you'd have such a thing as Deputy HCO Exec Sec. That would be one of the higher – the highest two ranks in the org. That doesn't mean any
permanency of any kind whatsoever. Small breath of air can come in the window and take that title off the board, don't you see?

Because it's not anything but an assigned title. It's just somebody filling time until somebody can be put there or they can be confirmed, don't you see?

Then you see something like Acting HCO Exec Sec. Well, you'd know at once that that was a Saint Hill appointment, and that is an official appointment. And after a short period of time up to a year, why, that title is held as Acting, and then is wiped out on the Acting and becomes just HCO Exec Sec, and that was a full appointment.

Well, when I say that there are some of these statuses that don't have any number after them, don't you see, it's that type of thing, you see?

A deputy – well, that doesn't change anybody's number because they're a deputy, see? But a person would have to have, in actual fact, the staff status of the post to be an Acting. So they'd have to pass the checksheets about the organization, and so forth, in order to be an acting appointment.

Two or three things can occur then. You can take a person and put them on and see how they do, don't you see? Well, actually, you can't wait for Saint Hill to investigate something while the post of D of T is going begging, so somebody has to be assigned to this as a deputy situation. Now, that may or may not be reversed by Saint Hill, you see? And so a local org could fill up almost any post with a deputy rating. They don't have to consult anybody. But for that post to have any meaning or draw the pay of that level, it would have to be filled from Saint Hill.

And of course, Saint Hill is enormously assisted on this now because the Department of Examinations will be giving checksheet examinations for these, and right now are giving checksheet examinations without the checksheet. They just take a blank piece of paper and every bulletin the person passes and policy letter they pass, why, they give them an okay on that as having been passed. Well, that's later transferred over to the checksheet where it belongs.

So, what I'm doing at this present moment is simply turning out the bulletins and policy letters and materials which are necessary for these various statuses. And they look an absolute avalanche, you see?

Here is your status for Director, your status for Secretary, your status for Executive Secretary. Relatively undifferentiated, these bulletins are just pouring out. So one will be the theory of the organization itself – the theory of its construction, how it is put together and why, don't you see? Well, this thing is coming right out alongside of, "Pens must be filled at nine o'clock in the morning," don't you see? [laughter] Well, of course, that's an HCO Exec Sec's status – theory of the organization. How do you put it together? What makes it tick? There's an awful lot to know that way.

Now, one of the things that's interesting about these status hat books that will eventually be written – they're not now being written up in the form, but in the eventual hat book, you'll find it an interesting thing (some of these are now being put together), but there's a
summary paragraph which takes the whole department. And a little sentence will take up the section. That will be the works.

That's simply heads. You see? Well, we take Department of Review. Now, the whole function and action of the Department of Review and everything that it does is all given in one paragraph – thrrrrrp–boom! See? And then each one of its sections is given in one sentence – prrrrrrr. But that heads the write-up – the full write-up – which just goes on page after page after page of the full write-up of the Department of Review and the full write-up of every one of its sections.

Well, a person working in that zone, who is slated for that quarter of the org, of course knows the big portions. But everybody else at a certain status level has to know the little paragraphs and sentences. That's so they merely know what that's for over there, not how to run it, so that they can work with it. They say, "Oh yes. Yes. That's such and so section. Oh, yeah, well, that's supposed to take the students and so forth. Yeah."

Well, actually, how they do that is quite remarkable but isn't included in the broad training level. So, if a fellow gets assigned then to a department or a division that he has not been in previously, why, in addition to that, his status might not be disturbed, but his appointment would remain Acting. Do you follow? Until he had mastered that particular division, and that's why the difference between the Acting and the Permanent appointment. You get the idea?

So, you never appoint – you could take somebody from a Permanent appointment, let us say, of a Director of a – well, let's take the D of T, he's a Permanent appointment D of T. And you want to upgrade him, and the post is open on Qualifications Division. So, well, the Secretary of Qualifications is open, and there is nobody eligible over in that line for status or longevity or anything else for it, and he's obviously for it, don't you see? Well, you could make this person Acting Qualifications Secretary and then confirm it at the time when he had burned the midnight oil on all of the hat books, you see, of that Division, and at that moment, why, he would become the Qualifications Secretary.

Now, that, you might say, is the long-range look. And true enough you've got to start somewhere to bring order and organization into things. And it is definitely the long-term look, and it's going to take quite a while to build this up. I don't imagine this will be in total operation before next week. [laughter] Now, I'm joking there. I expect it'll be in total operation all over the world by August, in full cry.

It's very interesting that orgs right now are – they haven't got the org board yet. This is a foul trick on my part. It was not meaningful and so on, but there were some other things that had to be gotten out before you could get out the org board. And the org board shifted about a bit, and only a couple of weeks ago settled down into some framework that looked very good and doesn't seem to be a shifting framework at all. There it is.

And now it just depends on the thirty-seventh hour of my day in order to get it done, because I'll have to letter it – write it up and letter it totally. I've just got it in rough draft right now. I've got to put it in a more amplified rough draft and then letter it and then take it down to the darkroom and make big copies of the thing and then shoot it out all over the place, and they'll have their org board.
But this org board – bits and pieces of it have been released. For instance, the Technical Division was recently released. Well, just their Technical Division. I just told them to get in a Technical Division and appoint an Ethics Officer and appoint a Director of Examinations, see? That was all. Just their Technical Division and that and that.

Well, I showed them a little picture in a Sec ED – maybe you saw the Sec ED – just a crudely hand-drawn picture of the org board of the Technical Division. And that's quite adequate. And I told them to put it over underneath where they used to have the Academy and the HGC and so forth, and just put it down there in that form. Well, they'll get it up there and so forth, and then they'll find this horrible thing occur. Then they'll find that they no more than have that Technical Division more or less set up, they start to be hit by some of the traffic that's begun to move their ways. By the way, organizations are beginning to move off of Emergency right now. London just moved off of Emergency today and was highly congratulated for it. Other organizations are coming up, and things look pretty good.

But Auditor 8 is going to hit in just a matter of weeks in their areas – to everybody in their areas. And that's going to start building up traffic, and that traffic will build in toward that Technical Division. So I'm trying to get them to get a Technical Division there in order to take care of the traffic and get their courses and so forth stretched out just right, to take the heavier traffic, see?

Well, that's dandy. They'll do all that. That's for sure. And they start moving traffic through their Technical Division, and they'll realize they've got an Ethics Officer, and the Ethics Officer will be finding his feet and straightening out the lines.

All the ethics really does is hold the lines firm so that you can route and audit. You see, all ethics is for, in actual fact, the totality of its operation – it is simply that additional tool necessary to make it possible to get technology in. That's the whole purpose of ethics, is to get technology in. Well, man doesn't have that purpose for his law and justice. He wants to squash people who are giving him trouble. That isn't the case in the handling of ethics. It's an entirely different operation. And you'll find out it's a fabulously successful operation. They'll handle it with too much violence, and they'll handle it with too light, and they'll eventually get it adjusted, and they'll eventually learn this fabulously simple point: that ethics is there to let you get technology in. You see, it's the tourniquet before the doctor arrives. You got the idea? It makes it possible to get technology in.

If an area is too enturbulated and there's too much chitter-chat and yip-yap going on in an area, things are knocked apart and the people in it are being knocked around to such a degree you can't get technical in. All you've got to do is just shut it up long enough and say, "Down, dog!" right up to the point where you can – till the auditor arrives. You get the idea? So, you can just hold that area. Now you straighten it out with ethics and then you get the technology lined up. Now auditors start to audit with the process they're supposed to audit with, see? Now the cases start to move through the HGC the way they are supposed to. Now the student begins to go up through his courses and get the material he's supposed to. We don't have forgetful little omissions like not giving them any checksheets or anything, see? And this technical goes in, see?
Well, when you've got technical in, why, ethics – that's as far as you carry an ethics action. You carry ethics action to the point where you get technical in. No further.

And it's interesting to me, by certain comparative figures, that the publication of a suppressive as a suppressive person is apparently the equivalent of a public hanging. You get exactly – I'm not speaking jokingly – you get exactly the same responses from the individual.

And there's something interesting about that. Over the years I found out that when you cancel somebody's certificates – bang! – within two or three years he was back, straightened out and doing fine. At the absolute outside, two or three years. But when you didn't cancel his certificates, he wandered off and you never heard of him again and he went to hell. Now, there's an interesting one for you. That's simply an empirical datum.

For instance, the other day – I'm now checking off all mailings that go out from organizations – and the other day I was quite fascinated to see a name as the featured Scientology lecturer at a big open evening that was being advertised everywhere – a name. And five, six years ago, at least that, he went around in one small circle, and he was pounding and screaming and howling and that sort of thing, and he was going to do this, and that, and the other thing, and so forth. So I just told him, "Well, your certificates are cancelled, son. And by the time you see fit" – the way we did it in those days – "to get yourself five hundred hours of auditing at your own expense," I think it was, "why, we'll entertain giving them back to you."

Well, what do you know. At the time we used to do that, they always used to put on, "they didn't care." They didn't care. But it's very interesting how glad they always were to get their certificates back. That was what was remarkable. About two years went by and by George he did get his auditing; he did get straightened out, he's been doing fine ever since. And here he is, I noticed him the other day, and so forth (just checking through literature), why, he's the organization's featured lecturer at an open evening and so forth. In other words, everybody has forgotten about this until I've reminded you. Do you understand?

And when, in other words, you have exerted an orderly disciplinary action in some direction where somebody is wrecking people and trying to smash up the org and trying to push things around, for some reason or other putting a label on them brings them back. And if you don't do anything about them at all, not only does the enturbulation continue, but they go off and get lost and go to hell in a balloon. Isn't that an interesting thing?

So, my data is quite positive in that direction that it is a very unkind thing to do not to try to bring order into a Scientology area. And it's an extremely unkind thing to do not to give somebody a hard knock when he's trying to knock down everybody else around him, and say, "Quiet, fellow. Let's quit it now." See? It's very interesting.

Now, man, of course, has a tremendous reaction to something called justice and what he laughingly calls justice. But of course, man has no understanding with which to back up any of these hangings that he commits himself to. In other words, he doesn't have real justice because it has no end product. Its total end product is punishment. Its total end product is doing something. Now, that it doesn't straighten out the community is manifest because – well, it does some good but – perhaps – but it's manifest in the fact that crime continues to rise across the world. And the crime statistics of the world today are going up much higher and faster than population is increasing. And it's such a worry to law enforcement officers today.
that those that I have spoken to, just within the last year, were in a very apathetic frame of mind, and they just wanted to lie down and quit. That's a funny frame of mind for the world's best police force to be in, isn't it? Well, that's because there's no end product.

Well, you put somebody in prison. So you put them in prison. So when you let them out of prison they go steal another car and you put them back in prison. Do you see? Worse than that, they are incapable of doing more than worsening an individual with the type of disciplinary action which they employ. So it has no end product but punishment, so it's just old-time, MEST universe "Punish everybody. Down with everybody," don't you see?

Well now, you try to bring in an ethics system across this line, of course you jar a lot of people's banks. And that is quite easy to do, because of course those words are to be found in the reactive mind as end words. So as a result you'll get a considerable reaction. But it's very interesting that much greater proportion of people in Scientology today favor a decent ethic level and favor ethics actions, weirdly enough, than are batting back against it because they see that this will square things up.

Well actually, what it eventually does is get them better training, better processing, a better organization and a better grip on the subject of Scientology and less abuse with it. That's the exact end product of an ethics action.

And ethics is only — people will have to learn this along these lines in Scientology, that the total extent of an ethics action is to get technology in. That's all it's for and not for anything else.

Now, you can't sentence people to technology. That's quite interesting. You can't sentence somebody to getting better. But you sure as hell can sentence him to not getting better. Because after all, what are we doing? We are factually and only there, gratuitously as a matter of fact, helping people to help themselves and to get better. That is our total action.

Now, nobody has got a pistol to our heads forcing us to do this, so the only thing that we would do would be the normal thing which we would do anyhow. After a guy has made just so much ruckus, we lose our desire to assist him. And that is really the basic expression of an ethics action. It's simply an expression of this normal reaction of "We don't care to assist you anymore" or "We don't care to assist you for a week or two. Let you think it over." Do you follow?

So, the end product of an ethics action is to get technology in. And that's its total action.

Now, far from blowing up an organization, if you very carefully look over the ethics levels — actions, or the justice actions of organizations and huge governments and empires, and companies and this and that, and compare these things, you find some rather astonishing data falls out in your lap. It's so contrary to what you might believe that you might tend to discount it. But after a while the data itself is too overwhelming.

The taut ship, the harshly run empire, the viciously conducted regiment, normally has a very high esprit and works like mad, can get itself out of most anything and survives practically forever. And the sloppily run ones go by the boards quick.
I first got on the track of this in studying... Some time, by the way, when you haven't anything else to do, read Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. That's quite a thing. I undertook that some years ago because I was having trouble sleeping. But I decided I would read it from one end of that many-volumed volumes to the other – read the whole thing. And it was quite an interesting exercise. I hope I never get so ambitious as to start reading the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* from one end to the other. But, I will say, I am running out of reading matter now that Ian Fleming has picked himself up another body. [laughter, laughs] May have to do it.

But, I was considerably struck in this study by something I didn't understand at all, and I couldn't make any sense out of it all, and it just left me gawp-jawed. Only long periods of progressive rule and recovery from barbarian attacks and internal upsets were periods when the emperor was a nut, just a sadistic boob. It doesn't make any sense at all. Now, a good emperor would come in, and he was going to straighten everything out and get the roads open and do all the progressive things he should have done, and he would be dead from within two to eighteen months. He would have been assassinated and everything would have fallen in. And then another bloke takes over. Tortures everybody in sight. Shoots everybody down in flames. Throws them to the lions and the elephants because just that afternoon he was bored.

Like Caligula: some fellow who was being king of the wood or something down somewhere south of town, so he went down there with some bully boys and killed him just for the hell of it. It was a sort of a shrine; he felt like desecrating shrines that day. He gave knighthood to his horse. He was a chattering maniac. And he went on ruling.

Tiberius, a pervert – years and years and years, and he dies with his boots off quietly in bed, surrounded by his weeping retainers. But the next guy after that that says he's going to defeat the enemy, and he's going to straighten out the empire and rebate taxes and do land reforms and do all the good things that you think a good emperor would do – dead! And I couldn't believe it. And that datum kept racking around in my belfry, round and round. And every once in a while I'd... Well, it had to be true. Because there it was. It's part and parcel of history. So I looked it over and compared it to my own knowledge of the subject; yeah, that was true. I never tried to run anything like that. Gee, you know, it just didn't make any sense to me at all.

Now, I run an expedition or a ship or something like that, normally all the discipline that would take place on the thing is I'd whistle somebody up on the bridge – without a normal mast or anything that you're supposed to have, you know – I'd just say, "This is just between you and me. You've let the side down, boy. Now what you going to do about it?" And he would tell me what he was going to do about it, and that was the end of that. And I used to have very nice, quiet, orderly ships. I never lost anybody doing anything. It was quite amazing, see? So this other didn't make any sense.

Well, apparently you could, if you were dealing very intimately with a relatively small group, by the dint of personality alone, spread out an area of calm that everything is orderly in. All right.

Now, I'll let you in on a secret. You is about ready to move out into that turbulent area called de general public, and he's nuts! We're no longer just operating here, see? We've had
our troubles internally but they're always at the public points of the org. They're where the org is hit by the public in general, see, those are the points you can expect to go. Those are the first lines to go out.

Well, the Registrar-pc line: just getting the pc from – to the Registrar's desk and getting the pc up to the D of P. That is usually the first line to go. Well, of course, that's the Reception-public entrance line, and the lines in that vicinity are always shattering. When I'm in an org I put that line together about every – once every three months. It just completely disappears and goes to pieces.

Well, that's an interesting thing, isn't it? I used to blame us – not very seriously – but I used to think there was something dreadfully wrong with us, that we tried to put a movement of this magnitude and wisdom on Earth and could still be that enturbulated and knocked about, and so on. I eventually got so I could look a little bit outside the organization, and I found out that we weren't being knocked about – that's what's funny. Compared to other things; they're really knocked around. Yeah, but they're held with a brutal discipline to hold them in line at all. They're stood right up there very tight.

But in our length of time of existence we've seen several organizations go to pieces. There are several governments that have gone downhill very markedly. They've become rather disorderly. Crime ratio has gone up. The number of bankruptcies per the number of companies has increased-increased-increased; it's going up higher and higher. The measures being taken by governments are normally aimed at managers. They're trying to sort of put things out of business. The enturbulation there is very great. The police officer has been less and less and less able to hold things. And during that same period of time we've been more and more able to hold things, and we have been getting better and better. And our organization lines are becoming more and more sensible, and we have had more and more duration – that is to say, more and more survival potential. And the technology at the same time was getting better, of course, but it was being better applied. Don't you see? We're running an exact reverse curve.

Well, we could keep this up for a long, long while. We could go on our gradient scale and to some degree individually and otherwise, why, we will go on our gradient scale. But if we suddenly start expanding organizations, we are reaching straight out into that raw, tumultuous mass called the public. We're reaching straight out into a society that has never looked so good and was quite so bad.

In other words, we had to have some kind of weapons, some kind of tools, to extend our reach so we could get our job done in time. Now, all we had to do was extend our reach. Now, how does a Scientology executive extend his reach? How does a Scientology staff member extend his reach? How is he able to hold more people still so that they can get processed? How is he able to do this?

Well, I found out another factor. And this is, by the way, the key factor that influences this: I found out that as people moved on up toward OT that a certain disdain occurred. Well, it ceased to be important, any more than you might consider it important to kick over an ant heap. If things got too annoying or something like that, somebody is going to bite. Do you
follow me? Somebody is going to bite. So I started to design ethics when I saw that it was going to be necessary that people take orderly bites. You see, we've got to take orderly bites.

For instance, before picking up the Capitol at Washington, and turning it around on its base and setting it down again, you'd damn well better give somebody a Comm Ev. Let's be legal about it. Now, that sounds utterly incredible, doesn't it? And yet you really are looking at something like that. It doesn't matter whether it is within your range of reality or not. Just envision it as a possibility. No matter how fancy this might be – but still consider it as a possibility – that if beings became more and more powerful and they became annoyed about something, and started to straighten something up, they're liable to straighten them up with such thoroughness that hardly anybody'd ever recover. Do you understand?

And – this is the other missing factor – unless they have some orderly method of straightening things up, they will take it upon themselves to straighten them up in their own jolly good way, and it'll make one hell of a mess. Now, there was the entrance point of ethics. And the other side of the entrance point of ethics is as an organization expands... I don't say that an OT should be under justice; no, he must have some orderly, agreed-upon communication line by which he does something.

For instance, I'm in an argument right now with Washington, DC, on one simple fact: Our attorney there is absolutely aghast at the declaration of Lyndon Johnson as a suppressive person. [laughter] He says this won't do at all. Well, I don't know, the guy is all over our backs. I think he's suppressive. He hadn't called off the FDA; we're having to do it ourselves. We're having to go over and undo practically half the government to get the FDA undone. You're not kidding, we are. You're doing a beautiful job over in Washington, do beautiful job. Not only do they have a Senate investigation of Health, Education and Welfare and the FDA going – which probably will cost the FDA the bulk of its appropriations and may kick the head out – but as soon as that's over the House is going to investigate the FDA.

They're already using our terms in the courts there when they discuss the matter. The suit is only stated in the exact same terms which you could care to find in the policy letter which I wrote to cover it when it originally occurred. And the terms which occur in those policy letters and so forth are now part of US court pronouncements. So, we can reach.

And, of course, I was just joking. I did suggest, you see, however, that the president of the United States should at least be given an amnesty. And that we do this thing in an orderly fashion. And I really didn't see any reason why you couldn't consider him suppressive if he was trying to wipe out our organization by not calling off his dogs. I thought that was some of his responsibility.

But, our attorney says that this would make the president mad. Now, it's interesting that this is not contested by our attorneys because it is silly. [laughter]

And, our attorneys down in Victoria – we're being less successful in this argument. We're arguing back and forth, but now a rather soft approach is being used on this and we're trying to get it done.

Let me ask you this burning question – let me ask you this burning question: Are you for just shooting somebody down without warning or do you want ethics? See? That's the
question. Now, what are you in favor of? The kind of law that just freakishly and like the thunder and lightning all of a sudden strikes down anybody in sight? Or is it the kind of law that you say, "Here is the path. Narrow as it may seem, you try to take Scientology out of the running and that's off the edge of the path. And if you have done that, things are now going to happen. And we do them in a very legal fashion." In other words, we have no illegal hangings. Every one of our hangings is legally done. You get the idea? There's always thirteen turns in that hangman's noose. See, there's always thirteen steps to that gallows. In other words, even a blind man would find out after a while that he was being warned. You get the idea?

Now, this doesn't happen to be for me. I can handle you guys. I can handle a lot more. But what am I supposed to do, stand around here as the only cop?

Now, right now what you've got in essence is a little system of ethics which is being adjusted, in actual use – being adjusted and its procedures are being looked over. And it's working very, very nicely. And of course, it isn't too different than what we've been doing, but it's being done on a scheduled action, and it is effective. And the only reason it's there is to hold things quiet until technology can be gotten in. All right. Very good.

In acting along these particular lines, we of course have it rattling around inside organizations, rattling around Scientologists. I imagine there are two or three people here on staff right now that probably in the last twenty-four hours have seen an ethics report handed in on them of one kind or another. Just some executive handed in an ethics report on them, see?

"Did willfully and knowingly upset the ashtray all over my shoes." They're becoming used to the tools of the thing, and with familiarity they will then be able to use it sensibly.

They're now finding out how much shock you can give somebody with Scientology ethics. It is a brutal dose, man, when it's shoved all the way home. And they find out how lightly it has to be used. The lightness of use is fantastic.

For instance, we have had somebody who worked at Saint Hill here as a cleaner for many years, and no amount of talking to her, no amount of persuasion by others, has caused her to find out that there was an organization present or there was any kind of an organization going on. She just works for Mary Sue and myself, and she goes on and she does all this work and so forth, and if anybody else talks to her, why, she goes up in a screaming fit. Well now, you would expect ethics would upset somebody like that, but quite on the contrary. I turned her in the other day for a scarred frame on a door. Obviously some heavy piece of furniture had been slammed against the door like an elephant butting into it – something very undelicate. And I wrote out an ethics chit and of course sent her her copy.

Now, you would have thought she'd have blown, screamed and so forth. She very nicely then answered up on the thing and stated that it had been done by workmen when they were moving furniture up on that floor. And she did identify it, and so forth, and so help me Pete, today turned in a damage report on a broken curtain cord that she had found in the house and forwarded it to – Ethics! [laughter] From a person who a very short time ago just considered that we were all a lot of nuts, that was an awful upgrade of case.
No, if you're going to handle things in your immediate environment, if you're going to handle this mass of public out here, if you're going to handle raw meat and all of its suppressions and potential trouble sources and all the rest of this, and the various ills that we run into when we handle these people, you're going to need weapons with which to do it. You start funneling them into the organization and this guy says, "Nyah-yah-yah" and he starts knocking around, "Wrrh-wrrh-wrrh-wrrh." Well, if you have any familiarity with this thing called ethics, you'll be able to tap him on the shoulder and he won't "Yah-yah-yah." At least, if he does, he'll "Yah-yah-yah" someplace else. You understand?

Now, you would be surprised what this does technically, how it backs up your technical. Now, here at Saint Hill – in our new activity which we call an HGC and which we had no public pcs for to amount to anything so we constituted a Qualifications Division here at Saint Hill – we put our Technical Division together and then put our Qualifications Division together. And what's going together right now is the Qualifications Division in full. When we get the Qualifications Division in full again, we'll come back to the Technical Division and put it together again more broadly, don't you see? We'll play it against these two factors. What's getting all the attention right now is the Qualifications Division.

Now, in the handling of these various lines, it is simply putting up channels for people to travel on. Now, if you are going to do your job at all you are going to have to have some way to route and handle without getting into an altercation every time you said "Boo."

Now, in this HGC that we had running and so forth, we had two persons now, so far, that would have just baffled a D of P to the end of time. The D of P just would have gone around holding his head in his hands and wondering what to do, and he would have been sending a cable to Saint Hill or something like this. And he just would have been worried about this, and so forth. He wouldn't have known what to do. Because those were spook cases, those two cases. They ran like a dream, got tone arm action, they went outside and collapsed.

Now, one is collapsing on a highly cyclic basis. He's up on Tuesday and down on Wednesday, see? Three days ago he's telling somebody how bad off he is, but just today there's a despatch in saying how he's just found out his chest and asthma have cleared up. Well, you can absolutely count on the fact that within thirty-six hours it's how bad off he is again. This case is a rolly coaster case.

What is a rolly coaster case? This is your technical advance: Your rolly coaster case is a potential trouble source and just on the other side of him there is a suppressive person invalidating his gains. And that suppressive person was always out of our view before, and we could just hold our heads in our hands saying, "Why does that guy get so good and get so bad? And how does he go up and down? Well, I'll audit him some more." The one thing you must never do is audit a potential trouble source. He's never going to get any better – not until he's labeled as a potential trouble source and told to disconnect or handle. He's going to go bzzz-zzz-zzz. And actually it's an awful mess because by the fact he's getting better, he then becomes such a threat to the suppressive person that he just gets done in. His environment becomes absolutely unlivable. To the degree that he makes progress, the pressure has got to
come back against him, and you're just killing the guy. The better you make him the more he's going to be hit from the other side.

And sometimes you don't – well, you don't even know the identity of this person, see? So you see a case going hzzzz-hzzzz-blu. What is this? He was in wonderful shape when he left your auditing room, terrible shape on Tuesday. Then he comes back and you give him a little assist, see? Now he's fine on Wednesday. On Friday you meet a friend of yours and say, "You know that pc of yours. Well, he was threatening to commit suicide last night, and they had to call in the police."

"What in the name of God is going on?" you'd think. See? Big mystery created. You'd blame it on your auditing – what had you done? You'd blame it on the technology you were using. Didn't have any relationship to it at all. Just on the other side of this boy and out of the sight of the auditor was a suppressive. Now, how are you going to handle the suppressive? Well, you'd certainly better label him one way or the other. Now, nobody is handling this person, and they're stark, staring mad. What do we do with this guy? How do we handle this bird?

Well, how we handle him is – by George, you better not go on processing that fellow. You better not, because you'll make him worse. No matter what you do about it you'll make him worse. It's not that your technology isn't working. That's the trouble: it is! You're spoiling somebody's total Svengali control here. And the harder you push at it and the better you make him – you could wind him right up, you know, with cyanide pills in the coffee. You understand? You're putting him in grave danger of his life.

So, what's the nice thing to do? He's always had this problem around him, but nobody ever said, "Your problem, fella. Do something about it." See, so you give him a little policy letter on the subject of a potential trouble source, and it tells him what he's got to do.

You don't even have to issue an Ethics Order on such an action unless – watch this now – unless technology doesn't go in. See? In other words if we can get technology in, short of shooting somebody, we will. You see? But supposing he starts going, "Yow-yow-yow," and so forth, and, "Poor Agnes. She has a perfect right to berate me because I am such a dog." Boy, this guy is caved in, isn't he? Now, he says, "Well, if you won't process me, I guess I will just have to leave Scientology, too, to go off in my own way with Agnes." One Agnes a suppressive person; one pc a – not just a PTS now: he elected himself out.

In other words, the degree of action which you can put against him to straighten out the situation is quite considerable.

Now, the normal action would be to tip somebody off on this, even with an Ethics Order. This is quite a normal action, not the preferred or the ordinary procedure. I'm just saying it's just one that could be done. Cases vary. You would say, "Now, you know, you're going to be labeled a PTS, a potential trouble source here. And if you can just get your wife in before she is labeled a suppressive person, she can be processed. But after that point, why, we couldn't touch her – if it goes this far, and there's a lot of trouble in this. So why don't you get her over here and get her audited." Now, frankly, you wouldn't be able to do this in an organization which was just teaching and processing up to Level I. Because suppressives, let me tell you by experience, are pretty crazy – you understand – their normal run.
Now, if a person isn't very crazy, you hand the label to him, he'll straighten out; he can see the light. But if he's real crazy, man, he can't see anything. He's just got to fight. Well, if you knew what he was fighting you wouldn't feel so sorry for him.

He's back there on the track a few trillion years fighting the Ugbugs. He's solving a present time problem which hasn't in actual fact existed for the last many trillennia in most cases, and yet he is taking the actions in present time which solve that problem with the Ugbugs.

What the devil is that all about? Well, it's the guy is totally stuck in present time. He's got 99.9999999 percent of his attention units are at some past period of the track – an exact, precise past period of the track. And in that precise, exact instant he is fighting off something and is trying to handle something by some means, and those are the means and practices which he is using in present time. He does not have any problem with you; you do not have any problem with him at all – none! You aren't back there where he is, and he isn't up where you are. Now, you can assume there are problems, but that isn't the problem he's trying to solve.

And that is the whole anatomy of psychosis, and I knew we would find it someday. That's the whole anatomy: this is stuck on the backtrack with 99999 percent... And they're fighting off – they're trying to give the person poison before they can be strangled themselves. So they've got to go around and they've got to give everybody poison, you see? And then they reclassify poison because that is too direct, you see? By cross-association, identification and so forth, why, then they've got to do something to get somebody to do something. And they just see it. And it just adds all up and everything becomes everything, and associative restimulators are all over the place. And they're actually performing this same action. They're performing this same action. So of course, you try to help this person, he misidentifies you at once just like a mad dog does. You extend any help in his direction and he bites you. Of course, he'd bite anybody that came anywhere near him. Why? The guy is stuck on the backtrack and the flying saucer pilots are getting him, don't you see?

Anybody that approaches him or tries to have any effect upon him of any kind whatsoever is immediately and instantly identified as a flying saucer person or something of the sort, and therefore has to be shot down in flames and killed, and so on. He's just defending himself in some mad insanity against things that are no longer there. And it's... so on.

He falls into several categories as he does this, and they're very short and all that material is at Class VII.

But the action here that he is trying to do is mistimed. That is to say, it wasn't successful back then, but he's still trying to do it now. Only he's trying to pull it on you, so your effort to solve his problems do not in actual fact solve the problem he is in, because he's in a problem with somebody that hasn't got anything to do with you.

Now, you could blame yourself and say, "I wonder why I'm having so many problems with this person?" when in actual sober fact you aren't having any problems with this person. You're not even giving that person any problems. Do you see? No, he's just fighting off this chimera.
Now, another thing is, is when he is driven down to the first dynamic to that degree, he of course then will attempt to solve things by knocking off everyone else. That's a perfectly good solution: the way to live is to kill everybody. So if he sees anybody getting any stronger or any better, he goes stark staring mad. This is the one thing which mustn't happen! Nobody must get better because these flying saucer pilots, if they got any stronger they'd be able to get him! So nobody must get any better. That's the one thing which mustn't happen. So Scientology will get it right in the teeth the better we get, you see – and the better known it is that we are actually helping people. You may think – you may think that the saving grace of Scientology is for everybody to know that it works instantly and immediately and just goes fine. Oh, no, no, no. That is the moment when you had better start watching out. We've gotten by so far because it is well known that we're complete frauds. [laughter] It's almost as if I designed it that way.

Well, right now we're about to stick our necks out. We can handle anything that breathes – rapidly and immediately. We can push somebody up to Clear and we can push them up to OT. Here we sit. We've got the technology. We have the organizational technology. And as we start to expand and we start to have a broad, dramatic effect upon the community – already we're within an inch of it. We're receiving a bid, and are in receipt of a bid, that is from a vicinity of the United Nations to train Scientologists for it. Very interesting. International City is being listened to. The only organization I wrote it for was the United Nations. You've never seen me mention it since. I knew sooner or later they'd tangle up with it because they haven't got any other solution. They've tangled. I'm talking about Wednesday night.

Now, organizations start beefing up and getting big and sassy, and their pricing range and amount of service and that sort of thing starts to improve. Now, I'm not trying to run through just public. We've got to retrain psychologists, psychiatrists, doctors. We've got to handle them. Some of those guys are pretty batty. Fortunately for us they're not all crazy, but some of them are real crazy.

How do we handle them? Are we going to sit around and argue ourselves deal, dumb and blind about how we are not actually trying to hang them from the local rafter, that our process is an entirely different thing? Do we go on exhausting all of our energies on the more suppressive members of the society or do we – do you expend those same valuable energies upon the broader body of the society? Which do we do? Well, we certainly had better get out of the road the boys who want to stop us, because they're not trying to be convinced, they're just trying to stop you. If you made those flying-saucer pilots any stronger, man, they'd have it. See, they know what's dangerous, and that's people who get any bigger or tougher, because after all they're in this terrible state of having to fight off all these people, and very hard to do being followed by a green alligator.

You haven't had much experience yet on this Level Chart. We haven't actually given you much data about it. But as you start to put that together – and certainly those of you who move into Level VII – you're going to be aghast! You're going to be aghast at how wrong you have been. You have been wrong. You've been wrong right along with me. You've considered the insane portion of the society lower than it was; it's very, very high!
And you start running right down amongst the grass roots on these people, and you find out what they really think and what they really been up to all the time they were walking around wearing their cute little old lady's bonnet – krdrdrdrd – and life is going to be to you a much more exposed affair. And people are going to stretch out there, and the sheep and the goats are going to be looking different. And you're going to find out that some of these people that you had a little bit of trouble with and you thought they were just kind of a tough case – if you ever go back and process one of those guys, your hair will stand on end. A tough case? What the hell were you doing in the same room with a gorilla? [laughter]

We've gone through one of these periods of finding out more about man and mankind that, of course, we couldn't crack the back of what's the anatomy of insanity. And we know that now. And you can – if you recall or look over literature and so forth those days, I said the one thing you could understand about insanity is that we didn't know anything about it, and it was incomprehensible, and that was the thing you could understand about insanity. And we left it parked there.

Well, we've gone on to this point, and I can tell you down to a gnat's eyebrow what insanity is, see? Insanity is now comprehensible, totally comprehensible. I've just described it to you. You didn't find that very complicated, did you? Guy is stuck on the time track fighting off the werewolves. Ha-ha. It's not my guess, man, it's not my guess. That's subjected to processing proof that happens right before your eyes at VII – pow! There he is – boom! And that's the end of that process. You see?

In Dianetics, we were trying to run the track – we were trying to run the whole track and trying to make the track be good and so forth. We've moved so far in fifteen years that what might have taken us thousands and thousands of hours of very good processing can now be done in less than fifty with total positiveness on an insane pc. That's progress.

You hit the society with that, you better damn well have the organization, you better damn well have the training, you better damn well have the ethics to back you up. Rdrdrdrdrd! Talk about jumping into the tiger's mouth to see if he has halitosis. [laughter]

I don't fancy myself in the role of having to be the only one who can bring any order, the only one who can straighten up something, the only one… You know, that "only one" gets tiresome after a while, you know? Of course, it would at once be a lie to say I didn't do the work, but would also be an imposition to say I was the only one who could then ever do anything. You see, these two points are different. So if I have any trouble at any time handling some suppressive at five or six thousand miles, I'm sure some executive someplace is having trouble handling him on the other side of the desk. So I've tried to give him weapons with which he could handle this situation. And those weapons are fitted well technically.

A potential trouble source does behave that way. A suppressed person is in that condition. If you label the person you can resolve the situation and get technology in. If you don't label them and don't call a spade a spade you will never get the technology in. If you don't clear the way for technology and use it to get technology in, it's going to take you many times as long to get the technology in so it speeds it up.

How long does an ethics action last? An ethics action lasts until technology is in. Elementary. How much ethics do you use? You use enough ethics to get technology in. When do
you stop an ethics action? Well, you stop it when you've got technology in. This is very elementary and very funny because somewhere along the line you're going to have somebody complaining about all these unfinished cycles of action. Somebody is going to complain about them, but he'd be a fool if he did.

There's been an interrogation madly in progress. There have been interrogatories going out to this or that and the other thing. There is data being amassed. There's stuff being put in folders; there's programs of whole investigation of this and that is going forward. There's paper, paper, paper, piling up here, and there's more work being done. And a Comm Ev has now been formed up, and they're busy choosing interested parties to this Comm Ev, and so forth. And all of a sudden you don't hear anything about it anymore at all. It's just dead vacuum. What happened to all this?

Technology got in. You understand? What was all that doingness? Well, that doingness was going to go all along and mounting up higher and higher and higher until technology finally got in somewhere along the line. You see? It's total planning.

And I'll tell you the awfulest thing you ever saw in your life. Terrible thing has just occurred. Lives are being blasted. Ruin stares many people in the face. In the London area at this exact moment there's a long, long list of interested parties that contain amongst them several very suppressive people, and some who are just there for witness purposes. Oh, it's a very serious affair. It's a Committee of Evidence to obtain data on the spreaders of false and malicious rumors so that they can be sued by the association for redress and damages. And that moved right out into civil law, didn't it? In other words, that's a Committee of Evidence married up with civil law. And it means business, too. If it doesn't settle down, why, it will go on proceeding, don't you see?

But what actually is occurring? Poor little old HCO up there has been just knocked around by suppressives until it doesn't know whether it's coming or going. So I just used this mechanism to say, "Down, dog. Let's have a nice quiet, quiet area while we get HASI London put back together again." See, there's no fake about it.

But to show you how bad it is, since HCO has been putting it in up there – putting ethics in – and straightening it up, straightening it up, they've been on a steady increase, and they've been on a sufficiently steady increase that they are now the first org out of an emergency area. Isn't that interesting? And they're going to have the ten, fifteen people that are stark, staring nuts in the London area – out of all of those millions of people in London, you see, there's only this little handful – [laughter] and they're just going to be as quiet as a smothered bird. Going to be real quiet. And during their quietude, technology will get in.

It's all very interesting, because it's all very serious, and yes, it could go right on through to a final conclusion that did blast this, that and the other thing and would blow up most anything. But, it's a question then of when this technology will get in well in London. That's the only question. It's not a question of where does the ethics proceed. That is not the question at all. It's how long do you have to hold the area down?

Now, maybe, the HCO Sec up in London can breathe. She was being bothered the last couple of days a lot by interested parties calling in and saying they were innocent and hadn't
said anything, and nobody was saying anything, and everything was awful quiet where they were which I thought was a very healthy sign.

You would be surprised how psychopathic some of these things can be because proceeding from a psychopath, of course, they're psychopathic.

You have no idea some of the rumors that go around – or maybe you do. They're utterly fantastic. It's all the more incredible because how the hell would I have time to do these things? How the hell would anybody have time to do these things? Here I am at work, hammer and tongs, turning out bulletins and plans, handling despatches, and roaring it up, and trying to form up this and straighten up that and so forth – and somebody thinks I've got time for some of these other actions. Tshuth! They compliment me. [laughter]

And here's probably the only outfit that ever hit this planet that meant exactly what it said, and was doing exactly what it was doing, and was doing exactly nothing else, and was achieving its targets right straight along the line – pow! pow! pow! And this organization is guilty of "Yack-yack-yack-yack-yack and yack-yack-yack-yack-yack-yack. And the other day, yek-yek-yek-yek-yoh." [laughter]

I fortunately have some knowledge of the psychopathic personality and what he will do and imagine, but it's sometimes very peculiar how they can dream it up.

One of them the other day – very interesting up in London – I'll just tell you this little aside and so forth. Boy, he had everybody – oh, these big generalities, you see – he had everybody in East Grinstead was suing Saint Hill because Saint Hill was totally broke, you see, and our accounts were all in bad shape and everything was bad. You see, big great genera… Saint Hill is absolutely paid right up to the notch. The only suits in progress at the present moment are those that we're leveling to collect a little money from some private persons that owe us some dough, not even Scientologists. Huhh-hh!

You never saw a happier, more prosperous picture. You never saw a public atmosphere around and about that was calmer, see? But this guy is saying, "And it's all in a jam. And do you know what it's about? And my authority is, my attorneys which are down in East Grinstead and mur-hur-hur and mer-hur-hur-hur-hur." [laughter] Oh, he's just having a ball, see?

So, the other day they lowered a slight boom on this particular direction and they called a spade a spade, and he was put as part of that Comm Ev up in London. And you know, he came in and told the people that he had told all this to, who had sat and listened to him and taken the notes on it, that he had never said anything like that before in his life; he had never mentioned it.

What people would miss about this: he believes that. He believes that, just as he himself never said it in the first place. It was some circuit. See?

Why, of course, now, he says with perfect truth that he never said it. That's true. How the hell could he say anything? He hadn't been there for seven trillion years. [laughter]

Well, anyway, right now – right now with – when we haven't got things straightened out along on the new org board and a few things like that, you see more of ethics internally in
organizations than you might ordinarily see. When you're sitting out along one of these organizational channels one day you'll just thank your stars. You're sitting there maybe as an Examiner and so forth, and some student will come in and fly up in your face, and so forth. And all you told him is he'd better study his E-Meter a little bit harden And he just takes your head off and practically – so forth. And at that moment it's a choice between restraining yourself from frying his brains and sending a chit to Ethics so it will accumulate in his file. And I think you'll be very happy to send a little chit to Ethics and say, "Doakes. Discourtesy to Examiner. Ethics."

Of course, nothing happens to Doakes. In actual fact nothing will happen to Doakes for days or weeks. But sooner or later somebody will decide that it's too enturbulent right now in that particular course and so they'll go look in the ethics files, and they add them all up, and they find one nice, fat file, and they feel they need a head on a pike so there is Doakes. There's his head on a pike.

Now, we find out that all during this time that it wasn't hit or miss or by chance and so forth; we find out he in actual fact hasn't been making any progress, and it was actually damned lucky for us that we found out about it now, because we can do something about it.

So anyway, you'll find out that the organization will run as long as it has channels, and as long as the particles on those channels don't carom off the sides of the channels and collide with the working parts of the organization. Now, if you can bring that about, then you can have an organization that has a total capability of pouring through it practically the whole human race.

In the absence of holding the sides of the channel, being able to remove the barriers to progress – in the absence of such a tool, why, you just couldn't ever work up to volume. Everything has to be handled on such a tiny, particularized, individual basis, and people are caving in, and you have to replace your Registrar every three months because the public impact wears her out, don't you see? That sort of thing. Well, you don't need that sort of thing as it goes.

So, I'm sure – I'm sure that the boys with the more entheta look at life got it all figured out that we've all gone stark staring mad, you see, with all this justice. No, we're just having a little fun with justice just now, and when we learn about it, why, we'll be able to control a fairly wide sphere of public in such a way that they don't all get destroyed. That's the main danger. The main danger to them is not ethics, it's having their silly heads blown off because they make somebody mad. See – not me. I wouldn't blow their heads off, but I can't guarantee somebody else won't.

So, there is more or less the way that things fit together these days, here's the direction that we're going. As a matter of fact, it's probably with your heads stuck down amongst the textbooks and wrapped around in the environment with various particles flying around and handling all sorts of small problems and that sort of thing, it may sometimes look like you're not really moving or going anywhere or things are happening which are very poor indeed, and so forth.
Well, you just take a little bit of an overall look at the situation and you find out that it's pretty, pretty darned fantastic. The only thing that's wrong with Scientology these days is the advances are quite unbelievable. Nobody could do this in fifteen years. It's not possible.

You're going to see a Scientology, in size and so forth, which compares to some of your very large industries in the not distant future. You will have amongst you not just Scientologists; you're going to have to fall back on a lot of wog, man. You can't make Scientologists that fast and use them in admin. It wouldn't be possible.

Yeah, well, you could give them a beginning Scientology course and you could do that. Well, here at Saint Hill I've already piloted the operation. I've been working alongside of non-Scientologists on staff for quite a while and it's very easy to do, as long as you have discipline in when they begin. You got to have discipline in when they begin and let them go along with it, and let them know something about it and handle it, and handle it in a disciplined fashion. If you do that you don't get any trouble – into any trouble with a non-Scientologist; he knows where he stands; he knows what the score is. And he'll work – he'll work very nicely, and a Scientist can work right alongside of him.

As a matter of fact if he happens to be stark staring mad – and I do mean that advisedly – of course you'll have some collision, because you always do. But in actual fact, over a period here of six years, easily 70, 80 percent of the work at Saint Hill has been done by non-Scientologists who didn't know anything about it at all.

So, in your large Central Organizations, you'll find out the Technical and Qualifications Division; your upper executive levels and so forth, will be mainly composed and – they'll be actually totally composed of trained personnel. But then even in those divisions, all of your clerical actions, everything connected with filing and typing and keeping address plates, and putting things together, and all of the types of clerical actions you can shake a stick at, lots of professions that you could name, will be mixed up in that organization. Well, it has to be kept and straightened out, and that organization has to be straightened out, too. That's been one of the little things that has been very hard in putting together the org board. How do you put together an org board that doesn't take a Scientologist to keep it straight. See?

And that's one of the things that's been solved in relationship to this because that takes a considerable amount of discipline. They find out that discipline is much better than the one in the factory which they just left. But if you don't have any discipline at all, they just collapse. They feel they – that you're soft in the head or something, and they don't know what to make you out. They walk around. They haven't got any walls to bump into. They're very used to disciplinary walls, you see? Unless you give them some they feel quite disturbed and quite lost and quite unsafe actually.

So, we've piloted this out. So that's one of the factors of expansion.

And then you're expanding into a public where law and order has actually ceased to exist. Today you could no more get a person arrested for stealing your pocketbook than you could fly to the moon on a washboard. If the cop did arrest him, he probably wouldn't even bother to take him in front of the magistrate's court. You'd just be very interested if you wanted to talk to the police. This isn't being advertised, of course; it just happens to be deadly
true. You're walking out into a society that is losing its grip on order, and it's a pretty poor show.

Now, you've got the additional fact that when you put in a stable datum, enturbulence will blow off. Well, let's not get all the enturbulence in our teeth, let somebody else have it in their teeth, too.

The net result of what we're doing is trying to make an orderly show for the future. Those of you who are aboard at this particular time may not – on course, for instance – may not sometimes feel that you are handled with all the gentleness that you might be handled, that you're maybe *yanked* into this pattern and *yanked* into that pattern and so forth. And I don't come out and hold your hand. It's not that I don't want to talk to you – a long way from it, and so forth. I miss talking to you. As heavily as my schedule is put together, it's almost impossible for me to turn around twice. I have to economize and only turn around once.

The main thing about it is, is I do get individual reports on this, that and the other thing that's going on. I know about where you sit and know just about what the score is, and you'll find at this moment a Sec ED is transferring those students who have been on a slow drag over a considerable period of time into a special completion unit under Review, at no cost to themselves, which pulls them off of the lines, puts them back on the original check-sheets they're on so they can finish that with a cycle of action and get what they came for and also have their cases straightened out and be terminated. That, of course, unmatches the unmatched particle flow. In other words, the student who has lagged behind.

We've had a unit on Emergency and this is more or less the way I'm ending the Emergency. You might say, we're pretty well ending the unit. But what we're doing in actual fact is simply… The machine now, you might say, is geared to take a certain particle flow of students along a certain particular line. Well, those who have been dragging are certainly going to get less attention unless they are given some special attention on this, and those that are overdue up into the next slots and so forth had better be handled. Well, the place to handle that is Qualifications Division because it corrects what's going on, on the assembly line. Don't you see? It takes things that can't run on the assembly line and puts them over and handles these. And that'll probably be taking place here tomorrow morning. The next day there will be a mad scramble on this. But the whole action is I've seen here very plainly that there are certain people who just plainly would never finish up at all unless they're given some specialized attention on the thing. And I don't intend to lose them. We need every auditor we've got.

You see changes like this. Sometimes you don't see the overall picture, and it's a little bit hard to understand, and it sometimes works some privation or upset on you once in a while, something like that. Well, I'm not trying to tell you it's all for the best in this best of all possible worlds, because that would tell you at the same time that I never make any mistakes. No, I don't – I don't work on that formula at all. I just try to be right far more often than I'm wrong, and then I consider if that's that and then we take care of that, then it will somehow or another work out. It's highly satisfactory in the final analysis. It's not so satisfactory, of course, when you happen to be the one who gets caught in the wrong solution. [laughter]

But there's always, of course, one thing you can count on. I'm the first one to change it when I find out it's wrong.
Well, anyway, I wish you lots of success with you – with this new lineup and with the
new unit that you'll be moved over onto. And I'm officially as of this moment ending the
Emergency on Unit C without shooting anybody in flames.

It's been a lecture more or less on organization and ethics and how those thing com-
pare to each other and what their actual use is. And I hope you can benefit from it to some
degree.

Thank you very much.
THE FIVE CONDITIONS

A lecture given on 25 May 1965

Thank you.
What's the date?

Audience: twenty-five.

Twenty-five May AD 15, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. A meter with a gray face. Isn't that interesting looking meter.

All right, I have a little bulletin – bulletin to give you, a couple of bulletins. And one of those bulletins is that Mary Sue is late today. [laughter]

Now, there's a rumor going about that if you're being processed in the HGC as a student, you can't come to lectures or something like that. That's false.

Let me give you a clue – this is the little bulletin you have. I'll give you a clue on the way we have to operate in Scientology: If it isn't written, it isn't true. And you just put that down and you'll get along fine in organizations and everyplace else. If it isn't written, it isn't true.

Somebody says this, that and the other thing; you say, "Well, have you got it in writing?"

And they say, "Well, no, as a matter of fact, (something)." Well, then it isn't true and that's that.

This, by the way, had to come into being. The first place I know of it was when we were down at 2600 Hoover in Los Angeles in 1950, and people used to walk in off the street and say, "Ron said to give me fifty hours of processing," or something like that, and by George, they would. [laughter]

There's very often some misunderstood statement or a rumor line or something like this is passed on verbally. And frankly it – even if it was uttered verbally it should have been in writing. So once more, if it isn't written, it isn't true.

You find out that when things are moving very fast, a whole bunch of verbal orders will get mixed up in the thing that other people aren't aware of and suddenly, why, nobody in the organization can agree with anybody else because the verbal orders are standing in the road of everything, and it just all breaks down. So you have to have that rule, and you have to make it stick.

Now, the other one is that Saint Hill had to be declared in a condition. Now, a declaration of a condition is something new, and you will soon find it applying to the course. And the
bulletins are all practically written – the policy letters are all practically written on this, but I haven't had a chance to finish them up or sign them or something of the sort. But we've been using this, nevertheless, for some little time and that is, strictly, a condition is an operating state. Organizationally, it's an operating state.

And oddly enough in the MEST universe there are several formulas connected with these operating states. And if for instance, England, the British government, knew these or the United States government knew these, they wouldn't get into very much trouble. But as it is, they don't know them and they get into a great deal of trouble.

There are apparently certain formulas which have to be followed in this universe or you go appetite over tin cup.

I'll give you an idea of the Emergency Formula – the Emergency Formula… Of course, we're more accustomed to being in a state of Emergency on this planet than we are in any other state. And nevertheless, there is a certain way that you handle an emergency. And an Emergency status is declared simply and only by a down statistic; that is to say, the statistics went down. And it doesn't matter what statistics; if they were supposed to go up and they went down, why, that's an Emergency.

Now, the reverse can take place. The reverse can take place. Let's take the number of students in a unit. Let's say it keeps going up and it kept going up and it doesn't go down. Do you see? Then, obviously, the students aren't being graduated from the unit at the same rate they're being put into the unit, so there must be a slowdown in that unit of some kind or another. So that will create a State of Emergency, too.

So it's the desirable statistic has not been attained. And the statistic which should go down goes up or the statistic which should goes up goes down.

Now, let's take the gross income of an organization at large. That has to do with a, let us say, a drop. And it's a consistent drop: One week, we don't pay any attention to it; two weeks, we start paying an attention to; three weeks, why, and then we jolly well pay an attention to it. Don't you see? And if it consistently does this in an organization and shows down, down, down for four consecutive weeks we declare them in a State of Emergency.

Now, the declaration is issued by Secretarial Executive Director, which is a positive order. In other words, it's a written, posted order; people are not left in the dark concerning this State of Emergency. You just had a unit on this course go into a State of Emergency. Now, there are several policy letters connected with this which I won't particularly bother to delineate. But there are certain actions which one has to undertake when a State of Emergency is declared.

The first of these actions is, well, you can say promote – that applies to an organization. To an individual you'd better be – say produce. That's the first action. Regardless of any other action, regardless of anything else, why, that is the first thing they have to put their attention on.

Very often you will find out that the moment that the emergency was noticed… Well, let's take you: You find your money is going downhill at a great rate, and you're not getting as
much money in as you should have been getting in and there's less and less money and so forth. Well, you actually are in a State of Emergency.

Now, the proper thing to do, according to Mr. Wilson, a thetan that wandered in from someplace… Well, he did. He had an ambition to end Britain. And that's libel and slander so we'll have to cut it off the tape. But anyway, he really made this statement: He says England should be a fourth-class power. And he's making his postulate. You didn't know that he said that? Oh yes, man. That's a matter of publicized public statement, made right after leaving the United States before he was elected.

Anyhow, he's making it. But now, you see, he finds the organization called the government in a poor state economically, so he economizes.

The United States government does this all the time. As soon as they find out that their treasury balance doesn't equal their squidawoof and the ideas of the secretary of the treasury that he just got from the first cell of the Communist Party or wherever it is – or wherever they get their ideas.

The United States government, you know, runs its economics today straight off Karl Marx' Das Kapital. If you don't believe it, read Das Kapital, if you can. Now, that sounds awfully rabble-rouse and very extreme, but it happens to be a very banal statement. It's even been noticed by the Wall Street Journal. The formula of economics in Das Kapital is "From each according to his ability to pay and to each according to his need." Socialism. That's the formula of taxation contained in Karl Marx's Das Kapital, written about 1879, something like that. See? And the governments of the world are following this today. And these capitalistic governments are having a ball with this.

Well now, supposing when they find that they're going broke they economize. Supposing they take that as their first step. Ahhhhh. Every time they recover from an emergency they will be smaller and less able. If that's all they do. Do you follow? They have violated this actual formula of Emergency. There is an actual formula of Emergency. It does exist in this universe. It's in the woof and warp of the universe itself. And its first line is – its first line is – the first broad, big action which you take is promote.

You better jolly well promote. And that carries with it on the part of an individual or factory the idea that he better make his intentions known, and so on.

Now, after you have promoted and after you've got that well in hand, you economize. But you have to do that first. Don't bother about economy; bother about promoting.

Exactly what is promotion? Well, look it up in the dictionary. It's making things known; it's getting things out; it's getting oneself known, getting one's products out or something like this.

In the form of an artist, the idea – he finds he's – his statistics are shot. He suddenly looks up one day and the bank balance is down to nothing and that sort of thing and the landlord is camping on the first landing and so forth. Well, he's – he must first and foremost promote.
He better take those three academy paintings that he was busy dabbling with, and he
better sit up all night long and finish those things real fast. He better wrap all those other
paintings that he'd already finished; he better get them off to a gallery awful quick. And he
better call up a press boy of some kind or another and say, "I am having an exhibition." See,
and it didn't matter how many pounds, shillings or pence he had to borrow to make the phone
calls or put the ad in the paper or get a – some literature printed that he was having an exhibit.
You see, that didn't matter. Promote, man. Let's get it up there; let's get it out there; let's get
the lines straightened up, see? Huh!

Now economize. You follow?

And then – I'm giving you the very rough formula. And then he's got to prepare to de-
deliver. Now, he actually during his promotion could have sold a half a dozen paintings. Well,
then he economizes, and then he paints them and delivers. Got the idea?

So it's in that action. And when you find your statistic is down you first have to pro-
mote, and when you got your promotion well in hand then you better economize, and then
you jolly well better prepare to deliver.

And that's the one-two-three. If you do it backwards, you've had it.

Now, there's another condition known as Affluence. And this is one of the most dan-
gerous conditions there is and nobody recognizes it as such. Let's take – let's take some fellow
on the south side of the northeast side of lower Chicago. And he's always been going along
with twenty-five cents in his pocket. That was about the most money he ever had in his
pocket. And all of a sudden, he gets in a crap game and he wins ten thousand dollars. Well,
what's his normal operation?

Whoa! Huh!

I remember a famous movie Victor McLaglen played – played in, that showed a beauti-
ful rendition of this. It was The Informer. And he's paid a huge sum of money for turning in
one of his fellow Irish Republican Army soldiers. And he just blows this, don't you see? It's a
marvelous example. The first impulse somebody gets when they get that much is to – is to get
very rich indeed.

So what's this fellow on the lower east side of south Chicago's lower north side –
what's this fellow do? Oh, well, he buys himself a house, the future payments of which are
going to be $175 a month. He buys himself a car, the future payments of which are going to be...
He's got all the down payments for these things, you see? He buys himself a watch. He
lays out a bunch of clothes that he doesn't need. And he neglects to pay off anybody that he
owes. And his ten thousand dollars is gone. He now owes another twenty thousand and he
hasn't got a prayer of paying that off. He's violated the condition of Affluence. And the state
of Affluence Formula has been definitely, wildly violated.

Now, the first thing you must do in Affluence is economize – just right now: You got
ten thousand bucks. You didn't expect it from anyplace. You didn't know it was going to be
there, and so forth. Just quickly cover it up with your hat and economize. Say, "Where are we
wasting money?" [laughter] Bang! You must, just at once.
And then make very, very, very sure that you don't buy anything that has any future commitment to it. Don't buy anything with any future commitments, don't hire anybody with any future commitments, nothing. See, that's all part of that economy. Clamp it down.

Get every bill that you can possibly scrape up from anyplace, every penny you owe anywhere under the sun, moon and stars, and pay them. Pay every bill is your next big broad step. Pull everything down in all directions until you've got it down to as close to zero as you can get or zero.

Now, invest the remainder in service facilities; make it more possible to deliver. See, service facilities.

And part of the formula is to discover what caused the condition of Affluence and strengthen it. You see? Move your operation or what your life or you're doing, and so forth, slightly over, so that it admits this zone and area of affluence.

Now, if you do those things and so forth, why, life will look like a dream. But you notice that the condition of Emergency, if handled at the beginning with economy, would inhibit getting out anything in order to produce enough money to raise the statistic. So if you went into a condition of Emergency and economized instantly, you either might always remain in this condition of Emergency or if you recovered from it you would find your organization was smaller or you were smaller or you had less scope, because you have applied the state of Affluence formula to the condition of Emergency.

And all you've got to do is misapply one of these formulas – be in condition B and say you're in condition A, or continuing condition A when you have moved into condition B; in other words, be operating on the wrong formula – and you'll wrap the organization up. You'll wrap it up.

And part of the Emergency Formula, since... These things will be published in great detail. Actually, there's about thirteen steps to one of these formulas. There are certain major points. These are the ones I'm taking up.

If for instance, you didn't – you went into a condition of Emergency and then you didn't change – after you'd promoted, you didn't make any changes in your operation – well, you just head for another condition of Emergency, see? So that has to be part of it. You better change your operating basis. You better do something to change the operating basis, because that operating basis led you into an Emergency, so you sure better change it.

But Affluence – Affluence: You must have been doing something awful right to get in that much money. Well, you jolly well better discover what it is! That's the search that you go into. At its proper numbered slot, you go into a search and overhaul anything and review it all. After you've provided some service facilities and you're straightened up, and that's the end of all of that big kettle of money that came in, then you had just better look-look-look-look. What the devil did cause this? Because you may have the wrong idea of what caused it. It might have been a complete fluke, or it might have been this or that.

But you better – better hunt and research and look at it and watch it very carefully and say, "Aaah, yes, yes! That's because I st..." Well, in the case of a painter, you see: "That's because I started being nice to editors' and painters' and art gallery people's wives. That was that.
program I went out on last month of 'Be nice to the hostess.' Hm. So after this I'm always going to be nice to the hostess." Don't you see? Oh, it works like a bomb, see? Gorgeous. After that, nice to the hostess, conditions of Affluence happen every now and then. You follow? It'll be some screwball thing of this particular character.

You might have thought that it was because the world was suddenly more conscious of art. That had nothing to do with it, see? Until somebody can define what art is, the world is not likely to become more conscious of it. [laughter]

So here is a – here is a case where you could go into a – an operating condition unknowingly, pay no attention to it, keep running as though you were in another operating condition, and all of a sudden just go appetite over tin cup; the whole thing just crashes and you don't quite know what happened to you. It's all a big mystery. But if you know these operating formulas (of which, by the way, there are five), why, you're jolly well – well-off.

The lowest, most basic of them and the most snarly one is the condition of Emergency. When you're in a State of Emergency, boy, that's snap and pop.

Well now, part of a condition of Emergency contains this little line of "you've got to stiffen discipline" or "you've got to stiffen ethics." To an individual this would simply mean, well, not go down to the pub every Friday night, you know? Let's stiffen up the discipline; let's stay home and grind the midnight oil away, you see? Let's stay home and do one's homework or something. You get the idea? Discipline stiffened up. Be a little more regular on the job. Work a little harder. Something of this sort, see? Don't goof quite so much. Don't make so many mistakes. This would be part of that operating action.

And, as a net result, organizationally, when a state of Emergency is assigned, supposing the activity doesn't come out of that emergency. Regardless of what caused the emergency, supposing the activity just doesn't come out of the emergency, in spite of the fact that they have been labeled state of Emergency, they have been directed to follow the formula, they have been told to snap and pop and get that thing straightened out, and they're still found to be goofing; the statistic is going down and continues to go down and so forth. What do you do? There's only one thing left to do and that's discipline, because life itself is going to discipline the individual. Life itself is going to discipline the individual very cruelly and savagely.

Living in another age, in a less socialistic period, why, the net product of it was starving to death. In a business, why, it'd be going into bankruptcy, see? It's a crash situation.

And it usually winds up in an ethical situation. Fellow who's starving to death will quite normally steal. Bankruptcies wind up in bankruptcy courts. It becomes an ethical situation whether one likes it or not. You've got justice staring you in the teeth.

So, the rule of the game is that if a state of Emergency is ignored and the steps are not taken successfully (do you understand "not taken successfully" is different than "not taken"?), why – and the condition is continued, then you get an announcement after a while that the condition has been continued. And if the condition is continued beyond a specified period of time, why, that's it. It has to walk forward into an ethics matter. Because how else could you straighten out that activity? There must be somebody goofing like crazy, sitting on most of the comm lines, do you see? There – you've got some ethical problem involved with it.
There's somebody who won't function. Do you see? There's somebody who's got the brakes on so that you can hear – smell them smoke. And so you walk forward into an ethical situation.

Now, the state of Normal Operation is the second condition and that is supposed to be just normal operation. It means not "stability." You could call it a condition of stability and it probably should be called a condition of stability except for this one little factor: This universe does not admit of a static state – not using our definition of the word static – but it won't admit a no-increase, no in... no-decrease. You cannot have a condition in this universe where there is no increase and no decrease. That's a totally stable condition; there is no such thing in this universe from one end of it to the other. It's – there isn't anything that always remains the same.

You take some of the hardest substances there are, which oddly enough are plutonium and some other such elements; those things diminish, you see, or explode. You take lead. You say, "Well, lead will stay there a long time." Well, I invite you to look at the lead on some churches, and so forth, and you'll find out that it's diminishing. As hardy as the element is supposed to be it's still diminishing.

And you take a tree or a body after it attains its supposed size and so forth, why, it actually doesn't have a long period of an absolute plane. You see, it's either increasing, increasing, increasing and when it goes into that plane, and so forth, you'll find out that it's really decreasing. So that very old people have actually shrunk in size.

You understand, I'm not talking about this from the viewpoint of "it is right." I'm just saying this is the way the universe is rigged. I'm giving you some laws that I managed to strip out of this universe. And where the agreement of beings and their interlockings of organizations and materiel and that sort of thing – where these things function, well, you'll find out they're governed by these universal laws.

These are quite interesting because they over – they completely knock out economics as we have known it. And they supplant a different operating basis for economics. We don't expect to be teaching anybody these things, particularly, but we certainly are interested in using them ourselves. They're very valuable data.

The condition of Normal Operation, then, is not one of stability. And therefore, I'm not going to call it "stability," – although it's probably supposed to be called "stability" – because it can't be. Normal Operation must be a regular... routine or gradual increase. And there must be a regular, routine, gradual increase. And if there is no gradual increase there will not be a condition of stability. You cannot have a total, even state of existence which does not eventually fall on its head. The second you get this even state in this universe, it starts to deteriorate. So a state of stability would eventually deteriorate.

Well, to prevent a deterioration you must have an increase. That increase doesn't have to be spectacular but it has to be something. There has to be a bit of an increase there.

Well, the way you maintain an increase is when you're in a state of Normal Operation you don't change anything – you don't change a blessed thing. You just let it go and you're very benign about the whole thing. Ethics are very mild. The justice factor is quite mild and
quite reasonable, don't you see? And there's nothing very desperate going on, you see? There's no savage actions taken particularly People come to – sitting around in an old shirt or something like that. Well, let them sit around in an old shirt. Maybe that has part of the increased statistic. You're not sure, see? But don't go plowing around.

Now, what you do do is you very carefully examine every slightest rise in a statistic. Every time a statistic betters – let me put it more accurately – every time the statistic betters then look it over carefully and find out what bettered it, and then do that. That's the only changes you make. And every time a statistic worsens slightly, quickly find out why and remedy it. And you just jockey those two factors: the statistic bettering, the statistic worsening. Repair the statistic worsening and you'll find out inevitably some change has been made in that area where a statistic worsens. Some change has been made. You better get that change off the lines in a hurry. And what – when you find that a statistic is bettering, something like that, you better find out how it is bettering.

You very often find out it may depend on an individual. You maybe got a new – a new person on some post, or something like that, and they're doing extremely well, you see? Well, one of the ways to better it is pat them on the back and hold them up as an example, don't you see? Give them a little bump in pay, something of this sort, don't you see? But increase that statistic.

We've sent out a mailing or we've done something or we've approached somebody or we've talked to a different type of person recently, and suddenly our statistic is a little bit better. Well, we'd better add it up very carefully that we talked to this type of person, and without abandoning what we were doing before, also do this other one. Do you see?

And therefore, you will find that your statistic is just – keeps bettering and the worsening statistics tend to fall away. And you just keep riding this horse on that sort of a jockey basis. It's just a very nice – it isn't a – it isn't a lazy operation; it's a very alert one. You watch your – you watch your statistics.

Now, let me give you an example of how I speak of this organizationally. Of course, we have OIC boards and that sort of thing to watch statistics by and everything has to be staticizable. That is to say, you've got to be able to get a statistic on anything, anywhere in an operation. If you can't, why it's all on rumor and God knows what all, and you very soon will be in trouble. Maybe your own life is only in trouble because you don't staticize it.

Very seldom does a clerk, for instance, ever look at his pay as a statistic. If some fellow, for instance, has been getting nothing but that same paycheck now for the past two or three years, that's a State of Emergency. Do you follow? Although the statistic hasn't dwindled, that's the other way you can get into a State of Emergency because sooner or later that's going to dwindle; that's going to crash.

You never saw anything quite so silly. We've got a couple of organizations which never rise and never fall. And sure enough, after about two or three years of never rising and never falling, one of them had a hysterical cable in here the other day that it couldn't pay its rent. See?
Oh, well. Without anything dramatic occurring it had gotten itself into an emergency, see? The statistic hadn't even visibly declined. It was just the fact that here was this line – level – level – level – level – level, no increase over these years. Poof. All of a sudden, bang. It's into some kind of a State of Emergency that has sneaked up on it, you see?

The State of Emergency that would sneak up on it, to somebody that had a gross income across here, happens to be in the woof and warp of the universe itself. You have things like inflation; things become less valuable. So if you had the same income, it won't buy as much. And actually that was a declining statistic. Do you follow? I mean, although it looked level, it was really declining. The civilization around it was growing so it didn't have the relative importance to the civilization around it that it should have had. See? So it wasn't really level at all. And all of a sudden there it is in an emergency – can't pay it's rent.

So the individual clerk who has been dragging down X number of dollars per week over the past three years and has had no rise of any kind whatsoever – no rise, no prospects of a rise or anything like that – does not realize that he is looking at catastrophe. He thinks he's looking at security, the idiot. But for sure, if he has had no change of any kind in pay status for that period of time, he's looking at a personal emergency, if only because inflation itself will catch up with him. His twenty-five cent pieces now don't buy as many cigarettes as they used to, so it's actually a declining statistic. In the expansion of the world around him and the crowd that he is moving with, and so forth, their statistics are changing and his isn't. There's more recreation available to be purchased by his fellow man, but he isn't now getting more money with which to purchase the recreation. See, these little tiny factors will enter in to his life and although he hasn't watched it at all, he sees this level statistic and doesn't realize he's in a state of Emergency.

Well, how does he get out of a state of Emergency? Obviously, ask Mr. Wilson – economize. Oh, you treat it as a state of Affluence, huh? Well, look, whether he knows it or not, he is acting as though he's in a state of Affluence. And if he tries to follow the thing by first economizing without promoting, he's going to then get all of the consequences of Emergency. If you start applying one of these condition formulas to the wrong condition, you will get into operation the consequences of the one you are applying, you see – the one you are in. It's being neglected. So that if you want to really go into an Emergency, be in an emergency and apply an Affluence Formula. In Emergency apply Affluence Formula – boy, you're in Emergency! It'll crash you. Do you follow that? And all of that is hidden and out of view.

We're not talking now about something that's just dreamed up or that's a good idea. This was what lay in back of the operation of the machine called the physical universe. If these things didn't occur – whether amongst living forms or organizations or chemicals or rocks or something like this – if these – these actions didn't occur, one kind or another… How – it is very hard to see. Yet they are there. Matter follows these formulas. Other things follow these formulas, you see?

Now of course, they become a little more flexible when you apply them to life, and there's a little more life can do about it. Just to have – doesn't lie there like a – like a rock and simply erode, see? Life has more volition and so can apply the condition very definitely.
So here – here let us take a condition of Normal Operation – individual is in Normal Operation, apparently, and then the curve no longer goes up and it lies there level; everybody feels secure; they all feel it's all going all right. Twitterwit and Featherbrain & Company Solicitors – they've always been there, see, so they will always be there, of course. And much to their astonishment they wind up in a bankruptcy court. And how the devil did they get there, because their income had never changed? They say, "How'd – how'd it happen?" you know? "Hu-uh!"

So life is very fateful and life is very fantastic and life is very incomprehensible. Well, they didn't know the laws, and that was the real law they should have been following. Twitwit and Featherbrain & Company, and so forth, had no business having a totally even income since 1832. [laughter] If it didn't do anything to improve it, it was in a – in – going into an Emergency. And it will eventually react as though it's in an Emergency. And because they're ignoring handling an Emergency, of course, it becomes a real emergency. And the next thing you know, why, there's...

They don't ever know how this happens to them, by the way. There's one of the most famous boot makers in the ent... in the – in England – Peel – went by the boards the other day. So help me Pete, they have made boots for royalty since time immemorial. Probably Henry VIII had his boots made at Peel & Company, see? Fantastic. They did this fabulous job of boot making. They're no longer amongst us. And they blamed it on all kinds of things. They blamed it in all different directions. The funny part of it is that they were so apathetic about the whole thing, they didn't even bother to sell the name of the company. Any fool could have bought the name of the company and turned a line of Boston-made – Lynn, Massachusetts-made shoes and stamped them "Peel." And – that's what they did to Stetsons. You can no longer really get a Stetson that's a Stetson. Dobbs, or somebody, bought up Stetson, and they just stamp "Stetson" on the hats.

Well, they were so apathetic about this whole thing and it was so incomprehensible to them, they just suddenly went out of business, you know? They did. Well, along about – along about 1835 at the very latest they should have started advertising. [laughs] It didn't matter how many – how many royal feet were covered by Peel boots, see? That – royalty and so forth. They probably never even thought of giving somebody five thousand pounds or something like that to wear the name of the company on his boots in white letters or something, you know? I mean, they – however crude it was they thought of nothing. Do you see?

And that's how civilizations go to pieces. Civilizations generally don't know these formulas and they go bzzzt! "Well, there's always been a Roman Empire. There will always be a Roman Empire." Actually the Roman Empire went into Affluence, tried to treat it as Normal Operation and disappeared from the ken of man. The Affluence they went into was brought about by Julius Caesar. He expanded the empire's borders fantastically, suddenly and immediately. He also violated the normal operating procedure of the Roman Empire which was Pax Romana: build the roads, keep them open and keep peace everywhere and trade with everybody and rule nobody – to hell with them. And that was the way the Roman Empire was doing, and it was doing all right. They'd been going like that for, oh, a long time.
All of a sudden this bird comes along, and he gets the idea of conquest. He was doing a rehearsal for Hitler or somebody. And he gets this idea that the thing to do is expand the borders and get rich and make everybody rich suddenly, without any basic structure or anything. So oh my God, he was taking in this area, that area and the other area – this very area right here was tremendously affected by this nut.

It was typical, by the way, as I was telling you the other day about how they follow people who haven't got good sense. There was an epileptic homosexual. God almighty. Marvelous. How in the hell anybody would listen to him I wouldn't know. But you're probably not aware of the fact that the main battles fought for the possession of the British Isles were fought just a few miles from Saint Hill here, over in the Ashdown Forest. They were just over the hill over here.

Well, this nut did such things as take the British Isles, which for years and years – decades – had been getting Roman pottery and Roman cloth and Roman coins; and the old Phoenician tin ship line, and so forth, was coming into the south here. They were in trade, don't you see? And this channel over here, you could jump across it if you felt not too heavy one day. And the stuff had been coming over from Europe. And the British Isles here were in very close communication with the (quote) Roman Empire (unquote). They were – the civilization was very nice and they were very enamored with this new civilization. (It looked new to them.)

And they, for instance, had an older civilization that they were going on which you found remnants of in Ireland. Well, it was over here fairly strong and it had wicker chariots and things like this. And this new civilization looked good to them. That pottery looked good, and those togas, they looked real good and so forth. And they actually would have lined up on the shore the way people do occasionally with Scientologists in a group, you know? They want to know all about it, you know? What is all this? You know? And so on. And if you haven't got a suppressive present, why, they get you talking for hours.

The British would have lined up on the beach down here if they'd heard the Romans were coming over to show them how to fix up a few things, you know? They would have said, "Hurrah," you know? "Hello, how are you?" you know. "Gosh," you know, "been waiting for you for a long time. Me, I know some Latin. Listen," you know? "Pax vobiscum," you know?

No, this nut Caesar, he gets – he gets some little baskets or something they call ships and sails across this. And he lands on the beach in a hostile battle array and has got to find somebody to fight. And he finds some people to fight. And of course they fought him because it looked sure like an invasion. He had himself a ball, and then for some hundreds of years, why, you had this country stumbling along and trying to intervene in the politics of the Roman Empire, and outside the Roman Empire but inside the Roman Empire, and occasionally running the Roman Empire. Oh, wild.

Affluence. He all of a sudden got this tremendous quantity of territory, tremendous quantities of peoples. Did it all wrong way to. Didn't deliver really. He gave them slavery, not Roman civilization. They didn't treat it by the formula of Affluence. They just squandered the
wealth of the empire on this so-called conquest of new wealth and that was the end of the Roman Empire. And it after that…

Certain other political factors existed in the world. The Chinese, by the way, about the year one, licked the Russians. That's not well known but – the Russians haven't publicized it. They've said more about inventing TV than they have about that particular thing. But the Chinese licked them, and it fought them down to a nub. And they retreated – the Russians did – and they actually vacated and evacuated all of Siberia. And the Chinese drove them straight down into what is now the Urals and so forth. Boy, they were running and they were running hard, you know? They were scared. And they were sufficiently powerful even so… China was at the height of her civilized might, you see? About the – that was the real thing that occurred in the year zero. It wasn't Christ, it was this cataclysm.

And in went the Chinese and out went the Russian people, and they hit over into this area of Poland. And they kept hitting against that area. And they took all the peoples that were in the area of Poland and central Europe, and so on, and that actually had been on this side of the Urals, and so on, and those people were just forced out of their homeland by these new people that had been chased down, defeated by the Chinese.

And those people then migrated south, and they kept migrating in waves and fighting, and so forth. And they were actually streams of refugees, and they kept crossing the Danube, and so forth. And the Roman, he didn't know what this was all about. If he'd been smart he would have treated this as a new affluence of some kind or another, he wouldn't have fought these people. They frankly were not in a warlike state of mind. They were defeated – they had been defeated by the peoples the Chinese had defeated, you see?

Oh, they were without household goods or bread or any other doggone thing, and they were coming down in streams. And then they'd get organized somewhere up around the German forests or somewhere down into France somewhere, and they would form into an area that was trying to find some way out. And the Roman Empire barred their retreat from these Russians that had been chasing them out. And that actually is, apparently, the real basis of the – oh, things like the Vandals and other erasures of Roman history. These birds were just driven down on the empire. And they had all sorts of wild adventures, and so forth. But it wiped it out.

But the Roman, by that time – he couldn't stand up to anything. He probably could have handled these people politically if he'd still been operating on his old basis of Pax Romana. He'd still have been trying to keep the peace and keep the roads open. He would have said, "Yeah, well, there's a lot of country over there that doesn't have anybody in it. Why don't you people go over there," you know? Something like that. Instead of that he had to hold down this phony empire that Julius Caesar had put together that gave him boundaries. Up to that time he'd owned the whole world without putting any signposts on it, don't you see?

Julius Caesar went out and gave them affluence by putting up some signposts saying "This is Roman territory." So they couldn't handle these barbarian invasions and they're no longer with us. I don't know if you haven't noticed recently, but I noticed in the last war that nobody was ever very worried about being faced by Italian troops. Broke their backs.
Now, these various conditions... And there, there historically, was a huge condition of Affluence which was begun and which wound up appetite over tin cup.

Now, furthermore, the Russians didn't do all right on their defeat because they went into an emergency but didn't promote. See? They didn't – they didn't follow any kind of a formula. Well, you have to dream up what they'd have to do, you see? They would have had to have promoted something:

"We are useful to you Chinese," don't you see? Or "People of the Balkans, we come in peace," you know or something. They – all they did was just walk out there defeated and everybody they ran into, cut his head off you know? Uh-uhh. They didn't know much about formulas.

But you can get yourself in one of the most remarkable appetite-over-tincup states that you ever cared to be in, in your life: just apply the wrong formula to your own personal existence. This doesn't just apply to big organizations, big civilizations – applies to the individual. You go into one of these conditions, you're in it without knowing. You've got to be in one or another of these conditions, you see? There isn't any other con – there isn't this thing of no-condition. And you're in one or another of them.

And the funny part of it is, a state of Emergency – you know, a state of Emergency continued is still a state of Emergency, only it's worse. And that state of Emergency not recovered from with no Emergency Formula ended is worse. And then – that condition is continued and so forth; it's worse! There is no condition of "emergency over, because everything is dead." That's one of the horrible things to look at in this universe: nothing ends.

You could probably take any pc and get the – get the tail end of some duel he had at some unimaginable point of the past and you find out to some degree the duel is still going on. It's quite interesting. He never really gave up, you see? He was killed in the duel but he never – never really gave up. You see? The total persistence of the universe is one of the most amazing features of it. It will persist. Survival of anything and everything is the God and watchword by which it functions.

So what about this guy? He's in a condition of Emergency – and he becomes – he used to be a bank president and becomes a clerk. All right, he's still in a condition of Emergency, and he doesn't repair that as a clerk so he becomes a skid row bum. Well, he's still in a condition of Emergency, and he doesn't repair that so he becomes negative skid row bum. And then he goes down to a point where he still can't – he can't even pick up a body or function in any way whatsoever, so he's still in a condition of Emergency. At no time along the line does he pull out of this condition of Emergency. He's still trying to handle it as the wrong condition or something like that.

You want to know what the dwindling spiral is: It's really just applying the wrong formula to an existing situation. And that'll give you a dwindling spiral every time. And the handiest one to go into, of course, is Emergency because when the others aren't repaired or handled properly, why, Emergency then occurs. That's why we know far more about Emergency than the other states.

Now, there's a condition of Power Change...
I might as well tell you the other two conditions. There's – the first one is the state of Emergency. The next one is the state of Normal Operation, parenthesis (stability) – but don't be fooled by the word, thinking it's level. The next one is a state of Affluence. And the next one is a state of Power Change.

And the state of Power Change is the – where you have a company running all right, let us say, but the general manager has been hired by some other company because he has such a successful record. Now, this is one of the most mishandled states anybody ever heard of. You know, you get that cliché. "The new broom sweeps clean"? Well, it doesn't only sleep queen [sweep clean], man, it just sweeps everything out.

You're always getting a condition whereby Mr. Sykes has taken over now in the main central bank, and he has left the branch bank where he has been so successful. And his job is taken over by Bill Smithers. And Bill Smithers moves into this little local branch position, and the new broom sweeps clean. He violates the formula almost always. It just seems to be sewn into his makeup to knock it off. And it's just ignorance, you see? Well, he makes changes.

Now look, the little bank must have been doing all right if its boss was able to take off to become a manager of a bigger bank. Must have been doing okay, huh? Well, if that little bank was doing all right and if it was in a state of Normal Operation – which it normally would have been in for anybody to have been promoted out of it – this new bird coming in: Actually, life is a beautiful song if he follows the condition formula, and there – that's perfectly easy. You just *don't change anything*. Power change: don't change anything. Just because power has changed, don't change anything.

Now look, it applies to the individual on the basis that the new manager of this little district bank – the new manager of the little district bank – has been, previous to that, the chief cashier. Well, he's had a power change, see? He's from chief cashier to manager of the little local bank. Well, what do they normally do? What does a wog normally do when he runs into this situation? Well, you know very well, the wife has to have a bigger house and they have to have a better car, don't they? That's obvious. He's got to be the part, hasn't he? He's got to have more – better clothes to live up to this. It's obvious.

He's got to have – he's got to have a better front, you know? And they have to have more social affairs and make more social contacts, don't they, which makes it less possible for anybody to get his job done, don't you see? Also runs up a nice bill of expenses on entertainment and all this sort of thing. But if it were only that, it would simply be the individual violating it. He goes ahead and violates the formula for the local bank.

Well, it's always irritated him, the fact that he has had to say "Good morning, governor," or something, when the manager came in, you see? This has always irritated him and he hasn't got any better sense than to alter the operating procedure. So when he comes in he doesn't let his new chief cashier say "Good morning, governor," don't you see? He decides that this had better be that he is met in the office with most of the papers of the day. So the chief cashier is supposed to be in the office with most of the papers of the day. Well, he never gets a chance, then, even to hang up his hat. He's hit with all the papers, don't you see? And he gets all the chitchat of the bank before he can even breathe.
So this makes him a little bit sore, so he gets mean to people in his immediate vicinity and spoils the morale, see? So people make a few more mistakes than they ordinarily would have made in adding up the figures. And then there's this new rule about the tea break. He has decided that he had better put the tea break from *lufluf* to *blu-luf* see, and this is a big change. And then there's another change and there's another change and there's another change and there's another change. The new broom is busy sweeping a bank clean of being any bank. And the next thing you know there's no bank. See, its statistic goes *psheyr!*

So you want to ask, why is it when they have moved off Bill Smithers to become the head of the whole chain, do they have such a hell of a time replacing him in the local – local area? Well, it isn't that the guys that replace him are stupid or incapable of doing the job or something. It's just they don't know this formula.

What a song it is to inherit a pair of successful boots. That is really a song. There's nothing to it. Just step in the boots and don't bother to walk. [laughter] And this is somehow or another considered by people reprehensible, you see? You're supposed to strike out on your own. You're supposed to put your own personality on the... Bull! Put on the boots, but don't walk, man.

You just sit around for a while. Just sit around. And people want things signed – you know, immediately, that you're going to get – all of the pressure points in the organization are going to come to you at once, and – the fellow who had it before you had all these pressure points. But he must have resisted them successfully because they're – still exist. See there? See? So anybody wants anything signed that your predecessor didn't sign, don't sign it. That's an easy rule to follow, isn't it? This absolutely is the laziest position that anybody could ever occupy. And that's the only way it can be occupied – with total laziness. *Don't do anything!*

Keep your eyes open, learn the ropes and, depending on how big the organization is, after a certain time, why, see how it's running and run it as normal operating condition. If it's not in anything but a normal operating condition just apply the normal operating condition to it. Go around and – besides the little routine that's done, why, go around and snoop around and find out what made it a little bit better that week, you know, and reinforce that. And what worsened a little bit and take that out that made it worse, you see, and just sniff around. By that time you're so – you're so well acquainted with the operation, you know everybody by his first and last names, and you know this, that and the other thing, and you know where all the papers are, and you know the favorite dodges, and you've seen all these things happen, don't you see? And frankly, the operation will just keep on moving on up. It would move ahead very successfully.

Because quite normally there are only two kinds of replacements, only two circumstances – not conditions – but there are only two circumstances which require replacement: the very successful one or the very unsuccessful one. So the place was probably not in a condition of Affluence. It was probably in a condition of very steady Normal Operation for a long time which eventually came to the fifth – the fifth one which is Power. And the fifth condition, unless there is some other condition I've overlooked in it, is Power – the condition of Power.
Now, this fellow, in operating this bank, had operated under normal operating conditions, coped with all of its emergencies, didn't go blooey in all the affluences, and so forth. And he finally got into a position where he himself had assumed a position of power in the eyes of his own superiors.

See? He must be quite a bloke. He must be extending the activities of his organization all around. And he is operating at a position of where, for instance, power – well, somebody asks him for his position or opinion on something or other, and he says so-and-so and so-and-so. Well, his position of power is simply that they say, "Oh, yes, well, that's the way it is?" Even his superiors, you see?

In other words, the operation was running so well, and so forth, he eventually found himself in a position of power. And so the reason he gets promoted is, of course, he's outgrown the zone that that power matches, so they move him up to a higher power position. Quite elementary in its actual look. It – he'd inevitably move up to a higher power position anyway.

And when he does so he would leave, of course, an operation which was – which was in a position of Power. That would be its actual condition quite normally. When the fellow was promoted creditably, then the organization he leaves behind must be in a condition of Power.

If the organization is in a condition of Emergency, well, then God knows what you do. Now, the fellow who walks into the boots of somebody who has left it in disgrace… Very often there are two or three replacements before they finally set it down and stabilize it. Because every once – one of these guys will – well, they try to act – maybe their – maybe in the last job they had they inherited a condition, you see, of normal operating condition, see? And they found out they didn't have to do anything and it all came off all right. So the next one they inherit – they inherit, it's in a condition of Emergency. Its statistics have gone to hell, causing the boss to be fired. So they decide not to do anything, you see? Ooh. No, no, no, no. All he's got to do when he inherits one in Emergency is nothing extraordinary – it's just apply the state of Emergency Formula to it, which is immediately promote!

"Oh, statistics down? Oh well, let's see, what do we normally produce around here? We produce eggs. All right. Eggs. Good. Who do we use for our advertising? We've got an advertising manager or an accountant anyplace? Or we – any firm that advertises for us?"

They say, "Well, Smythe & Company has been our advertising firm for the last hundred years."

"Oh, wait a minute. This organization is in Emergency in spite of them. Well, we're going to get a new one. But meanwhile, Smythe & Company can turn out this campaign, and I'll also get somebody else to turn out a campaign, too."

"Smythe & Company, get out the standard campaign. That – the one that last produced a lot of egg selling. Now, repeat that whole campaign."

But the fellow says, "Oh, you mean, you wanted the girls with the bows on their…"
"I won't – I don't care whether they had bows on their hair or not. Just repeat the campaign! That was the last point of success. So get that one out quick. Can you – can you get that out? Any time – where the – in the next… Well, I'll give you lots of time; you've got until yesterday."

"Oh," the fellow says, "but you haven't paid your last account," and so forth.

"Well, we – I – that's – that's something else. I haven't got anything to do with that and neither do you. The only chance you ever got to get your account paid, son, is just to get out that advertising campaign *flash* and so forth. And if you don't get out the advertising campaign *flash*, why, you lose our account, and you're also going to lose your bill. So take your choice."

They say, "He speaks sooth."

So they get a promote out, don't you see? And he meanwhile – meanwhile gets ahold of another firm that's going to replace this other firm, and he says, "Get out an egg campaign. Right away. Sell lots of eggs."

And the fellow says, "We've always had an idea about selling egg campaign. We have a radio ad, and this rooster comes in and winks, you see?"

And you say, "How's he going to wink on the radio?"

"Well," they say, "well, we had it worked..."


And the board of directors, a bunch of old fuddy-duddies or something, are sitting around saying, "But how are you going to pay for all this?"

"Pay for it?"

See, they're trying to put the Emergency formula into the Affluence formula, and so forth.

"Well, fine. We'll – I'll give you a complete memorandum on that. I'll give you a memorandum on that by next Monday. Yes, sir! Yeah, we'll give you a complete memorandum on the whole thing." ("Grace, copy something out of an economics textbook or something, would you?") [laughter] "All right, very good. Now..." See, he also handles that by promote. He's going to give them something, don't you see?

And then after he's got this firm over here putting on the last successful campaign, he's got a new firm that is going to take their position if the new firm succeeds – when he's got all that promotion out, then he sits down to his desk and works all night long, every night and gets out *the* promotion that's going to save the bacon. Got the idea? On all lines and regardless of any expense. And then he makes sure that it happens. And then the next thing you know that organization's curve starts going up.

Elementary. Sometimes it takes longer. Sometimes it's sooner. Sometimes you hold your breath for a long time: Your promotional period is just week after week after week. "Oh my God, that last promotion didn't bite. Let's get something new here. Let's get something..."
going." You know? Keep it up until you all of a sudden see the statistic start to recover, and then economize.

And then just say, "All right, no purchase orders. Nothing. Nobody can have anything. No, I don't – can't pay any bills. I'm awfully sorry. Nobody can pay any bills. I mean – no, we can't buy anything. You say they're going to cut off the water tomorrow; well, I don't know how we'll bathe." [laughs] Just shut it off right there.

And then say, "How the – where the hell…" We haven't even thought of this up to this point: "Now, where are we going to get some eggs?" Horribly enough that's the only possible way it can be done. If you work it in reverse and worry about getting the eggs before you sell any eggs, you're going to go crash in this universe before you have an opportunity, don't you see? So now you've got a new fantastic and frantic condition which you are now going to have to enter in on.

"Where are we going to get the eggs?"

"Why, I thought you knew, Joe."

"No, I didn't know." [laughter]

Big conference with juniors, "Are there any eggs?"

Somebody says, "Well, there are Irish eggs. Nobody has ever sold those over here before."

"Oh yeah? Irish eggs. Hmm! I thought we had lots of eggs."

"Oh, no, no, no, no. You – you forgot, the thing that caused the emergency, and that sort of thing, was because hen-bite got loose amongst the hens and they all died."

"Oh, is that so?"

But you see, now, it requires real frantic, fast operating skill with which to get a supply. And if you're very, very clever, why, the first order that comes in from the big wholesaler for eggs you immediately fill it. How that happened is a concatenation of miracles, don't you see? But you fill it. You make good there because you – your next thought is to prepare to deliver and in the lag – when your promotion was going out and everything else – in that lag you are actually able, then, to prepare to deliver. See? So you conference with your juniors and so forth.

"They got lots of eggs in Ireland. They haven't been able to sell any eggs in Ireland for some time. You know there used to be a tariff and it more or less got uncustomary to import eggs from Ireland, and so forth. They're – and they don't use them anymore."

"Why?"

"Well, because they're brown eggs."

"Oh, yeah? Well, I thought… They're brown eggs. Well – how white – white eggs. Let's see, white – eggs are white and brown. All right. Very good. And do housewives have anything against white eggs?"
"Well, no. As a matter of fact, they used to have a superstition that brown eggs were healthier and made better cakes, or something. They – in old cookbooks you used to see occasionally 'Brown egg...' You know? 'You use six brown eggs for this particular type of cake.'"

"No kidding? And they have brown eggs in Ireland. All right. Good. We've got all of that propaganda going. We've got all that campaign going, and so forth. We will release another propaganda campaign now that brown eggs... And we'll quote old Betty Kettlebottom's recipe for brown eggs. [laughter] Yeah, yeah. We'll fix that up, and here we go, and here's – and we'll get in the Irish eggs."

And the wholesaler calls up and he says, "Say, those eggs you just shipped us, they're brown eggs."

And you say, "There's no additional charge." [laughter] "They're not dyed; they're natural."

And he'll go, "Are they?" and accepts the brown eggs.

That's how the universe goes together, and that's what fast management of an existing area is. And anybody by knowing these formulas, actually, could apply them to his personal life in a very wonderful fashion.

I'll repeat them again for you: There's the condition of Emergency – the state of Emergency, same thing; the Normal Operation; of Affluence – state of Affluence (sudden peaks of income); and Power Change, where the guy comes off; and the last one is Power – and the condition of Power. And a condition of Power Change merely means the old boss and the new boss. That can play hob.

Very often we have gotten into this in Scientology. Because I've left an operating area and it's been taken over by somebody else, we've gotten into a condition of Power Change. And instead of sitting back quietly, why, whoever inherited the boots changed some of the things that I had going, don't you see? They didn't reinforce them, and the area would go bzzt! And they couldn't quite tell why it had gone down so fast, and it – attributed it to my magic personality. Well, there might have been something to that, I will have to admit. But actually, it wasn't actually attributable to that at all.

It was that during the time I was there I had certain operating lines moving, and nobody kept those same lines moving exactly the way I kept them moving. And of course, Power Change – somebody else took over the control of that immediate area, why, they'd move those lines, they'd make changes, they wouldn't keep those lines flowing. If the guy had been very clever, he would have gone through the exact same routine of every day that I went through. He would have signed nothing that I wouldn't sign. He wouldn't have changed a single order. He would look through the papers that had been issued at that period of time – these are the orders that are extant – and he would have just gotten busy as the devil just enforcing those orders. And his operation would have increased and increased and increased and increased.

Now, when an operation, then, after I leave it does collapse – you know, it goes downhill (it doesn't ever totally collapse, but it goes downhill) – then you know very well what happened after I left. Somebody changed all the orders. See, it wasn't that the public
responded badly or something like that. It's just that somebody must have shifted all of the orders. That's all. Very elementary. You can trace it very easily, you see?

But the condition of Power is quite interesting. And that, of all of them, is the most fascinating – not because one is particularly power-happy but because it is peculiar. It's peculiar in that it apparently belies what you would normally think and expect to do as a Operating Thetan, because that is a condition of Power. And moving up into that condition of Power you have to follow its formulas.

Now, I've written its formulas down. I'm not going to try to quote those formulas to you at the present moment – I don't have the full list and I might tell you a little bit wrong. But I will tell you this about it: is what you mustn't do is disconnect. Isn't that peculiar? That's the first law of a condition of Power is don't disconnect. That will bring about catastrophe for both you and anybody else.

Now, look at what might happen. Here we have an operating Scientology organization – we can see it organizationally very easily – and it's operating pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. And after a while, some of the boys get the idea "Why are we demanding any money from preclears? After all, we've been operating in this area for some time; only our currency is used in this area. Why charge anything? Furthermore, we can mock up and put in place and haul in from the granite quarries outside the town all the building material we want. Why are we buying anything?" See?

And a bunch of these birds get pretty eager beaver and they start to do it themselves. And then they say, "Well, we really don't have to have any students or preclears." And it's the violation of that formula alone which brought about implanting, trapping and an antagonism toward thetans – the violation of the state of Power. And the first thing it is, is don't disconnect.

You'll find out that people whine and complain about this. How about the big boy who becomes the big boy, and he's been a local boy in some town, and all of a sudden he becomes a big boy. And he's highly powerful on Wall Street. And he never again speaks to any of his friends in the old home town. Jesus, those people resent that. That is so much the matter of the thing that I can tell you personally that it's almost impossible to speak to them. That is to say, if you've been in an area where you've been very well known and you suddenly become, oh, you might say, become a celebrity or something like that – these people won't believe that you want to talk to them, you see? They're so used to having the formula violated. You get the idea?

You'll find out that people whine and complain about this. How about the big boy who becomes the big boy, and he's been a local boy in some town, and all of a sudden he becomes a big boy. And he's highly powerful on Wall Street. And he never again speaks to any of his friends in the old home town. Jesus, those people resent that. That is so much the matter of the thing that I can tell you personally that it's almost impossible to speak to them. That is to say, if you've been in an area where you've been very well known and you suddenly become, oh, you might say, become a celebrity or something like that – these people won't believe that you want to talk to them, you see? They're so used to having the formula violated. You get the idea?

You'll find out that you've been to Saint Hill, and you've - you're in the org, and you go back. And you've always had a good time talking to Josie Ann, and so - the receptionist and so forth. And you'll find out that, although she'll chatter with you and that sort of thing, she has a feeling like you're quite superior now. It's going to be you who has to break down the communication barrier that's erected. You'll find out that very often these people have drifted off from you.

And you wait until you've gone through VII, and you've gotten yourself well up the line on Clear, and you can handle Power Processes, which gives you total dominion over any type of case there is. Now, we haven't talked about your state of case; we've just talked about
what you can do and the reputation of what you've got or what you are – just that, you see? We're not talking about you being able to do anything beyond your business, see? Wow! One of your hardest jobs will be not disconnecting. You'll find out there are certain people around who are now absolutely sure that you don't any – want to – any longer want to talk to them. And you start communicating with these people, and they will give you some of the weirdest reactions: Some of them flash back at you. Some of them are too respectful of you. Some are very propitiative of you. Your conversation quite commonly starts out with "Oh, I thought you would have forgotten all about me." This is quite weird, you see?

In other words, beings in the universe fully expect that you're going to violate the first position of the Power condition, which is disconnect. They think you're going to disconnect.

Well, let's supposing this organization got itself so that it was totally self-sufficient: it didn't have to train anybody; it didn't have to process anybody; it didn't have to do a thing. Next thing you know, this community, anywhere around it, is going to think of nothing but implantation, stakes, violating any freedom that a thetan might have. They're going to become very suppressive. They're being denied service for one thing. No bridge was put in.

One of the most dangerous things we could do – if we just wanted to blow up everybody in this room, there's one terribly dangerous thing that we could do: We could just not make what we know available. For instance, to have the Power Processes being performed at Saint Hill, and let's limit them totally to staff at Saint Hill. Huh! Somebody is going to get upset. Well, they get upset enough when you don't let everybody do them. You're not willing to sit still, you see, and watch somebody out in Keokuk process somebody into the ground because nobody star-rated him on the bulletin, don't you see? Because we have no way of star-rating somebody in Keokuk on these bulletins.

So we keep it corralled just to that degree and you'll see a little bit of natter. But actually the public at large, and so forth, in responding to me on this sort of thing, quite well accepts the idea that certain of these materials, the better – the stronger, tougher of these materials should be in trained hands. They think that's a good idea. And that's as far as we go. Yes, we say they should be in very trained hands and that we should have an ethics of their proper application. That's about the only thing that worries people. They're still available, don't you see? People can still get these things, and so forth. We haven't disconnected.

Supposing I announced, "Well, I walked across the bridge now, and I've given you some materials and so forth, and I'm leaving. I've got an appointment at the Central Galaxy, and so forth. It's about time I reported back anyway – I've got to collect my back pay." You'd see some wild things occurring. You'd be just a little bit amazed at how wild they would be. You say, "Well, it doesn't make much difference because after all he's given us all the materials, and he's done all this and he's all done that, and so forth," and so on. I say, "Well, I'm Clear now, and I'm moving on up to OT, and so forth. And hope – wish you people some luck. Bye."

Back in the old days, when I'd get dis... I would never get discouraged particularly but I'd just get to thinking about my own concerns and that sort of thing, and I told some people, "I'm not going to be around forever," and so forth. And I've had several people immediately
break down and cry and get upset and a couple of others get angry, and so forth – a very
misemotional mess. Do you see?

No! Power! Position of power! Don't disconnect. Even though you're promoted to
general from colonel of a regiment, don't be such a fool as to think that you can totally dis-
connect from that regiment. Because the only way you can't disconnect from the regiment is
to disconnect from it. You can't just deny your connections. What you've got to do is take
ownership and responsibility for your connections.

Now, the condition of Power is the guy going into a condition of Power or the organi-
zation going into a condition of Power. And the condition of Power Change – that state – is
actually a fellow assuming a condition which has been held from Power. You get the differ-
ence? You're replacing Bill, who was in a condition of Power. He was actually in the condi-
tion of Power. Now, when he moves off, disconnects – when he's gone – then the Power
Change is who took over. Do you see? That applies to taking over a post, do you see? Or the
upgrade of the power of an organization also is covered under that same formula, weirdly
enough.

And then this post up here of the assumption of this state of Power, and so forth, is
governed by its own formula. And the first thing it's got to do is make a record of all of its
lines. And that's the only way it will ever be able to disconnect.

Now, for instance, if you were a very, very succ... I'll give – show you this applies big
and small, see? Supposing you were a very, very successful – you were a very, very success-
ful Receptionist in an organization, and you were so successful that you were made the Regis-
trar or something, see? Supposing something like this went on.

Well actually, that is an upgrade of power, isn't it? Now, you don't permit the person
who takes over the post to operate in a condition of Power Change unless you make a total
record of your post. So on a condition of Power, the first thing you have to do is write up your
whole post. And you'll find out if you don't write up your whole post, you're going to be stuck
with a piece of that post since time immemorial. And a year or so later somebody will still be
coming to you asking you about that post which you occupied, because you didn't write up
your post. Do you see? So you made it possible for the next bloke in – whether he does or not,
that's beside the point; but you've made it possible for the next fellow in to assume that state
of Power Change, of changing nothing, because you've shown what was there, so he knows
now what not to change. You got it?

But if you didn't write it up, then he could change it, and you're being pulled back to
that post continuously. And that's the surest way in the world to be snapped in against some
old post that you have held, and that's how never to get away from a post. It's just, don't write
up the post of Reception, and go ahead and take the post of Registrar. And don't be very sur-
prised, however, if you spend 50 percent of your time answering the telephone while being a
Registrar.

And you say, "What wonderful mechanics are involved here. This – these new – these
new people that take over these Reception posts, they're just girls and they're no good and
they don't care..." Now, let's make sure before we start being too critical: Did we ever write
up this post, Registrar? Did we ever really leave the post? Did we leave it in a condition that it
could be left? And then, did we just negate the whole post after we left it, or occasionally did
we walk by and say, "How's the post coming?" See?

It's no sudden disconnection, man. That's what it really amounts to. Don't go discon-
necting. This is one of the most foul tricks that this universe plays at this particular time, is
permit death. They have a thing called the last will and testament, and that's a bequeathment.
Who the hell cares about the bequeathment; how about the bird's lines? See?

This guy is the school janitor, and he says, "Well, the world can get along without the
school janitor," and so forth. "And it's not important," and you know? And he kicks the
bucket. And "I leave my – I leave my Sunday suit to the garbage man," you know? And he
thinks he's done his job, see? How's he get a time track. *Hmph-hmph-hmph-hmph-hmph!*
He just never wrote up the hat of janitor so it could be occupied. In other words, he didn't take
responsibility for his former situation; not having taken responsibility for it, he's stuck with it.
It was his former position, and he didn't take responsibility for it so, of course, he's stuck with
it. Naturally.

He should have written up, instead of the last will and testament... He says, "Oh, oh,
I've got TB now and I'm kicking the bucket. And the doctors have promised me that they're
going to kill me in a few days." [laughter] "What should I do?" You know? What should he
do? There's only one answer, man. There's only one answer. He'd better write up his post. It
isn't whether or not he's in a condition of Power Change or not; he's in a condition of Power
with relationship to the janitor. See?

He may be doing poorly personally and may be in another personal condition. He may
be personally in a condition of Emergency, but as far as his post is concerned, he's in a posi-
ton of Power. He is *the* janitor. And he just ought to get that old stub of a pencil and that old
account book and sit down – and lie down and somehow or other get himself comfortable
enough to say, "Ya empties the ashes every Tuesday. And you'll find the fuse on switch box
number 17 is always blowing..."

And he – responsibility is, write the thing up and get it into the hands of the guy that's
going to take care of it. *Now* if the other guy doesn't take care of it, that's *his* track, brother,
that's not yours. Do all you can to make the post occupiable. Sooner or later somebody is go-
ing to come along and occupy the post properly.

Condition of Power Change: that might go appetite over tin cup two or three times un-
til somebody sees this old account book. "What's this?" "Well, that's old Sammy's write-up of
his job." "Oh, 'Switch box number 17 – 16 goes out – .' Well, I'll be a son of a gun, it does,
too. Hey, where's this? 'Every Tuesday, that's the best time.' Oh good. Of course, this stuff
about the hot water doesn't apply. We've had a new boiler since." Well, they had to have a
new boiler because they didn't apply the old hat. You get the idea?

So one, in his own personal life and in operation of a post, a state of an organization, a
state of a family, state of a civilization or the state of a planet or a sector, well of course, all
comes under the heading of the states of condition. And if they're in one state of condition,
operate into another, they for sure will fail.
These will be issued in the not-too-distant future in the form of a very exact bulletin giving you a number of exact steps for every one of them. There are quite a few steps, one right after the other. And they can be applied by cross-relating them to an individual; they'll be written up mainly for an organization, of course. But they can be applied crossways to that.

And one of these days, students – in the not-too-different future, I think probably by Tuesday of next week – students will be declared in a condition of Emergency if their statistic goes down. That's the statistic of the number of passes. So you're going less examination and more statistic, you see?

Your statistic goes down and that's what determines whether or not you go to Review. state of Emergency, don't you see? What do you have to do in a state of Emergency? Well, it's covered exactly in the state of Emergency. And you find out if you follow the state of Emergency, why, you come out at the other end smiling and smelling like a rose. [laughter]

The – it is a wonderful fact that those things did exist and that they do regulate existence, regulate life, and that life can therefore be followed. But I invite you to do one thing after these are issued and you get an opportunity to study them. I invite you to do one thing, and that is take some existing civilization aspect, take the course of existence of some government and estimate that government's state, see? Find out what state that government really is in, and then watch the newspapers for the measures which that government is taking. You'll go into stitches.

Contained in these is why the British Empire has become smaller. Every time they went into a State of Emergency or a state of Affluence, then they would assume the wrong formula. And the second that they assumed the wrong formula, of course, they'd emerge at the other end of the situation smaller. That's always the case: You want to become smaller – just always apply the wrong condition. Apply the wrong formula and you'll get it every time.

Now, the United States has got a bunch of formulas going right now. I don't know what they're operating on at the present time. But it's quite interesting – it's quite interesting. It would be, rather, a quite interesting mental exercise just to estimate what condition are they in, see? What should be the assigned condition? Now, that's the assigned condition; what's the formula? All right, the formula is so-and-so. Well, what are they doing? And you'll generally find out they're in some other wild condition that had nothing whatsoever to do with the condition that they are in. And then you wonder why statesmen fail and wars happen and things get worse and civilizations go by the boards, and why the Dominican Republic flag will be flying over the White House any day now.

Anyway, I think you can have some fun with this. But much more important than this, you could probably set yourself up as a business advisory bureau that would actually bring out of the woods any failing business in the world. You could set yourself up as an adviser – just using these states, see, and doing nothing but urge that they be taken, don't you see? Boy, they'd think, how wise, how wise you are, don't you see? And, "How does he know those things?" And once – if we did this, then we would supplant... I'm not advising anybody to do this. It's just a gag. We use it operationally ourselves. But a fellow by the name of Keynes, Lord Keynes, is the top dog in today's economics. And he only has one law and that's increase want. That's his law: increase want. And I've worked that out economically. If you increased
want – if you wanted really to increase want, you'd just have to starve everybody to death, and you would have reached and attained the end product of Lord Keynes' central law.

And as far as I can see, that's about as far as anybody has gotten on states of condition in modern civilization. And I hope we can do a bit better.

Thank you very much.
HANDLING THE PTS

A lecture given on 8 June 1965

Thank you.

Well sir, this is the...

Audience: 8th.

...8th of June. Yes! The 8th of June AD 15, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

I am speaking to you today in the voice of somebody who knows we've got it made. I am actually working very, very hard now on your final plot of the R6 GPMs and I am doing the suffering so you won't have to. Because you never would have got it straight. That's the end of that.

So I'm running them down and fortunately didn't release any of the materials before I did run it down and this new run, you've got R6EW; it works beautifully. You need a lot of it before you need any GPMs, anyhow. When you finally run into the GPMs, why, you will find that they are all there, all plotted very neatly and all correct.

It's like playing tag with a tiger. And the – I found out accidentally that I had run three out of the middle of the bank and three of them incorrectly, in addition to that out of the middle of the bank, some 680 GPMs below where I was supposed to be. Turned on a marvelous case of bursitis, and didn't call the doctor; simply straightened out the GPMs. But this is the sort of a thing that you can run into, because you see it's so hotly charged that everything reads.

So I'm doing the run on down the bank, and although you have a lot of people amongst you who have just gone Release and so forth and they're walking around bragging and shining and doing all sorts of things like that, I don't know whether I'll speak to them or not actually, because... [laughter] ...I've got the first six GPMs of the track run out absolutely correctly. Go on! [applause]

Now give all these new Releases applause, too! [applause]

That's a very funny phenomenon: somebody who's had a successful run on Release, and so on – I wouldn't do this lightly – but walk up to him and infer Scientology doesn't work. I think you've got to get so – he'd probably spit in your face. You're walking against an un-shakable certainty; don't you see?

As long as you've got something which is partially working and it's "doing him some good" and "he didn't have too many problems" and "it made them a little bit easier" – you know, that level of certainty, why, you can get pretty reasonable about the entheta kid, you know? And he walks up to you and he says, "Nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, bank, bank,

And you say, "Well, maybe he's right, you know? Because the results I've had, you see, I had a little present time problem one time, and it eased up a little bit in a session." No certainty.

So of course, person's got no certainty, why, he can be lied to. And however – what's happening at this particular present time is I was listening to Mary Sue the other day and somebody had inferred something or other about Scientology. There were sparks coming eighteen inches out of each eye. It was a remarkable phenomenon, you know? I lit a cigarette on it and thought about it. [laughter, laughs]

I notice now that there's a lot of doubt and wonder about ethics and so on, here and there and so forth. What is ethics? I just heard one from Chicago, just before I came to the lecture and so forth. "Scientology is to help, not to punish people." [laughter] How the hell would he know? He's never been helped by it. He'd made a lot of dough with it, but he's never had any tone arm action I've ever been able to find out. Suppressive.

So we are developing, simply, systems by which to handle the public at large, is all we are doing. And right now it goes in with a thud against some staff members and so forth and students collide with it and that sort of thing. Good. Get used to it. Because the action is actually intended for the public, don't you see? But until you have a familiarity with law and order amongst yourselves and some experience with how it works and what seems unjust and what seems just and that sort of thing, you never can grab ahold of it.

Now, you can't go nonchalantly knocking off the United States government or something like that without at least issuing an HCO suppressive order, you know? I mean, it wouldn't be fair! Now, let's come down to cases. Give them warning. Give them a chance to recant. What's interesting about it is, if you don't have a system of law and order you will never have law and order. You will just have cruelty, duress, suddenness, revenge, these sort of things.

How about one of these – one of these Releases and that sort of thing? Supposing you had no system whatsoever with which to handle an impolite, entheta or suppressive person? Well, he of course is thinking on a broader number of dynamics. Now, let's just move it up a little bit: This guy goes Clear and he goes OT. It's part of his experiential track that people are nasty to him occasionally. Part of his experiential track that the Melbourne Parliament is filled full of dingos. Don't you see?

Now, I hate to go whole track on you, but you've been a lot more active talking about it than I have. And the truth of the matter is that – don't you think that person would get a penchant for turning the parliament building upside down? Don't you think he'd think that was an awfully good idea? If he didn't have anyplace to step that day, don't you think that he'd think that was an excellent place to step?

Now, with his brilliance and effectiveness returned don't you think for a moment that when this subject came up he wouldn't turn his effectiveness in the direction of knocking it out? Regardless of whether he could handle the masonry or not, let's leave that as an unreal-
ity. You might not be used to handling masonry, lately. But let's supposing he got very bright and very able and that sort of thing: Don't you suppose he'd shoot that Melbourne Parliament down in flames? Hm? It can be done. We've got the US courts now talking in our language. Didn't take much doing.

All the findings about Scientology now are couched in Scientology terms. They define an E-Meter with our definition; not with the FDA's definition – ours. That's the courts. Those are hearings. So you can make a penetration one way or the other. But supposing you just went for broke on this? Supposing you decided that the Melbourne government – Parliament down there in Victoria wasn't good for people. And you decided you were going to wipe them out. I can assure you, you would be perfectly capable of doing that.

Now, that gives us a problem. If you don't deliver into the hands of executives and Scientologists and Releases and Clears a method of uniform justice and a procedure by which it can be accomplished, you're going to have chaos. You won't have a new civilization, you'll have some rubble. Because of this fact: Two or three of them would have to get together to decide what they were going to do before they did it in order to have anything just about it or work it out in any way and that wouldn't be the way they operated if no system existed. That wouldn't be the way they operated at all.

One guy would say, "Let's do Ron a favor!" That's the end of Parliament down in Melbourne. Boom! Well, at least declare them suppressive first.

Now, war was defined by a fellow by the name of Clausewitz. I don't know if you ever knew him in any past life. He was a philosopher on the subject of war. And Frankie the Limper – pardon me, Franklin Delano Roosevelt [laughter] – never read Clausewitz. He never read Clausewitz. He would have taken a vocabulary or something. His vocabulary ended – began and ended with "my friends" and "give us another appropriation." I think that was the end of his… Just to be suppressive about it.

So Mr. Roosevelt did not know Clausewitz's definition of war. And I can shorthand this – it's in horrible German, and if you quoted it completely and so forth it would break your brains. And you'd have to go look up in a dictionary and it would all be misunderstood and you'd commit overts on him, so I'll give you the shortened version, which is simply this: "War is a means of bringing about a more amenable frame of mind on the part of the enemy." [laughter] And that's what war is. And that's all war is.

Frankie, however, he wanted unconditional surrender. Now, would you please figure out what "unconditional surrender" has to do with that definition of war by Clausewitz? Unconditional surrender is not a more amenable frame of mind on the part of the enemy at all. It's an obliterated enemy. Now, that sounds more like Genghis Khan talking, to me, than an enlightened statesman. Unconditional surrender.

So he continued the war with Germany two years, and he continued the war with Japan one year. They were trying to surrender. They already were in a more amenable frame of mind. The end of war had been achieved. But the machinations of war had to move forward in one case two years, in another case a year. Smashing everything in sight. Knocking out Lord knows how many of the other people and how many of ours and no telling how much of that last period – when we were trying to get "unconditional surrender" – how much that cost in
terms of rehabilitation of the country. I think most of the damage in the country must have been done during the last period of the war, not the first period of the war, see?

In other words, that was a very costly and stupid thing to do. Unconditional surrender. Uncle Joe Stalin and the rest of the boys wished it off on him down there at Casablanca, and he went along with it and so they decided that Germany had to unconditionally surrender and Japan had to unconditionally surrender and that was going to be the end of war. Well, that is not the end of war. War is simply "bring about a more amenable frame of mind on the part of the enemy," and that is all war is. And when you fail to halt it at that point and then negotiate and fix up the differences, why, you're a fool.

Now, what are we looking for here? Now, there are certain elements in the society that declared war on us some time ago. If you don't believe it, it's not my imagination, so on. They said, "There won't be any E-Meters and there won't be any anything and nobody must get better, yeah! Down with those people!" You know? And just about in that level of intelligence, you see? They declared war.

Of course, we know the mechanics of such people. Those people are caught somewhere on the trap – in the track with – in a trap of an engram. And they're fighting whoever has got them there. They're fighting the Sioux Indians or somebody like that. So everybody in present time, to them, with a terrific generality, you see, are Sioux Indians. That's right!

If you ever looked into their anatomy, you would find out that they were fighting enemies that no longer existed. And they're imagining enemies that don't exist. They bring, then, a discreditable mockery situation into a place where you have some enemies, and if fighting enemies is paranoid, you see, then if you fight anybody then that's paranoid. That doesn't seem to be very logical to me.

Somebody walks up to you, he's going to bash your head in and steal your wife; and because you're afraid that it'll make you look paranoid, you don't take any action toward him. Well, that's not logical. That's asininity moving up to the nth degree, don't you see? And people don't think like that as they get Clear and so forth. They tend to work on a greater – the greater good for the greater number of dynamics, don't you see? And some guy walks up and starts clobbering everything in sight and knocking everything around that – while you're trying to do your job and so forth, take some suitable action. But how much action should you take? Now, that's the question. How much action?

Well, it's just – let's put it in the area of war. For some reason or other some man somewhere or some government bureau or some parliament or something suddenly declares war on Scientology, see? Well, they aren't educated enough to know why. They're usually doing it from the basis that they once upon a time were jumped on by implanters, and they're still fighting them or – you know. Or they're being born and they're fighting the doctor or… We don't know what situation they think they're in. We're in the immediate advantage of we know they don't know what situation they're in. Well, we jolly well had better know ourselves what situation we're in.

And the situation we're in is that our people get chopped up and our organizations get enturbulated by certain actions taken in the environment against Scientology. Well now, how
much reaction should there be to that? And it should be just enough reaction to bring about a
more amenable frame of mind. That's all. That's on the broad, broad public view.

Now supposing, when anybody walked into an organization, started chopping up the
Registrar or that sort of thing, she simply sent for the Ethics Officer, the Ethics Officer came
over and took the person's name and address, and moved it on down through CF and Central
Files and parked the guy in Dead File, and that was the end of his communication line. Sup-
posing that happened? You know that they would have a better frame of mind with regard to
us. We would have enforced one little point: Be polite. Just be polite to a Scientologist, see?

Well now, if that's all you were intending to bring about, why, it would win, you see?
It'd win very easily – "be polite to Scientologists," see? Because they're impolite, don't you
see? And by that impoliteness they're declaring a sort of a cold war, don't you see? Well, all
you'd have to do is reverse that situation, don't you see?

Somebody writes you a nasty letter – I'm not talking about somebody who is simply
enturbulated in class or in the HGC or something like that – but somebody writes you nasty
letters and "You dogs, you bums," and that sort of thing. You mean everybody on staff has
got to read this thing? What's the popularity here for entheta?

Because there's only a maximum at any given time of 20 percent. Twenty percent is
the absolute maximum that entheta or impolite letters go. You mean you're going to concen-
trate on this 20 and you're going to neglect the 80? You mean you're going to let everybody
out there rot while you have a marvelous time playing ball with this 20?

That doesn't seem to me to be the greater good for the greater number of dynamics. It
seems to me to be a sort of a reverse, superdefensive look. And yet you'll find uniformly that
as these letters, entheta letters, come through the line and chop up people that they, rather
routinely, get handed in to the highest executives in the place, because they will always re-
quire special handling.

But this funny frame of mind results: The highest executives in the place never see the
other 80. They don't realize that 80 percent are just happy as clams with Scientology. So they
don't gauge their service for the 80 percent. They gauge their service for the 20 percent. So
therefore, you've got to give them some method of handling that 20 percent. You got to give
them some way to handle it so that it doesn't tangle up their lines so they don't service the 80.
Do you see?

All we're trying to do here, you see, is bring service to the greater number of people.
Well, that's very simple to do: Take the 20 off your lines. They get too bad and scream too
loud, why, issue an order. Make other people disconnect from them. Other people do. And the
very funny part of it is, as soon as a ghost of a system goes in by which one can enforce a
slightly greater degree of politeness on his environment, whether as an executive or an auditor
and so forth… You'd be very amazed what immediately happens. His reach is increased. And
what has happened – he doesn't have to sit back here and hold it all in, you know? He's got a
route to put it on. This is what you do: You do one, two, bang! Zzzt! That's that.

Well, after that's worked out and grooved in, and so forth, then this person's reach is
better. He doesn't have to stake for this nonsense because he's got something to do with it, so
he won't argue with it, so there – here he won't stick into it, don't you see? Therefore, he in an organization can go uptone, not keep getting pulled downtone. See, it's all sound technology as far as we're going here.

All right, our next – our next approach to the situation, then, is to bring it about where the individual can reach the 80 effectively without being entangled by the 20. And it's just the percentages of it. Now, that means, then, that you've got to keep the auditor and the executive in the frame of mind that services the 80, not that tangles with the 20. Something is very interesting here; I'll give you two very good examples here at Saint Hill of very recent times.

It was quite a shock to some people to find out there were literally thousands and thousands and thousands of letters in Central Files, coming in from Founding Scientologists. Those applications were just pure theta. These people were satisfied right down to the ground. And the only ones the executives knew about were the sour ones that had come in, and they were just a little tiny handful. I think that's fantastic. I mean, here's this whole ocean of terrific letters, you see, but the ones that had been forwarded through and that they knew about were this very little bunch. See? Pretty wild. Pretty wild.

Now, I'll show you how this comes in more intimately. Right at the moment I'm doing forty cases – forty, meself; forty folders a day. That's no trick. But out of those forty folders there will be a maximum, now – due to ethics and other actions which are taken and so forth – there's a maximum there of three to four cases that are not running perfectly by the book; out of that fantastic number of cases. You can chalk it up against the process. We can take a guy that's all enturbulated and spun in, going backwards and upside down and so forth and still stretch him out straight so he sounds – zung! – like a violin string pulled at both ends, you know? But nevertheless, you see, there's those three, let us say, folders, and there's something bad about those folders.

Now, I look at those because there's a maybe on them, you see? You don't take a fast action on it. And you fall into this kind of a trap: You forget the thirty-seven. Thirty-seven cases running perfectly by the textbook to an exact desirable result. See, there was thirty-seven auditing sessions there that just ran smooth as grease. And you look at those three. What are we going to do about those three? Well, worry, think, look for data and so forth. Well, if I'd do something like that, I'm sure that any D of P in any organization would do something like that. I'm sure that an auditor practicing by himself someplace would forget about those twenty that ran so beautifully and remember those two that didn't – do you see? – and worry about those.

In other words, you tend to get fixated on the maybe, which is very interesting. And this is the other thing that brought ethics into view. There are only two sources of difficulty with cases. Only two. The auditing comm cycle and PTS – potential trouble source. Those are the only two difficulties that really get in your hair. You can make mistakes everyplace else and still somehow get by. Just those two.

The auditing comm cycle. Now, of course, we could have the gross auditing error of he didn't even run the process. We could have the gross auditing error of there was no session took place at all. I don't mean that by descriptive; I mean the pc never appeared and the auditor never appeared. You see, these are gross errors, but let's not look at them quite so gross.
This auditing comm cycle. Well, the auditing comm cycle might include a bit of alter-is or Q and A or something; it might include some other devious things. How do you police this thing? What do you do, just go on as a D of P, saying, "Well, I hope all the auditors do all right?" See? Because amongst any such body of auditors there's going to be two or three auditors that are showing their teeth. And their teeth will show in some fashion along this: They're having some personal trouble or they're doing something or other. Don't you see?

Well, who looks at all this? What are you – as D of P or something like that, what do you do? Go charging down to the HGC personally, and grab the fellow and say, "What the hell's the matter with you, for telling your pc not to answer the auditing question? You know, that didn't seem to me to be a good thing to tell your pc and so forth. What's all that about?"

Well, actually, you never as a D of P get a chance to do that. Your lines are long, the work is many, there's lots of cases; you never get a chance to do that. Well, you've got something you can do with that. You, in the first place, would have a Review Division in an organization. That is, pardon me, a Qualifications Division for which you'd have a Department of Review.

If you wanted to know what was really going on with this, you could send your auditor for a check over on the comm cycle. You could send the pc for a check over on his case. Immediately you're going to get lots of data that you weren't able to have before. You don't have to solve this thing by hit or miss, hunt and punch; let's get both of them checked over. Now we know where we stand.

Well, now supposing it's just a case of "I ain't gonna better my comm cycle!" Well, I'm afraid that there has to be another place to send them to bring about a more amenable state of mind because he's declared war. We can't have this, and the place to send him, of course, is Ethics. And he goes over to Ethics, and Ethics says, "What's the matter with you? Why aren't you – what's this complaint I've got here from the D of P?" so forth.

"Well..." so forth, "Rrr-rrr-rrrr-rrr."

Well, they straighten it out. They find he's a PTS or they find it this or that or something has going wrong or they find out he's never had a case gain. You know, they turn up something, and then they give some sort of an action with regard to it. And eventually this gets back onto your technical lines and you eventually get technical in, don't you see?

But you don't keep that one going-going-going, busting up case after case after case, you see? You can stop that right there. So you can get technical in by just the simple expedient of taking that one out of the lineup until it can be straightened up. And that's advantageous, too.

Are you going to use the United States Navy principle on which to do this? The way the armies and the navies of the world do this is, one guy goes AWOL, goes over the fence after taps, so the whole regiment is instantly put on half rations and hard marches. You realize that they always apply these general regulations. Most of your government regulations take place because some guy has goofed. The ordinary citizen never really has to be policed. But he is policed continuously because of the goofs of three or four criminals. Do you see?
So it's an, "Everybody bears the burden of a couple of crooks." Do you follow? And you'll find that most of your arbitrary laws and savageness on the part of executives and officers, and so forth, stems from the fact that they are unable to handle the couple that goofed. And if they have enough loses in handling these guys then they get savage toward everybody.

If you want to keep them in a sweet frame of mind, you have to permit them to isolate the guy who is goofing and do something effective about it – by the number. And then you don't have an executive getting into a savage frame of mind. That's how your governments turn into suppressive organizations and so forth, because they really can't handle the criminal at all. They're quite incapable of doing this.

All right. So you get a broad punishment of everybody in sight! All the HGC auditors are suddenly turned over to – every night, all night long, why, they're going to have to do the Comm Course all over again, while... You get the idea. Well, it's all right to give them a Comm Course once in a while, when you're brushing them up and getting them on the line. But now, well, let's not have them, "Everybody in the HGC must do a Comm Course because one HGC auditor does – has been goofing on the Comm Course."

That doesn't seem – that seems to me to be awfully wog type of management, see? No, let's fix it up so this one auditor can do the Comm Course, and he knows what's going to happen if he doesn't do the Comm Course and straighten out. Do you get the idea? He's suddenly caught between two fires.

Well, there must have been something going wrong with him or his lifetime or something like that if he wasn't on the ball. He must be in some frame of mind which is grim. Well, is there any reason to visit your reaction to that frame of mind on all the other auditors who are doing their job? Definitely not.

So our action with regard to the pc now – let's take up the pc. You'll be very thankful for this mechanism, because the auditor doesn't just get sacked and forgotten about and mauled and that sort of thing. No, you can straighten him out this way.

Let's take this pc. I found uniformly that when a pc does not run under average – not brilliant, but under average – processing, he is a PTS or an SP. And those letters mean "potential trouble source" or "suppressive person." Inevitably and invariably. He's PTS or SP.

This doesn't include the fellow who thinks the process was flat, and the auditor wants to run it some more and the pc revolts for a while, something like that. No, no, we're talking about the guy whose case just isn't running. You can't seem to patch this case up.

Now, you just mark this down in letters of fire and you'll never miss. And you'll also have all kinds of 0 and I and II Level auditors who will be able to audit, zoom! And they will be getting results all over the place and you will see needles going free and so on – on these processes, if it's D of Ped this way.

PTS, SP. Now of course in the Case Cracking Unit at the present moment we simply do not give a damn if somebody's an SP. Bah! So what? Bah! If we can hold him down long enough to answer the auditing questions, why, he's no longer an SP. You understand? It's that sudden, see?
PTS – that's a different thing. We now, with the new lineup of processes there, are also incidentally handling the PTS. It took me a couple of days to get that technology. I found out that it would – found out this datum: We couldn't handle the PTS – potential trouble source.

Well now, that is simply somebody who's connected with an SP who is invalidating him, his beingness, his processing, his life. He's connected with a suppressive person. And the real trouble that you get into is by handling or trying to handle the potential trouble source with auditing. And all this data applies definitely to the processes below the Power Processes. It applies to all the processing that we have ever had. And this was why – if you keep this comm cycle in mind as the other factor – but this was why processing didn't work. Do you understand? It's as elementary as this. It had nothing to do with the fact that it would or would not bite the case. You could apply it badly.

It was falling down on the PTS. Now, the people who are more likely to come to you for help are PTSes. So you have a greater number of PTSes, potential trouble sources, walking in on you than any other particular type. And unless you handle it by ethics or ship them to Saint Hill and get them Power Processed… You can Power Process right over the top of that factor now. But not with anything else.

Unless you handle him as a PTS as given by ethics, your processing, no matter what you do, is going to fail because he's going to rolly coaster. Didn't matter how good you made him in the session, he's going to come back to the next session on his face. And if – even if you patched him up in that next session, he's going to come back to the next session on his face. And you're actually processing him into the ground. Because somebody is ARC breaking him faster than you can patch him up.

Now, it was this factor alone that we sensed, but didn't totally describe, when we started giving twenty-five-hour intensives – thirty-six-hour intensives, earlier. Consecutive processing fast in a chunk got the guy up before the environment could knock him down. Now, that's what we were looking for when we said the environment could knock him down; we were looking for the SP. Who's the suppressive person that's keeping that fellow from functioning in life. Who is it?

Now, that person was out of our view. We had our hands on this person – this girl, let us say, and she'd rolly coaster. She'd get better, she'd get worse, she'd bleah-blah. Processing would work for a moment and then wouldn't work, and next day you wouldn't have anything functioning. And all kinds of wild things were occurring with this case. And the D of P just racking his brains, driven into unusual solutions. Driven into inventing new processes to run. "Uh... oh, anything, everything. What are we going to do about this case?" Worry, worry, worry, worry, worry. Ah, he was handling a potential trouble source. He couldn't audit this person up faster than the environment was knocking the person down.

Well, what do we mean by environment? We mean an SP. There was an SP somewhere around that pc, and the funny part of it is, very often the SP is never even spotted by the PTS. The potential trouble source does not know the suppressives in his environment.

Now, the reason for that is quite interesting. The mechanical fact is that suppressive persons commonly speak in total generalities. They use "everybody," "they." They hear one catty comment, it's – in the next few minutes becomes on their lips "everybody says." Do you
see? They broaden and generalize entheta, and their identity broadens and generalizes. And if you want a picnic sometime, just ask a person this question: "Who has invalidated you?" Don't run it. I'm not recommending that as a process. It might – you might use something like that to clean up the beginning of a session or something like that, but lightly, lightly!

I'm talking about… Supposing you tried to run that as a process. Let's be more fundamental: "Name a suppressive person you have known." Hey, you know, the person you're trying to run that on will go absolutely bug-eyed. He'll try to remember and he won't be able to grasp it and he can't quite figure it out and he can't answer the question and he's getting into a terrible confusion because you're running almost straight, "Tell me an ARC break" or "Tell me…" Here's the process you're running: "Tell me the source of your ARC break. Thank you." And it just won't run as a process because the generality around the terminal – this continuous use of "they" and "everybody" and so on – has masked the terminal, and he can't pick them out.

And therefore, don't think somebody wants to be punched in the head all the time because he still, although fifty years of age, is still living with Mother. He's just never spotted the fact that Mother's a suppressive. You can watch Mother, you see, who's now an old dowager of seventy-two, knocking this bird appetite over tin cup and preventing him from being married and telling him what he has to eat for breakfast and so on. My God, he's fifty years old. And you can watch this, and he comes to a session, you know, and he's dressed in a weird looking dull gray suit, you know, that's a terribly – about 1890 cut and so forth and… If you ask him, "Who made you wear that suit?"

"Well, mmm. I just have to."

But you could have heard his mother say, "Now – now George, don't you ever wear any other clothes than that," you see? And it's perfectly visible to you, see, that Mama is keeping this guy under a hydraulic press. It's not visible to him! He can't spot her anymore. She's invisible in the environment. She's a terrific duress, like a – like a bank.

Now, you try to process this fellow. And he'll go zzzrrr-zzzzmmm. And he'll go up – oh, he had a wonderful first… oh, but the next session, troubles. Doesn't matter what you're running him on – 0-0 or anything else. We're not just talking about Power Processes. And if you sit there trying to figure out new processes and trying to figure out this and trying to figure out that… You say, "Has anybody been invalidating your processing or anything?"

"No, no, no, nobody."

That's right, he answered correctly: "Nobody!" That person doesn't exist. He didn't even hear it! Yet it registered, total.

Now, you could drive yourself around the bend trying to handle his case. But ethics tells you how to handle it. Let's look this person over. Let's ask a few indicators. This is not processing.

Put the person on a meter. Just, "Who do you know?" "Who do you live with?" "Who are you connected with that's against Scientology?"

"Oh, well, Mother doesn't like it very much."
"Thank you." And it falls off the pin.

Well, that isn't all it's been doing. Now, PTS, you say, "All right, here's the policy letter: handle or disconnect."

"Handle or disconnect from Mother? Oh, no! Oh, no!" But, "Oh, yes."

"No!"

"Yes!"

"Gee."

You actually haven't given him the force necessary to make the decision. You have actually pointed out what's wrong with his life. And the funny part of it is, if you name the wrong suppressive person, this ethics technique doesn't work. So when the PTS doesn't handle or disconnect and instantly go bang, then you can assume that you have named the wrong SP. You've named the wrong suppressive person. That's about the only trouble you have with ethics.

And frankly sometimes they give you so much trouble that you don't bother to call him back and name the right one. He's given everybody around the place a headache, as far as we can see, and that generality is intentional – there wasn't a single soul he didn't give a headache to that was in the place. And he – you don't get fascinated, see? You're not in a big state of quiver of "Let's help this person!" Well, you didn't make him that way, don't you see? You've given him the out, you've shown him what the score is.

Your responsibility, however, should extend far enough, if you're dealing with ethics and so forth, to punch around and watch for the person's face to lighten up. Say, "Well, all right, I found out that you're connected with a suppressive person – your mother. And here is the Ethics Order, and you've got to handle or disconnect."

He says, "My mother? Handle or disconnect? Oh, yes. Oh-ho. Well, what do you know! You – my mother? Yeah, that's right, you know. I never thought of that, you know." Zoom-zoom-zoom-zoom. You're getting tone arm action. You've never seen it on his case before, you see, to any great degree. Here the tone arm's running and everything's going at a mad rate. Fabulous! Big case change right there. Handle or disconnect. Yeah, he'll handle or disconnect.

Next guy – why, it's Hosiah somebody-or-other, and you're saying, "All right, we've been having trouble with you in processing. Now, you must be connected with a suppressive person." Or the guy's gotten tone arm action in the past, so you know he's not a suppressive. It's oddly enough, terrifically in our favor that... It isn't – it isn't because – we don't call them suppressive because they don't get well. I'm sure that you'll hear somebody saying this sooner or later. That is the indicator – is no TA. And when they didn't get TA you've always got yourself a suppressive, by definition. You don't have to look at his conduct; you just look at this case behavior of no TA, see? What's no TA? Well, it's less than ten.

Now, this individual – this individual, then, could himself be a suppressive or he could be a rolly coaster. And this is the other technical aspect. And the rolly coaster aspect is: He
HANDLING THE PTS

So, all the question you ask – all the question you ask of the case folder is, "Let's see, this fellow have any wins in processing? No, he's never had any wins in processing. Suppressive. All right. Has this person ever had any wins in pro... Oh, yes, he was doing all right last summer, yes, and he was doing all right when he came in for the intensive this fall. Yes, and he seems to collapse between those two times. And here he comes in now, this winter here, and – oh, he's flat on his face and he's in terrible condition. Why? He didn't leave here in that condition. Oh, look, he's in terrible – ah! PTS." See? That's all you need to know.

It doesn't take any vast technical acumen, once it's been reduced to the ne plus ultra, the simplicity of all simplicities. That is the simplicity. And you'll find these things will carry out.

Now, you've got – tremendous other ramifications with regard to this, you understand. Oh, you could find out all kinds of things about conduct and this and what he did and continuing overt and you could find this and that. And you could just stack these items up to hundreds, see? And the PTS – oh, you could get the data on that endlessly. More data and more data, and you could find out the trouble you had in Spokane was because this PTS got better and that made the suppressive on the other side of him go to the police. And we never knew that before, don't you see? All these things.

You start pulling on one of these little lines – you start pulling up the PTS line – and you get one little tiny bug – flea comes out of the line, see? If you started to investigate it and you pulled on the line a little bit further you'd find out there was a dog. And you pull on the line just a little bit further and you find out that there's a giant starts walking out of there. And you pull on it a little bit further and you'll find an elephant. And you pull on the line just a little bit further and you got a General Sherman tank. Never fails.

This is the wildest thing, when you start investigating. But all you have to know on the surface of it – all you have to know on the surface is PTS or SP. That's all you had to know. With that data, you can make releases. And if you don't have that data, you can't. You can handle students' cases. You can handle Free Scientology Center cases. Supposing you're mucking around in a Free Scientology Center and they're walking in off the streets, you know. "What's this Scientology? I haven't drunk any yet." [laughter]

You're going to find 80 percent of those guys, some rough figure of that character, bang! Boy; they're right with it! They go straight on up the line. Providing you don't get all tangled up with the other 20 that go thud. Now, that 20, a certain number of them, are going to go appetite over tin cup. They – the student auditor gave them a little session; they felt much better. They came back the next day and, "I felt good last night, but today I feel terrible."

Where do you send them? You send them to the Ethics Section; that's where you send them. Now look, if you haven't got any place to put him, he's just going to keep on standing there. And you can't process him any further because you're liable to kill him. Why are you liable to kill him? Well, there's two different ways you're liable to kill him. The higher he tries
to rise the more somebody's going to smash him down. You've doubled up the attack on him. You can process him practically into his grave. And if he got good enough...

Let's supposing – let's supposing this guy was married – was married to some girl that had counted comfortably on his kicking the bucket when he got to be sixty-five because he has thrombosis of the yumbussis. And here he is sixty-four, and he walks into the Free Scientology Center and there went his yombosis of the thrumbussis. And he comes back home and he says, "I don't have that horrible pain in my head now, Gertrude."

Well, if this sort of thing kept up very long, she'd slip him the cyanide. You think I'm kidding? When you get into those situations, they'll go to extreme, see. You're dealing with life in the raw. These people would be totally uneducated, totally unindoctrinated. They wouldn't know about anything from anywhere, don't you see? But they run into all these phenomena, just one-two-three-four, see?

Now, this fellow comes back in and he says, "What are you people doing around here anyway? I came in the other night and some fellow talked to me and I don't feel any better and so on, so on." What do you do with this guy? Stand there and talk to him? Or do you go process somebody or get somebody processed that will get a gain? You send him to Ethics.

What happens to the PTS when he gets to Ethics? You've got to have an operating Ethics Section then. What happens to the PTS when he gets to Ethics? He simply sits down and says, "All right, now, do you have somebody who's invalidated your processing or invalidated Scientology? Oh, is that so? Your wife? All right. Very good. Did you ever recognize your wife was a suppressive person?" I don't care whether you use terminology or not, see?

"No, no, I nev... I – oooh."

"Yeah, she's apparently got it in for you one way or the other."

"Say, you know, you're right. I often wondered why I've left so many jobs. I always seem to be able to do good and then all of a sudden I would do bad. Hey!"

Well, then you'd all of a sudden get a blowdown – see, Ethics would. You're not processing him. And they hand him a policy letter, and they say, "All right, here you are, handle or disconnect. And when you've done that, why – so forth. And here's an order which you already have – so forth. And we'll put this in the file. When you've cleaned this up, why, you come back here and you tell us what you've done and it's all set and you can get some more processing."

You haven't slammed the door in his face. Otherwise, you're going to slam the door in his face. And if you want to see all hell break loose, deny the world auditing.

Now, how about the SP? Well, actually, you don't slam the door in the SP's face. Right now Power Processing is only available at Saint Hill. It'd never be available, I don't think, in a Free Scientology Center. But someday it'd be available in your org. So you could say to this fellow, "All right, we know what's really wrong with you. You have a very rough case." Now, that's talking the truth. He also wants to bump everybody off, including you. Don't bother to tell him. "You got a very, very, very rough case, and there's only one place in the world at the
present moment that could handle that. That's at Saint Hill. They can handle these; that's over in England."

"Go to England?"

"Well, you have a very rough case. If you don't watch it you're going to die." [laughter]  

It's true, too! Tell any human being on Earth that – perfect truth. "We got to get you to an auditor quick, you're going to die if you don't." The doctor's gag, but this time with some truth because the doctor killed them.

Now, the main – the main action there is you haven't denied this guy anything. You say, "You're a very tough case. You're a very exc... you're very easily upset about things. You fight a lot of things." I don't care what you tell him, see? And "We're not enemies of yours, we happen to be friends of yours. You can be processed at Saint Hill. In a year or two – in a couple of years, we will have a type of unit here which is sufficiently skilled and so forth to handle your case. But up to then, why, no, and we're just going to have to ask you to stay away. We'll have to put this tag on you, and you can either do one of those, but in the meantime, why, just stay away because it's very restimulative to you." Makes sense as far as he's concerned – all makes sense.

All right. Without these tools and tricks, you can't process the world. That's for sure. You're handling life in the raw. And if you don't have channels and if you can't keep edges on those channels, you're just going to keep a mishmash from here on till hell freezes over, why, you're just never going to make it, that's all. You're going to take the 20 and fall all over the 20 percent and neglect the 80, and get enturbulated by the 20 and the organization's lines can't hold and because it's all being enturbulated this way or that, and your pcs don't gain and so forth.

Well, supposing you can handle these two factors. The organization stands together very neatly, things stay in a very orderly fashion, and in addition to that even your most elementary processes don't fail on the pcs. Because, you see, a process has rolly-coastered. Ethics. Actually what you do is send them into Review and Review sends them to Ethics. It's a one-two, bang! Everything on its route, everything with its label.

And the other thing is, it's a terrible, terrible unkindness not to label somebody. And we're perfectly willing to be that unkind occasionally. If somebody keeps writing us letters or talking to the people in a nasty fashion all the time or trying to chop us up and we don't seem to be able to do anything, we know the person is a suppressive and so forth. Believe me, we're never going to always issue an order, always go to a full panoply of dress parade: "This is a suppressive person," and post the orders on him. Nah, nah, nah. We've got another system to handle it: Dead File. It just cuts his comm, that's all.

Now, when he wishes to straighten himself out with regard to the Dead File, he of course will have to have a more amenable frame of mind. You've won your war; he can be processed or trained. It's elementary, don't you see?
If he declares war on you, if you don't handle it in the framework and definition of what's happening, why, you're in a mess. So you of course got to bring about a more amenable frame of mind on his part. Don't you see? He's declared the war, you haven't.

Now, if you want to – if you want to fail, all the way down the line, just keep on auditing PTSes without ever recognizing that they are, keep on having to use only Saint Hill graduates in the HGC because the newer auditor coming in, the Class 0 that could just as well be sitting there auditing pcs and so forth, is insufficiently indoctrinated and also needs discipline. Now don't furnish him any discipline – just don't hire him.

That doesn't sound to me like any kind of a solution at all. He doesn't think that it's important that he does this or that; first time he's been up to see Ethics he'll begin to realize that there's some importance in doing what the process said. Well, that's fine. So that's all right with him. Well, that's what you do. He'll get some results this way.

What are you supposed to do, stand around and give him a full HCA Course while you're waiting for this important datum to sink in or are you simply going to be able to use him? If you don't have discipline, you can't use his services. So you won't hire him, so therefore you won't get a lot of people processed. You see how this thing is figured out?

And the bigger – the bigger look – the bigger look at all this, of course, is the fact that you know you're going to raise hell with this civilization. There's going to be organization after organization is going to go down before this onslaught. It doesn't matter how nice we are, how mild we are, how sweet we are, how theetie-weetie we could possibly be; it'll still happen. They'll fold up.

Well, I'd rather they folded up on an assimilable basis. That is to say, they fold up on the basis of "Send us some auditors so we can straighten the place out," rather than fold up at the blistering hot muzzle of a gun, you understand? Or under the crack and roar of lightning. I'd say that's very dramatic. That will undoubtedly occur – I'd just like to cut it to a minimum. There's no reason to have any more dead bodies around than is necessary.

You can inject a certain positive technology into a civilization of this particular character. You could almost at this moment sit still and do nothing, as far as promotion is concerned. You really wouldn't have to reach at all. We're on the other end of the flow here at Saint Hill. We're going to have to resort to such mechanisms as dodged prices, you know, reservations way up to hell and gone – this sort of thing. If we were to try to handle the traffic which we have right now for case cracking and so forth, if we were to handle it all in one fell swoop, without putting some brakes on the traffic line of some kind or another, we just wouldn't be able to make any part of it.

So we've got to hold the line and give service while we're expanding the service. And we're doing that very easily. Furthermore, we've not only got to expand this service at Saint Hill, this has got to go into other organizations under heavy wraps – that is to say, it's got to go in, in a highly disciplined fashion – what we're doing here.

Because you can't turn this loose in the middle of the Kansas prairie, man. Whoever tried to do anything with it, he'd just go appetite over tin cup. No, an auditor running what we're running now has to be a well-backed-up auditor. And he has to be well backed up by the
D of P and he has to be backed up by an Ethics Officer and he has to be backed up by Review, and if he's backed up all the way along the line he could run this.

You could get away with running the lower-level processes without such perfection of organization. But you couldn't get by with the Power Processes.

The horrible trap that's waiting for some auditor who's going to get ahold of the Power Processes someplace and go out in the middle of the Chicago wilderness and start to Power Process some people...

Oh, it'll look good, you see, for a couple, three weeks. It'll look all right. Then he starts to run into all the other hats connected with it. And he won't be able to handle these hats. Even if he had a couple of friends, they wouldn't be able to handle these hats. And the next thing you know Chicago starts to beat his door down. So then what's he do? He would try to train some people who also wouldn't have... He wouldn't recognize that his failure on this was not having an organization that could handle it. And he'd try to train some people to do it to relieve him and next thing you know people will be knocking his blocks off.

There's nobody nastier than somebody who's been dished by the Power Processes, by the way. It's a two-edged sword. God, people go nattery! You never heard the like of it.

So what we've run into here is organizational technology, not individually administered technology at all. If a guy's got an organization that can back it up, he can take the world. Done by a bunch of individuals sitting unprotected and alone against the whole onslaught of the society and so forth, there'd be nothing but one solid mass of casualty. This you could be sure of. So your organizational look has had to be worked out.

Now, let's take a look at – let's take a look at what this does to processing offered. This is very important – important to organizations, important to individual auditors. If the – if it takes an organization to administer the Power Processes effectively, it isn't the D of Ping that's hard to do, it isn't the auditing that's hard to do; it's just the whole crashing demand line, the channeling, the lines, the this, that and the other thing. Because you're a manufacturing plant the second you go into this, see. You got – you think, "Well, we're just going to audit one pc, and then we'll audit another pc," and the next thing you know the thing tries to put itself into an assembly line. And your waiting list starts stacking up and this...

Well, if you don't have this all planned and grooved perfectly and there isn't somebody wearing each vital hat that is on each vital post and so forth – *Woo! Rrrrrrr!*

All right, so that requires a high degree of perfection of organization. Ordinary processes, to be successful, also have to be backed up. Now, you can get away with auditing an occasional pc, but why don't auditors stay in long term practice? Is it because they get tired? Oh, they make lots of money in the field. Is it because they wear out? Is it because of this? Because of that? No, they're just not enough of a team to handle pcs.

Remember, we've already seen a psychotherapy go by the boards. I've gotten results with that psychotherapy; it's called psychoanalysis. Why didn't it ever take the world? I think they were so busy trying to handle PTSes and SPs on an individual-practitioner basis, with absolutely no rundown, that they could never complete their research. Now, they might have found some of our sub-0 material, if they'd continued to research. But psychoanalysis had a
certain degree of workability. We shouldn't snarl at Papa Freud, because he is a very bright man. But it was the world that kicked Papa Freud's head in, and Papa Freud was not quite strong enough or able enough to take it.

But he, nevertheless, got across to the world the idea that psychosomatic illness could stem from the mind. He got across several other points, all of which are very interesting. His technology is sufficiently workable that I wrecked a Navy project, which wouldn't have amounted to anything at all, by sitting under a tree and psychoanalyzing their research patients. See, I wanted their data for myself. And they weren't going to do anything with their data anyhow, except file it, so I threw the book.

You say, how'd you do this? Well, I was sitting up in the middle of Oak Knoll Naval Hospital. I didn't have anything to do. And they had a project running by which they were testing people with endocrine hormones and so forth. And they kept book on it, of course, and I was a very good friend of the doctor who was running this project. And they would take these people one after the other and they'd run them through this lineup. And the doctor would tell me enough about this – we'd sit around and chin-chin – and he'd tell me enough about this that I finally got interested. And I started studying up on what he was studying up, and studied up on a few things off my own kick and found out what his project was all about – and had been interested in it before that anyhow. And I thought, "What a beautiful tailor-made experimental line."

So I merely looked at those patients that he wasn't getting any result on to see if I could change it by a mental shift. And boy, I sure fixed it up! I didn't put his – I didn't put his project out of action because I told him – after a while. But I found out a datum which is absolutely invaluable to us: That the mind has dominance over structure. Structure does not dominate the mind. And that differentiates us from the medico.

The medico believes that structure monitors the mind. And it doesn't. It's the mind that monitors structure. Because the endocrine, which is the midway point, you might say – the switchboard of regulation and so forth – won't monitor structure as long as the mind is unaffected. That is to say, if the mind is left alone, in a large number of cases the endocrine treatment will not monitor structure, including the glands or anything else. There it is.

But when you remove a few psychic blocks – traumas if you please – Freudian style, all of a sudden, zingo, it bites and monitors structure. Now, you could change the man's diet; you could change his exercise; you could do anything you pleased with him; you could change his operating environment; and you did not change the environmental factor enough to make the endocrine dosages work.

In other words, with the changed mind conditions, why, hormones would work; but with changed physical conditions, the aspect of the hormones did not change. That was a very, very fundamental thing, because it laid in my lap something very interesting.

Well, it was Freudian analysis did that, because I didn't use anything on these boys. Sitting under a tree out in the hospital grounds: "Oh, I think your name is Jones, isn't it? Hiya, hiya, Jones. Understand you're part of that project up there. Hmm? That so? What are they doing up there? Mm-hm. Have much to do with what you used to think about life and so forth? You ever been worried about yourself? You ever thought about this sort of thing? Oh,
is that so? Well, that's very interesting. What sort of a childhood did you have? Did you ever have any unfortunate sexual experiences in your childhood? Oh, is that so?" You know, light Straightwire. [snaps fingers]

All of a sudden he'd say, "You know, I'd never remembered that, you know?" You'd get this bug-eyed blowdown type of look. [laughter] Mark it down in your little book. "Jones. November 1945, 5th." Next time you're in seeing the doctor, and so forth, a week or so later, and so forth; let's look at Jones's weight and physical record. "Same, same, same, same, same. November 5th – haah!" And I'd say, "Thank you very much."

This doctor, by the way, he was – he was a young fellow. And he didn't take – he didn't take mental treatment seriously. He didn't think it worked. He'd never been educated in it in any way. But he was a nice young bloke, and he didn't blow his stack very much. He was very pleased after a while to find out what had been going on. It didn't draw any conclusion from him and he didn't owe anybody the record but the medical department in the navy, so the devil with it.

But he had wondered why these sudden shifts and changes, don't you see? Well, those sudden shifts and changes on that dozen or so patients and so forth was strictly and entirely doing – to what we would call, today, Straightwire, and – but it was run on entirely Freudian basis. So you see, there was some workability to that technology.

Well, then why didn't they advance any further? Because we were doing technology just a little bit superior – on a Straightwire basis – to that in 1950. We knew more, yeah. But why? Why didn't it move? Why didn't it change? Why was there no change at all in any of the Freudian line? Why was Freudian analysis the same in 1910 as it was in 1894? Why was it the same in 1922 as it was in 1894? Why did this subject never grow? It wasn't that it was successful; it's just that the individual practitioner never could organize, never could get anywhere, never could do anything. They never developed an organization which would have carried forward the research.

See, that's – after all, it's the same mind. Do you follow? It isn't anything different. So that's why I tell you today that our greatest danger – our greatest danger as we move forward – is that the technology which we have becomes shattered by unworkability, misapplication and so forth. That isn't what you want to do with it. What you want to do with it is put it together in an organizational line. And you want to put it together so that you know all of the accidents you can have with it. And you want to take care of every eventuality with it. And the second you do something like that, it starts moving out with a high roar.

Now, at that particular point, it comes into collision with the society. It comes into collision with vested interests; it comes into collision with suppressive persons. It knocks things appetite over tin cup for the medicos, the psychiatrists. Who the hell would go to see a psychiatrist? We got a shock treatment graph the other day: somebody had been processed, and had afterwards been forced into an electric shock treatment by some suppressive. First time I'd ever seen one. We had seen a graph. And the person's graph was quite normal and quite good before that electric shock treatment. And the electric shock treatment – the graph taken after the electric shock treatment was right – lying down along the lower band of the OCA graph.
Well, what's the appropriation these boys take in the society? Let's just look into that field of healing. What's their appropriation? What's their annual appropriation? Well, I know that - I know that it's over the billion dollar mark in the United States for medicine. I don't know what the figure is for psychiatry in the United States; I couldn't even guess. But it must be something pretty high because they're operating hospitals all over the United States - lots of staffs, lots of this, lots of that. You better start taking a look at this because you're going to inherit the lot of it - and not before very long. What are you going to do with spinners?

You say, "Well, all I'm interested in is going free." You're going in - to go into a condition of Power. All right, you go into a condition of Power, the most serious thing you can do is disconnect - bang. It's the quickest way to bring about a collapse. Don't even have to do this on a gradient scale! You can't disconnect just like that - bang. You've been woven in with the race and the universe too long to all of a sudden pack it up. You pack it up and it'll pack you up.

Oh, there's quite a game going forward here. I'm just pointing out to you a few angles. And what I'm trying to do at this particular time is to work out smooth lines and smooth flows. Now, when we look at this list over here of certificates, we see here that we've provided a route. Now, that route is a double route. It's a route by study; it's a route by processing. And we haven't begun to explore or exploit what can be done by study alone.

I taught an ACC one time and didn't permit any processing during that ACC at all. And they got better graphs than they'd ever gotten on an ACC. Well, I think that's a fascinating thing to have happen. So I just set it aside casually and said we'll take that up later on when we need the datum.

The fact of it is, you could probably study somebody right up these levels and straight up through to the top. But he would only come a cropper on study when he hit V. He'd finish right there. Because there's a tiger lying between him - lying between Release and Clear, Clear and OT. But lying between Release and Clear there's a tiger known as the R6 bank. You're not going to go through that R6 bank by changing your mind. That's all right for somebody to get the idea that they're just going to shift a couple of postulates. Nope, nope. That's a tiger.

I know. I've been bucking this tiger. I'm very, very well acquainted with this tiger. And it unfortunately isn't something which just keys out like that and you're rid of it. No, you can key the pc out of it, and he's in pretty jolly good shape. But when you move him up from Release, up over the jump, it will be by the vanquishment of the entirety of the reactive mind. Have to be a clean sweep and there won't have - won't be any dust left in the corners, and the floor will be beautifully polished and there won't be any floor. And then you've got it. And there's nothing of value in that bank at all.

Every now and then, you - once in a blue moon, as a person starts into it, they say, "But what would I do if I'd..." Ha! Sshh! It gets sillier and sillier as a concept as you go on, you see, to think that it has any value or any use.

So with that limitation you could study your way up to Release - with that limitation. But the actual fact of Release might or might not occur. But you probably could study your
way up to it. Isn't that interesting? That is a route. That is a route. And it is a route that you must not neglect.

It's the ideas you get, the looking at the rules and the laws, and adding them up to your life and cognizing on them, becoming wiser, smarter along these particular lines. You suddenly look at that and blow that, and you understand something else and, boom, that goes, and so forth. This is not something that you should neglect as a case advance.

Yes, it's always an advance in wisdom, but have you ever really looked at it as a straight case advance? Well, we already have this datum. There were quite a few on that ACC and actually their graphs showed conclusively that at the end of an ACC where they had simply received lectures – and they'd receive about one or two lectures a day – with this alone and whatever other texts and so forth had been assigned to them, their cases went way up.

Some of those cases were quite resistive cases, too. We never looked for them to have any gain at all. But of course they never had any time to tell the auditor they weren't making a case gain; they probably hadn't even noticed it. [laughter]

So therefore, this is a hidden line of advance – this line of advance of the levels. Now, we have something poor on this chart in that we call this 0, I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII – we're calling those levels – and now we have a second set of levels. And you'll find out that this is sooner or later confusing. So these are actually classes. Class for auditors, see. So you'll probably find your – when it's all written up to be in concrete, you'll probably mean – when we say, "level" we probably will be meaning these minus thirty-four on up to plus fifteen, or something like that. And when we say "class," why, we will mean this. You're already speaking of yourselves in classes of grades.

Now, this chart is a fascinating chart from numerous lines, because the – it goes as many as seventy levels below minus thirty-four. But to get down as far as minus thirty-four is quite remarkable, because you're down into screaming insanity long before you get there. Now, what are the aspects of these people? Well, there's things like – there's things down here like False Cause.

Now, the way you interpret this, I call to your attention that the interpretation of these minus levels and so forth is very tricky, because this is the first time you've ever had this scale. It's – you think you know all about it and it's the Tone Scale and so forth, and "Yes, the person – yes, this person's always numb, so therefore he's at – he's at minus ten." No, no, please! This person may be at minus fifty-four. Do you see what's wrong? Is this person aware of the fact that he's always numb? Well, if he was aware of the fact he was always numb, he'd be at minus ten, see? Do you follow this? It's what he is aware of.

Now, you take this thing like False Cause. That is to say, down below the bottom here. Now, you say, "Well, I'm aware of false causes, so am I at False Cause?" No, please! The individual could only be aware of a false cause without knowing it was false. Do you follow that? See? So you tell him – you tell him, "Babies are found in cabbage patches," and he would become aware of that as a datum and say, "Isn't that interesting!" And he'd accept that as a datum. Because it's a false cause. But that would be what he could be aware of. He could only be aware of causes that were false.
But he wouldn't be aware of the falsity of causes. Do you follow? So this is very, very tricky – very tricky to use. And you could make some blunders with this. But you can also make some very, very bright adjudications with it.

You all of a sudden one fine day become aware of the fact that… Well, you say – not you particularly – but somebody says, "You know, I'm always thinking I need changes, you know? Hey, what do you know! You know? I'm always thinking I need changes!" Cognition, see? There he is, minus four. He has become aware of it. So you might say that's his cognition level.

Now, how about the fellow who never cognites? Well, he's just not being audited or trained at the level he could cognite. That's all, that's very simple, very elementary. He's over his head in terms of levels. It's just as elementary as that. What can he be aware of? Well, what can he – he could be aware of; he could cognite on. Actually, this lays the pattern, then, of gradient cognitions as it comes right up the line. That person would cognite in that gradient of cognitions.

So what I've been talking to you about admits of the fact that we can now take somebody… Although we have processes which go up along all these classes – the processes go there – there's also this other phenomenon which has occurred of the Power Process, which just bodily takes anybody who can respond and yanks them up with a thud, up to IV! Crash!

Now, although I'd have to give you a complete lecture on this, some of the manifestations which occur there are quite interesting. And some of the data is very fascinating, that turns out of this. Because it tells you that what you have recovered is a terrific ability to know, an ability to be aware – at this level of Release – without necessarily attaining any more than you knew before. Do you got that?

But you have this terrific ability to get there in an awful hurry. You see? You can look at this washing machine – and before you couldn't even read directions to one, see; maybe something like that. "Oh," you say, "what do you know. Isn't that interesting! Hm! Hm! Your washing machine is busted. The whacha-call-it and so-and-so fits into the sum-sum, and that needs adjustment, you know?"

"Well, how did you know that?"

And you'd be very surprised because "How wouldn't they be able to see that? Are they stupid or something?" [laughter] You get the idea? You become a very quick study, very capable of becoming or knowing or coordinating or acting or figuring something out or putting something together, don't you see? That's what's increased at that – at that level of Release.

Now, I could say by extrapolation this probably is what will occur at Clear and OT. That is just redoubled. You've got it so much more plus the fact that you can also do creative actions and move things creatively and make things and bring things about which you never could have done before, such as not depending on a body and things like this.

But the actual truth of the matter is that the individual will not know more about how to do that by having been, but his present level of beingness will be such that his ability to grasp the potential and act upon the potential, assimilate and accomplish at that particular line, is just lightning fast. Do you follow?
Therefore, with this data falling out... And this data is based – it's empirical data. I mean, this datum – data surprised me. I didn't have a total grip on exactly what this was all about, don't you see? I couldn't instantly say, "Well, an individual knows more than he ever would have known before," don't you see? No, he only knows what he knew before. It doesn't matter how Clear you clear him, see, he only – he only now knows what he knew before. Of course, he has this slight advantage: He knows what he knew before as good as when he knew it before.

But if somebody's been on a long snore for eight trillion years, don't expect him to know everything that happened in that eight trillion years. He now knows as much as he knew about the eight trillion years when he was passing through the moments of the eight trillion years, you understand, and it wasn't very much. See, that didn't increase his knowledge of that. What it did was increase his potential, his ability and so forth. So he isn't bothered by his past. His awareness of his present is what is coming there.

So therefore, we have to deal with this fact. This is – this is a new fact and it's been a little bit hard to isolate this. And I've been studying it now a bit for several weeks, and not quite sure what I was looking at. And finally I realized what I was looking at: The person is never going to make it without being trained.

Sure, he could go through a university – he could go through a university in two or three months, you get the idea, to a six-year course, you see? Sure, he could do all these things. Yeah, yeah, that's fine. But remember he'd have to go through the university.

What's very interesting is – what you're going to see out of this is quite interesting, because the first thing he's going to be aware of as he moves out of a comatose, wog state into a higher level of action – first thing he's aware of is Scientology. I think that's very interesting. It's the first thing there to be aware of, and it's the first thing there to study. And it's the next thing which leads to a higher ability level.

Well, you're going to take this fellow up there, and you're just going to drop him, huh? The cruelest thing you could possibly do would be to audit somebody through to Clear. That would just be about the cruelest thing you could do to anybody. Not train him, not have him know anything about being an auditor, not know anything about the bank, not know anything about life, not know anything about himself, not know anything about anything, and you're going to audit him all the way through to Clear. Now he has this terrific potential to know, and you haven't made it possible for him to assimilate the technology which has brought him to this state. Although it wouldn't kill him, it would put him in a most dreadful confusion. It'd be a cruel thing to do.

He'd say, "What's – what's this all about? I never realized a state like this could exist."

He has no gradient, don't you see? Well, he could grasp it with great readiness. Unfortunately, the faster way to do it is to bring him up to Release on an express elevator, and then let him study his way up to where he's got to. You know? "These were the floors."

"Oh, I wondered what that blur was!"
And then put the tools into his hands, where he can move himself through the remaining step to Clear. And then give him, organizationally, something into which he can extend this benefit and use his potentials, instead of just going out and picking safes idly at night.

In other words, you're taking – you have to take a very total responsibility here. You can't handle something like this lightly. You go appetite over tin cup if you do. So we're trying to take as much possible responsibility as can possibly be taken along this line. Along with that you have to have (1) the route which brings somebody up in a hurry or the route by which they could be processed up slowly. We haven't totally discounted grade processing, you see?

But certainly provide these various routes by which it can be done. Provide this fast one, which before, the individual who was way down here couldn't have made it at all. Well, he can make it on an express elevator today. What are we going to do with this guy? He's right away going to say, "Oh, there is a state of Clear and I'm very aware of that and it'd be very, very nice and why don't somebody process me through to Clear?"

"Why doesn't somebody blow my head off?" – he's asking the same question. You say, "Well, I'll tell you what you do. I think you have a Beginning Scientologist certificate, correct? All right. Well, why don't you just start moving up the line, catch up your data, figure it all out, get it all straightened up and bring yourself up the line, and so forth, and you'll eventually be able to get your Class VI training and then you can go on through to the top." By this time he knows what it's all about; he knows how other people function.

You've given him a familiarity with the existence in which he lives. Now, at the same time you've done this, when you've moved him up along this line you have therefore moved him up as well in his span of knowledge of what is in Scientology, his organizational scope, he has come up to an understanding of the usefulness of the various tools of Scientology, and he has also found out that these new states aren't just being left willy-nilly to fall where they may but are moving up into a type of civilization which can also exist.

Now, having discovered these various things, when he moves out through the top, you're not going to have a lot of catastrophe – you're going to have a lot of order, you're going to have a lot of happy people.

This is what's taking the totality of responsibility along some certain line. And although taking that much responsibility doesn't seem to be indicated, it's only not indicated to a wog. Look what's happened to the atom bomb!

Now, the nut that dreamed that up never took any responsibility for its potentials. He didn't have his ethics in at all. And not having it so, why, one of these days, it's liable to blow the world apart unless we get there first. So we have to get his ethics in for him as well as for ourselves. And we'll be able to do that, too. But when you don't take responsibility for powerful knowledge, it'll all go crash. And you've got to take responsibility for it to the degree that it is powerful.

And we, for the first time in the history of this universe, have a total grip on life and what's it composed of and can bring people up with an express elevator clear up all the way to the top, over and out. That's a lot of power. We'd better measure up to it all ways.
Thank you.
THE WELL-ROUNDED
AUDITOR

A lecture given on 29 June 1965

Thank you. Well, thank you.

*Female voice: There's something I want to give you before we begin.*

There's something here. All right. What's this? Oh! Oh, yes, this is – thank you, thank you very much. This is a Declaration of Release to L. Ron Hubbard. [laughter, applause] It says, "L. Ron Hubbard is hereby certified has having attained the State of First, Second and Third Stage Release in accordance with the Hubbard Communication Office requirements. Signed, Department of Certificates and Awards." [applause]

Well, I was on Power Processing all this time without wearing one of those little signs. [laughter] You see, the red "R," now, makes it possible for you to ask questions. I can't guarantee what state you'll arrive at after you've asked the questions but there it is.

This – by the way, this might interest you. I've forgotten the exact date, but Mary Sue audited me to a First Stage – what they get in the earlier lower-level processes and so forth – audited me to that I think back in 1963.

*Female voice: February 24th.*

February 24th, 1963, and the needle went free and nothing would answer up and so forth. And we were going for broke on the thing, and we went ahead and did some other auditing and so forth, and actually I hit Keyed-Out OT at that particular time. Then as a labor of love, why, I went around and did a lot more research and a lot more work on the general situation and plowed myself in good and heavy because the bank was completely unknown at that time – the actual R6 bank – and I went ahead and floundered around in it and fell on my head and picked myself out of it and went back into it and pulled myself out of it and a few things like that.

When the Power Processes came out – I had to develop these processes – and after they were developed it was an oddity here that the Power Processes actually are totally predicted. They were not developed empirically. One of the first pieces of data we have ever had that was *totally* developed, 100 percent, without a single address to a single case or anything else. They were just – figured them out and there they should be and they were there. And we've been running them that way ever since. And the only place we get into any trouble and so forth is when we depart from that original, which was interesting.
But I got to thinking about that after a while and I said, "Well, this is pretty rough go and if I'm going to do a lot of case supervision and write up a lot of material on this, why, I jolly well had better have a better subjective reality on this than I have." So I rolled up my sleeves and I ran the Power Processes on Solo and ran them all the way through to the end and the proper end result and so forth. Well, oddly enough when I got to the end result, all that was sitting there for a "reviv" on the final engram and that sort of thing was just the beginning of track and the entrance to this universe and the R6 bank. I found out I was trying to buck this thing with a Power Process. So I'd wound up in the wrong spot. So I backed off a little bit and that was it. And that was what we'll know now as a Second Stage Release.

Then I said, "All right. There are other people going to do this. If you run into the bank, and that sort of thing, you should be able to play tag with the R6 bank and go into it and drive the tone arm up and not walk around with this terrible liability of throwing the pc into the bank and maybe not getting them back out of it again. So there must be another set of processes." So I worked very hard, extrapolated these processes, figured those things out and we got a Third Stage Release which is selective ability. You can just call your shots on what ability you want back and so forth and you can work it out with a Third Stage Release. And we got three more new Power Processes.

So a Third Stage Release would be somebody who had selective ability. Now, the funny part of it is that a Third Stage Release meets and shakes hands with R6EW and you can throw yourself back into the bank on a Third Stage Release. You can again run that too far, but sitting, greeting you at this particular time all you get is the basic reactive bank. But you're now at the correct end of it and it will start to disintegrate whether you know its pattern or not. But if you try to go very far without knowing its pattern, there are so many tricks in it and that sort of thing, you'll quickly snarl up. But a Third Stage Release can push himself into and pull himself out of the R6 bank at will.

So this makes a pretty well-mapped route at this particular time, and it's very interesting that the goal that we've sought actually for fifteen years, what we've been trying to do and so on, had just dropped out of a slot with this ease.

We're now getting an interesting reaction in organizations around: "Why is somebody sending a Class VII Auditor here to release us by Power Processing? We're releasing all the people we want to release on Level 0 and I and II. Hmm, hmm, hmm?" [laughter] Well actually, after they've released somebody on 0, I and II, they have made a First Stage Release. And the difference amongst these Releases is simply stability – the degree of stability; how long does this state last, and so on. The states aren't necessarily higher one way or the other – only they really are, but you don't – you neglect that. It's mainly stability.

And a First Stage Release very often got us into trouble on the subject of Clear. Every once in a while we'd get clearing into trouble because, you see, at one time we called that a Clear and that was as close as we were to clearing. Clearing is on the other side of the R6 bank, we know now. But all the manifestations of it can occur.

Well, there's the basic manifestations of it can occur – the needle phenomenon and so forth – so, it's a Keyed-Out Clear, you see. But a Keyed-Out Clear made with 0, I, II, III, IV, and so forth, may be Clear as a bell for five minutes, five days, five months, five years or five
hundred years. You just pays your money and takes your chance. The fellow has been brought up to a point where he can postulate and all he has to do is postulate one postulate wrong way to and the R6 bank rears up and hits him in the teeth, and he's no longer a Release. So it's very unstable, don't you see. Highly unstable. Completely changes somebody's life and so forth, and actually that is *Homo novis,* but how long does he stay there?

Now, on the Power Process, and so forth, Release there is no kickback. You can feel bad and you can feel wowsy and you can feel this and that and so forth, and your needle can go a bit off and so on, but you don't lose any of those things. You don't lose any of the capabilities that you've run into. You see, the degree of stability is quite great.

Now, you proceed on from there. There is no known technology for the creation of a Keyed-Out OT. We can't call one of those at will, but when I notice we can't do one of these things at will, why, give us a week. [laughter] But it's something – it's something that happens unpredictably. You may be going for a Power Process Release and find yourself with a Keyed-Out OT on your paws. And this is quite interesting. I wouldn't even attempt to describe a Keyed-Out OT. It's rather fabulous. But the degree of stability there is merely because it keyed out. It can key back in again. But it's liable to stay out and squared around for quite a while if you don't fool with it too much.

The net gain we've gotten out of all of this is we have actually, then, cleared by the definitions of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health,* a great many people. And then by going on auditing them afterwards on ordinary processes, we have just shot them to bits. And it's very hard on them to do this.

The only thing that a First Stage Release of that type we were making – auditors wouldn't know what a floating needle was. They'd see the fellow reading at Clear read and the needle would be floating and so on, and they just kept on running the process, you know. And the pc wouldn't know about it. He would know there was this point in some session somewhere where he felt wonderful. And he never saw the meter at that time and neither did the auditor.

And then after that he'd get ARC breaky in processing, and he'd find out processing was very hard to do and that he didn't really want to be processed and it was upsetting to him. Well, the only thing that could have been run on him then were the Power Processes, you see. And he could have been run on the Power Processes and brought to a higher degree of stability in the field of Release.

But if you were to overrun the Power Processes and if you were to pro... audit somebody now on ordinary processes who had been power processed, then you would be in trouble. Because there's only one thing there to hack at and that's the R6 bank, really. But you could come back and isolate some selective abilities with these other processes and move him on up to the Third Stage by selective abilities, playing tag all the time with the R6 bank and eventually all there is left is your R6 materials.

It's very interesting and I should tell you by the way – not to go on with this endlessly – but I should tell you that it is highly probable that you will not make Clear unless you've been Power Process released. The route right straight through the bank when it lies across an engram that will revivify, and so forth, is too hard. It is too rough. Because you've got –
you've got an engram sitting there and you're sitting in the engram and you're trying to run the R6 bank while you're sitting in an engram. You're not, then, in possession of all of your facilities with which to run it and you'll find out the R6 bank isn't as-ising properly. And that was the only trouble with it and so forth.

So if you've had dreams of just going right straight through to Clear without ever being a Release, why, you might as well come off of it because… That's all right; you and a lot of others will learn how to do Class VII before you're through, so… It isn't too hard to do. But that's the easiest and safest way. And then you find out R6 materials, they just run like a bomb. My God! There's nothing to it because you're just right straight at it and everything as-ises like mad.

It is an interesting put-together. The... also  it is quite fascinating to watch raw meat that is power processed. This is fascinating because they don't know where the hell they've wound up at. They have no inkling of that R6 bank there. They don't know what wall they're going to beat their head against, don't you see? And they don't know why an overrun made them feel so weird. And then you fish them out and they feel terrific, don't you see? They're fine, but they're not auditors, you see, so they don't know what's happening. It tends... they feel wonderful and full of awe. [laughs]

So your best route – your best route is Power Processes and R6 study and so forth to Clear. That is easily the best route through. Don't worry about it. You'll make it anyhow. You could probably – there'll be some small minority that will be able to make it directly and so forth. Only don't expect me to be around and hold your hand after I've told you the horrible truth. The horrible truth is that you try to run GPMs and end words while you're sitting in an engram that should have been run by Power Processing and you get somatics and things that you can't account for. There you are at the battle of the Marne being shot full of bullet holes while trying to run the R6 bank. The two things don't agree.

All right. Very good. This is the 29th of June 1965, AD 15.

All right. Well, I probably should give you a lecture today on something interesting, [laughter] but I forgot my notes and I don't have the reciprocal formula of the Latitudinal Bomb Festival, so I can't give you any lecture on that subject.

Now, the truth of the matter is we're advancing very, very fast today organizationally. The technical advances we're making unfortunately are out of the – this world as far as general release is concerned. Somebody sends an R6 set of materials through the despatch lines and I've got a clerk who is dead sick and can't account for it. You get the idea. Somebody hears the commands of the Power Processes and so on and decides to run them on a pc, or himself lying in bed at night, and a student doesn't appear for the next day for class, you see.

In other words, we're dealing – we're dealing with materials that look very elementary. They look very simple. Nothing looks simpler than the Power Processes. The hardest thing to teach about the Power Processes is that they are done just exactly as they are done and they aren't done any other way. And most of the instruction is just getting the few simple data in there well enough so all the other confusion blows off.
Here and there in the auditors on staff and so on you’d never see such confusion arrive in – arise in your life, and what they’re re... occasionally on some little point, and the confusion just starts going off because the datum is too simple. It's too fundamental, don't you see?

The way to run the Power Processes is you just run each one to its exact expected end result. And how do you run them? You run them muzzled. And what do you do if something goes wrong? You send the pc to Review. And what if the pc finds out it's an ethics-type case you're trying to run? Then Review sends him to Ethics to get him cleaned up with the environment. And it's just all da-da-da-da, da-da-da-da, you know? And really, it's trying to teach somebody how to do a very, very simple step when they're used to doing adagio or something, you see. And they think – they think what's being required of them is the adagio wh... adagio while standing on their heads on the back of an elephant that is galloping. And actually you're asking them to stand on one spot and say the word "one" several times. And they say, "Well, do you say it in a high-pitched voice or a low-pitched voice?" [laughter]

Now, I'm running up against – I haven't exhausted the materials of study by a long ways. And there's just so much data one hasn't got much chance to write it all up and put it in a condensed and put-together form. That will happen, too. But – well, now that I'm released, you can expect things to be better. [laughter, laughs]

But it's quite interesting the study materials have more to them than would first greet the eye. They are basically elementary themselves but there is a great deal to observe in that particular field. You could probably turn a half a dozen universities loose, researching for the next five hundred years, and they probably wouldn't exhaust all the things and stuff they would find about study. It's marvelous.

For instance, I have a photographer that's working here weekends and doing a little bit of darkroom work, and he has just taken his examinations for his professional society. He's apparently just finished a couple of years of full-time study in the field of photography and so forth. And he's very interesting. He's very interesting to watch from the basis of study. Although he works as a professional darkroom man in London during the week, he has never really learned the fundamentals of photography and he has not learned what is important in the field of photography yet. Now, either this was a fault in study or not enough practical or something of this sort, but he has not learned what's important. And it's very interesting that he will stand and yammer at me... I will be down there working on something or other while he's there – I'll go down and work for a couple of hours on a couple of days over the weekend, a little relaxation – but he'll be yammering at me about something or other and asking me questions.

He violates the first thing: he thinks he knows, you see. He hasn't found out that there's a lot of things he doesn't know; so therefore, his mind is not open to learning anything. So when you tell him something, he goes on talking about something of the sort. And I've now gotten to him to a point of overwhelm where although he goes on talking about something else, he will still do what's right. You get the idea. Now, that's an accomplishment but it's… [laughter] But he keeps talking to me – or he kept talking to me; I finally settled this – about the enlarger.
There's a big Micromatic 5 x 7 enlarger which is called a "cold-light enlarger". That is to say it has tubes in it instead of bulbs and this is a cold light. That is to say it's like your fluorescent lights except very high, high blue. Well, this is a very interesting enlarger. It's a doll. It sets on three different lenses and all you have to do is set it on another track. And it goes up and down, keeps anything in focus. It does most anything, you see. Beautiful piece of equipment.

Well, he apparently is used to some other kind of enlarger, something of the sort. And he keeps yammering away about this enlarger – the value of a cold-light enlarger as versus a condenser enlarger.

Now, you don't have to know anything about these terms, just balderdash. Just showing you there's differences here. A condenser enlarger has some magnifying glasses in it to spread the light evenly. But a cold-light enlarger, of course, the light is perfectly evenly spread. But a cold-light enlarger does not give you any great degree of contrast like a condenser-type enlarger. There's two types of enlargers.

So he's standing there worrying and worrying and worrying about the fact that this is a cold-light enlarger that doesn't give a high degree of contrast. He kept at this; he kept at it and he kept at it. And I wasn't paying him much attention for a while, but after all I finally said, "What is this fellow talking about?" He's talking about contrast. That is, the blackness of the black and the whiteness of the white in a negative or a print. And I suddenly realized what was wrong with him. He didn't know that this is something you do… The contrast of a print – well, you change the contrast – the print is dependent mainly upon film, not on the enlarger. And if you want to change the contrast of a print you make your developer stronger or weaker or you use a different grade of paper, and you can change it like turning the light on and off. You get the idea? I mean, here's this huge degree of variation that you can get out of the difference of developer. And as far as the enlarger is concerned, the difference is just about a quarter, you know, tiny; there's hardly any… You… In fact, nobody without a magnifying glass and a densitometer and a whole bunch of fancy instruments could tell the difference between a condenser enlarger and a cold-light enlarger. You couldn't really tell the difference. Of course, you can tell the difference on a condenser enlarger because it doesn't evenly spread the light. And you notice that half of your print is dimmer than the other half so it has a fault!

I finally rounded up on him and I said, "Well, wait a minute." I said, "In the final analysis what you're trying to get is a picture. And the type of enlarger that you say has all the contrast in it, and so forth, won't spread the light evenly enough. And it spreads the light so unevenly that it ruins your prints, so you don't get a picture with them. Now," I said, "let that be the end of it. As far as if you want contrast concerned, why, just go over there on the developing tray and in the developing tray double the concentration of developer or half the concentration of developer and," I said, "you'll get all the differences that you want. Now, you got it?" And he was going on muttering about this, but the mutter trailed off and so forth, and I haven't heard anything about enlargers since. [laughter]

I thought, that's all very interesting. That's all very interesting because here are a bunch of stuff, here are a bunch of considerations and so forth. This man must have been taught with ferocity on the subject of enlargers and how one was contrasty and one was not
contrasty with a whole bunch of missing datum. He must have been taught as though all of this was very important. It's completely unimportant. He's worrying about some little scrap of something and apparently nobody taught him anything about the fact that you can produce very black blacks or just pale gray blacks dependent upon what developer you use or what concentration of developer. Apparently nobody taught him the essential or he missed the essential in the textbook, don't you see, and he's flying around over here.

Well, I've noticed about this boy that he is full of tips. Brother, he's got more tips than you can shake a stick at. He knows that a pressman will occasionally flash a negative at a wall to presensitize the film before he takes a picture in a darkroom. This is a trick that one pressman in one thousand pulls once in his lifetime. [laughter] Do you follow me? A trick. He knows all these tricks. Just run off just tons of these tricks. And I say, "Don't let the temperature vary, now, in developing that film or you'll get grain" – which is true. And that's very important – he doesn't know much about that. But he knows a bunch of tricks about you mix some bromide with some bra-ruff and then you eventually get a double composite positive roff-roff. You got the idea. I've been watching this sort of thing. I sighed. I said, "Well, I'll make a photographer out of him yet."

But the main thing – the main thing that's of value to us and that I suddenly began to alert to is several of our study factors, you see, were out as he was studying and are out in his practice. And the one new one that I noticed and suddenly saw very familiar amongst some very slightly acquainted auditors, you know, out in the fringe – they hardly haven't done any auditing at all; they haven't had much training of any kind whatsoever – boy, are they hell on tricks! Boy, they're willing to listen to you all day long, as long as you will tell them some quick short-cuts and some tricks.

Tricks. Like how do you get a pc to answer up the question – a trick, see, of some kind or another. How do you detect a green-type thetan from a blue-type thetan without the use of an E-Meter, see. The coloration of eye change while running certain types of processes. These guys are deadly on these things, see. They're all completely unessential tricks. They're just bric-a-brac, you see. They're quite interesting but they're just bric-a-brac. And that same guy couldn't for the life of him sit down and give straight standard auditing on a straight standard command.

So I see tricks and odd bits and so forth as a sort of a dispersal approach to the subject of auditing. In other words, approach it from the fringe and somebody who's never really studied to be an auditor will pretend a great knowledge of the subject and then pick up a whole bunch of fringe tricks without knowing anything about where they fit or how to use them or anything else. Boy, he talks wonderful auditing. He sounds terrifically interesting, don't you see. But then you get him to sit down in the chair and simply utter the auditing command and acknowledge – get it answered and acknowledge the pc and handle the pc's origin and give the next auditing command – just a good, solid, main-course job of auditing – he's not there. All he does is pull tricks. And it isn't the tricks that get anybody anyplace.

And that, I began to realize, was what was wrong with psychiatry and psychology. They're full of tricks. All they do is nurse oddities. They are the greatest oddity collectors that anybody ever heard of. They remind you of stamp collectors. "Here is a rare stamp from Bun-
gawoolaland. It was only printed once in 1899 to celebrate the cashiering of the king from the British army. Very rare." Value, as far as world affairs are concerned, as far as his own life is concerned, zero. Do you see? They apparently pick up all the hors d'oeuvres, all the scraps off the floor and everything but the main dish.

Now, psychiatrists can tell you the most marvelous things about cases. You listen to them and your jaw drops sometimes. They're not all dummkopf – they're all crazy but they're not all stupid. [laughter] I've listened to some of their insane asylum manifestations with the greatest of interest. I... also they do a very good imitation of them. [laughter] I've actually been entertained by the hour by these blokes. But I suddenly realize, I have never heard one of them utter one essential piece of information that would have led to the resolution of a case. Fantastic hors d'oeuvres – no main course. Isn't that marvelous.

So apparently there is another phenomenon of some kind in the world of study. There's the fellow who can – who knows it and can do it, and then there's the fellow who knows all the tricks concerned with it and can't do it. Here is an odd fringe manifestation that I have spotted. So that when you get somebody to sit down and really be an honest-to-God, dyed-in-the-wool auditor who produces a terrific exact result – he or any of us have been through the same course of picking up all the tricks and asking all the questions as we moved in, don't you see, and these things start to blow. Their relative importance starts to assert themselves. Of course, they weren't important. And the eventual action is that these things all blow off and you've got a jolly good auditor. Now you go around and you ask him – let's say you're new at it and so forth, and you ask him, "Now, how do you get – how do you get the pc to look at you during the session?"

And he says, "What?"

"No, how do you get the pc to look at you?"

"Why do you want to know this?" Because of course he doesn't. "Why do you want to know this?"

"Well, you know, you're supposed to have the PC look at you before you acknowledge."

Well now, these things can really come up the line, and you say, "Where did they get that? Where did that come from?" Well, in the first place it's just an interesting trick which is used once in a while to a pc that you're occasionally worried about "has he finished?" And once in a while you get a pc who will apparently finish and then go on. Well, if you start following the procedure of that pc of waiting until he looks at you and so forth, then you're pretty sure, because sometimes he'll look at you and his eyes will be real vague and then he'll eventually give you a little nod like that – yeah. And you can give him the next command then without cutting off his line. This is one PC in a hundred. You understand? Now where, then, did the line come from. What is this? That was just a trick, you see. It's relatively unimportant. You could live all your life without knowing it.

But where did they get the idea that on every pc – the pc has to look at the auditor before the pc gets acknowledged? Because this puts an awful strain on the pc. The pc, aside from doing the auditing command, has to remember to look at the auditor or he won't get another
command. [laughter] You got the idea? Now, where did he get this datum? And I suddenly
remembered; I actually dug up where the datum comes from.

There is another datum. And it's a very important datum. And that is that a pc who
doesn't look at the auditor will always respond very well to an ARC break assessment. You
understand, he's not always visibly ARC broke, but you can always get an ARC break off of
him. And I'm always leery of a pc who never looks at the auditor. And a pc who will slew
around and sit sideways in the chair, I don't go any further; I just assess for the ARC break
right now. And I always find it. So it is just an indicator of an ARC break. Well now, just an
indicator of an ARC break, you see.

Well, to a finished auditor, it's worth knowing, so forth. There are other indicators to
an ARC break, too. He also set bad goals and he also did this and he also did that. But one of
them is that when you're supervising sessions or watching a TV demo or something like this,
and you can see that pc and he's just sitting sideways, you know, and he never looks at the
auditor, he never looks at the auditor. Well, you know that if you did an ARC break assess-
ment on him, why, he – you'd find an ARC break.

Well, this isn't – this is not first-rank information. It's about third-rank information, but
it's valuable, see. It has some value. But out of this we make the fact – now, we can move it
upstairs, then, misapply it, and say that "Never acknowledge a pc until the pc has looked at
the auditor" – that's any pc. Now we have got the data stretched out of shape, haven't we. The
datum is now out of focus. There is no longer any reason to give it this much attention, but by
giving it attention then we put an awful strain on practically every pc we audit.

See, he gets introverted; he's busily, deeply introverted in his case and he isn't about to
look at the auditor. He's really quite unaware of the auditor. He's back on the track someplace
or another, but he isn't ARC broke.

Now, if we waited for that pc to look at the auditor before we acknowledged, what –
this is what would happen. He'd sit there interested in his own case, willing to talk to the audi-
tor and so on. "What's the matter? What's happening? Wonder what's up?" You know, he's
about to ask what's up and the auditor says, "Thank you," so he says, "Well, that's all right." He
had to pull himself all the way up the track.

Well, oddly enough, if you pull this trick very often on one of the Power Processes,
why, the guy would practically go around the bend because he's being pulled across too much
track just to get an acknowledgment. He'll very shortly then go on auto. He'll start – you
know, the auditor will give him the command and he'll give himself the command and then
something runs it down here. Do you understand?

So there's mainline information that is real important meat. This is the stuff, see. And
then, of course, any subject matter, is – like any dinner, gets surrounded by – or the better
dinners – gets surrounded by hors d'oeuvres and dessert and scraps on the floor and chamber
music and, you know, that sort of thing. But if you depended on the hors d'oeuvres and the
scraps on the floor and the chamber music, you'd leave that table awful hungry. Do you fol-
low?
So an auditor in training should differentiate, should differentiate amongst types of data. Now, there's main-course data. That is the datum, don't you see. That is crash. See, that's big, important, senior datum that will add up to a practice, it's generally applicable and so forth. And then there's data that you should know in order to apply the main data properly. And then there is data that if you knew it, you would appear very clever and that normally wraps itself around like the parsley and so forth. It – well, it's "nice" but it doesn't have very great value. It's interesting. It amplifies it. It's run into sometimes. It's of interest. But what's the main-course datum in auditing?

Well now, when somebody does a shift on what a main-course datum is (namely me), a lot of people go very badly adrift. Well, we used to teach a main-course datum on the subject of this: you audit the pc in front of you. Very important datum in its day. And if you are auditing in private practice someplace, you jolly well should. Because there's nobody else there. But that was before grading was producing results and that was before organization. So an organization auditor doesn't audit the pc in front of him at all. Not anymore. He audits the process. And if he sees some bad indicator, sends him to Review. And that's the main-course datum. And that's a breeze because that's teamwork auditing.

The auditor is there; he's to lay the exact process to the exact end phenomena. When the end phenomena occurs – bang – that's it. If the end phenomena is not approaching, if the bad indicators are there, the goals and gains are sour, the pc is breaking down somewhere or other – that's it! Review. Because the auditor is – can be part of what's wrong.

You don't want to take a chance on this, even yourself. Pc may be peculiarly mad at you, or the pc – there might be something wrong with your comm cycle as far as the pc's concerned, or there's something you haven't picked up. And in the case of some auditors, why, they've got that wrong with them, too, so they've got a blind spot as far as the pc is concerned when it's wrong also with the pc. Weird things occur on this line.

So let's just throw all those irregularities out and let's put the pc on a standard approach and let's just take up everything with him that could possibly be wrong with a case. Well, I've just achieved that little technical trick and that was quite a trick. There is a policy letter now of a couple of days ago which has on it every possible thing that could be wrong with a pc and why they aren't running. There's forty-four lines on it.

Now, to get that piece of technology together and to put it in a form of order of importance and likelihood and juggle it up was quite a trick. A lot of case experience went along with this. What you're going to teach every auditor in the HGC, then, each one of these things and to pick it up without a form and without a list and it's all got to be done and so forth… Well, in the first place, I couldn't do it. Sitting there auditing that pc, to be able to do one – the right one of forty-four different possibilities – that sounds much. Particularly when the pc, unbeknownst to me, may have an overt on me as the auditor and is merely hard to audit from my point of view simply because the group is out. When this possibility enters in, don't you see, why, it tells you at once that I shouldn't be repairing any pc that I myself am auditing routinely. It tells you right away that it would be a – the source of the case failures when you have them. That would be the reason cases failed.
Now, let me show you what used to happen in the bad old days. Auditor goes in, starts a session. The pc says – "What goals would you like to set for this session?"

The pc says, "None."

The auditor says, "Oh well, all right. Uhmm… uhm… uhm… uhm… uh… Do you have an ARC break?" There's no read. "Do you have a present time problem?" There's no read.

Pc says, "Well, it's just that I just don't have any goals to set. I – go ahead and audit me if you want to. I just don't have any…"

"Well, all right. I'll audit you." Doesn't go right.

Auditor finally takes a break and goes and sees the D of P and says "I got a D of P [pc] down here that wouldn't set goals for this session." And the D of P sort of looks at the folder and he asks the auditor some questions, and they figure out – and all of a sudden they figure out that the guy's mother-in-law and so forth audited him once, and it's probably a restimulation of an incident in Arslycus, and we really ought to invent a new process called whizzeroo-bang-pup, and we ought to run it. But the auditor gets that process wrong and goes back and audits the pc on something else, and the pc starts looking worse. And this goes round and round and round with a tremendous number of errors being committed all the way along the line.

All right. Now look at this – look at this as neated-up technology. Auditor sits down; pc's sitting there. Auditor says, "What goals would you like to set for this session?"

Pc says, "None."

Auditor says, "All right. Thank you very much. Is it all right with you – anything you'd care to ask or say before I end this session?"

And the pc says, "What's up?"

"Well, I'm going to have to send you to Review. I'm sorry. All right, that is the end of session. Thank you. All right, now here, come along with me.

And it goes by Estimation, gets his chit, takes him over to Review and moves him right in over to Review and a Review Auditor who is an expert on assessment. That is the main thing he's an expert on. He can – he knows – he's picked because he knows a meter backwards. He never misses a read. And that's it.

Then the auditor goes back over and reports and does something useful. And the D of P goes on with his room assignments and his auditor training, and he is not bothered with all this. And the auditor goes and files things or writes some letters in the Department of Schedules and something – something goes on during that particular auditing period and pc's over there for – oh, I don't know, he could be over there all day.

Pc comes into session and says he's not going to set any goals, well, I don't think that the organization ought to stay it. The organization didn't go out last night and get drunk. So the D of P – the D of P is over there and doing his work very happily, and the auditor's going on and doing some useful work, and they're not disturbed by all of this figure-figure-figure –
good reasons why they can dive sideways and go off standard technology and that sort of thing. Because it isn't standard technology at fault. It never is. It'll be one of forty-four things. Never standard technology at fault, weirdly enough.

So, the Review Case Officer or auditor over in Review – he's in a different division. He didn't have to take any orders from the D of P. He didn't have to take any orders from the auditor. The only thing he's got to do, he just takes the responsibility for the case. So the pre-conceived ideas of the auditor now do not apply. Important. The auditor might not like green-headed people or something.

The considerations of the D of P and his conclusions: they're – they don't apply because the D of P is absolutely forbidden ever to interview a pc – ever to interview a pc – ever to talk to an auditor about a pc. Never! Ethics chit, man. "The D of P was seen today to be interviewing a pc. Ethics chit. Two week suspension. Cut his buttons off on the parade ground."

Because looking and talking to the pc isn't a statistic, is it? Only the case folder is a statistic. Only the case folder. Only the amount of TA that the pc got. Only did he make his goals and gains. Only what process was run with what wording. Only how long was it run, do you see? What was the end result of running this process? Is there still TA in that process? This is statistics, statistics, statistics – that's all – out of the folder.

Of course, you shoot an auditor for ever giving you a false attestation. Like he got 495 TA divisions in that particular session. Actually, the only way that you could get that would be to hook an E-Meter up to a helicopter. [laughter, laughs] But you get something like that – you don't want any auditor that'll falsely report things.

And then you just depend utterly, completely and only upon the case folder. You do your case supervision – don't ever talk to the pc. Never! And never talk to an auditor about a pc. Auditor comes in, "What am I going to do about Bill?"

"What are you going to do about Bill?" the D of P is supposed to say. "Who is Bill?"

"Well, my pc."

"Hmmm. One Job Endangerment Chit. You're trying to get me to give you an unusual solution." Job endangerment. That's the truth. We're now talking technology. We're not talking ethics. That's the truth.

A student who comes up to a Supervisor in a course and says, "What cute little trick can I run on the pc I'm running at night, because he keeps standing on his head in the chair?" Well, that Supervisor should at that moment turn in to Ethics a Job Endangerment Chit. Somebody's trying to persuade him to violate the rules of the road. Because for sure, if that case is standing on its head in the chair, there is no trick known to man or beast, because the answer you'd give would be based upon the answer... information you're being given which is probably false.

The best place for the guy who's standing his head on a chair would be in Review being gone over very carefully on a standard list which would pick up everything that could be wrong with a case, see. All those things would have to be taken into account. We'd find non-
standard processes, unflat processes, broken auditing appointments, ARC breaks and a horrendous PTP – the guy is in court every morning being divorced. And we say, other than that there's nothing wrong with the case. You get the idea.

There's too many things go awry here, don't you see, for this cute little trick. There's no cute little trick that will put a human being back together again. They're like Humpty Dumpty, and we're catching them all. They're in the shape of Humpty Dumpty right now. They've fallen several hundred trillion years, and they have landed with an awful splash, and putting them back together again does not consist of a cute little trick of how do you flavor eggnog.

If this guy's in trouble in his immediate environment, you can count on the fact that it's trouble. If a pc doesn't gain in processing, man, there are reasons why, and they are not covered by a cute little trick of how do you hold your little finger while you're setting your E-Meter. That won't cover it! A detective agency might cover it.

Well actually, the truth of the matter is the fellow leaves the HGC every afternoon and then goes over for his Turkish bath and colonics. Only he'd never bothered to inform anybody of this. He's mixing two therapies. He's holding down a screaming present time problem of a terrible gastric upset every time he's in session. Do you understand? So he's got a present time problem. Processing won't gain over the top of it. Nobody finds this present time problem, don't you see? Because – why they don't find it is just because it isn't being assessed for. You can get the data, but if you don't get the data, you're not going to be able to do anything about it. So you better go about the business of getting all the data that you can get on the case, don't you see?

So the new method, then, is the auditor sits there, goes into a standard session, expects standard responses which he will get, audits a standard comm cycle, moves straight on up through standard grading, every – after every day turns in the case folder. And the D of P, he does standard D-ofP'ing. He looks at it, "What's the TA? What were the goals and gains, and so forth? The process run? Now, let's see, last twenty minutes here, we had .5 TA divisions in the last twenty minutes. Well, how many divisions did we have yesterday? Oh, we had lots more TA divisions than that. Yeah, oh, this process is going flat. I think he probably ought to run it tomorrow to just a little cognition or something like that" – that would be the standard response for an ordinary process – "and get the hell off of it, and go onto the next indicated process up the line."

So that's what he'd write on here and so forth and so on. But as he's looking at this – he picks up the next form and he's looking at this, and it says…

By the way, what I'm talking to you about is not theoretical. I'm talking to you from the hard core of practiced experience. I've gotten in trouble when I haven't followed these rules myself.

He goes into this, he says, "Pc says, 'Not to have too much trouble in this session.' Hmm. Well, what's the TA for this session. The TA was twenty-seven for 2½ hours. Augh, pc isn't in trouble. Where are they on the process? Continue the process. Next." That's right. Getting too much TA for somebody to be in trouble. You understand? His gains are okay and so
forth. Just one little sour goal, you know. The guy was apprehensive. So we didn't pay any attention to it. That case is flying.

All right. Pick up the next folder, and the pc says – his goals and gains is blank. "The pc was very restive this session and didn't want to run any processes.' Who, Smithers. Auditor Smithers. How many hours were wasted here? Umm-hmm. All morning and all afternoon auditing a pc with an ARC break. Well, Mr. Smithers, we're going to make a citizen out of you, and here goes an ethics chit." "Smithers, Ethics Hearing: Running pc all day, ARC break, not following out proper hat and sending pc instantly to Review when pc wouldn't set any goals." Another chit: "Pc to Review." Total action. No unusual solutions. Next case.

Smithers comes back the next day with a blurred look in his eye and so forth, and he's saying, "Well actually, I thought I could help him."

"Oh, thinking, huh? We'll turn another chit in on you." [laughter]

And that's the way you do it. And the next thing you know the auditor knows exactly what's expected of him: He's supposed to run the case. Of course, there's a big kick on running a case like this because all of a sudden you see these cases start going zoom! The cases you're auditing really start winning. Don't you see? You're not running a whole bunch of oddities and little fringe-area things that are getting in the road of this, that and the other thing, you see.

Case ran fine for three days, fell on its head and didn't run anymore. Rolly coaster. You say, "Oh, well, rolly coaster That means a potential trouble source which means the person is connected with a suppressive person. We got the textbook answer; we know exactly what it is." No, we send him to Review. It's all we ever send anybody. We always send him to Review, see.

And over in Review, they go down the line and they've got one of their lines: PTS. Of course, he sees the PTS because the guy rolly-coaster. "PTS. Yes, yes, he's connected to several suppressives and is a member of a suppressive group – citizen of the United States." [laughter] "Has Wilson as a prime minister." [laughter, laughs] So – but Review never concerns itself with this. Review doesn't concern itself with that; just fills it in with a big, fat check. It's concerned with the case and this is part of a case picture, you see.

Now, when it gets back to the Examiner and the Examiner sees this Review report – the Examiner sees that PTS is checked – he doesn't send the case back to the HGC; he sends the case to Ethics. And the case goes over to Ethics. And the Ethics Officer sits there, and the Ethics Officer knows his business, he's only supposed to do certain things and he does those certain things just rat-a-tat-tat. And what the Ethics Officer does is say, "All right, you seem to be a potential trouble source here. What suppressive are you connected with?"

"Well, I'm not really connected with any suppressive. I don't know why they sent me over to Ethics. You people think you're something, don't you?" you know.

Well, some Ethics Officers could be expected to be just a little bit touchy at this point and say, "One week's suspension for being discourteous to an HCO personnel," but you wouldn't find that would be routine. They would say, "Now, who's the suppressive? Some-
body who wouldn't – who's dead against Scientology, your being in Scientology, raises hell with you and so forth. Who is this person and so forth?"

"Well, nobody."

Now, here's your interesting phenomenon. That guy believes this. He believes this because a suppressive always pulls generalities. Generality is the stock in trade, and the suppressive becomes invisible in the environment to the person and the person can't spot the suppressive. So the only thing Ethics does is work this over – with or without a meter, to hell with it. "Who is the suppressive. Suppressive person or suppressive group?" And he'll search it and search it and search it. Now, if Ethics is good, why, Ethics will just finally hit it, and say, "Ah, so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so. Is that right?"

The guy says, "You know, that is right!"

"All right, there you are." Ethics knows they got it because the person's face lit up like a Christmas tree.

But if you don't find the suppressive or you spot the wrong one, it's like indicating the wrong bypassed charge in an ARC break assessment. Nothing happens with the case. This is quite remarkable to watch. You have to do one or two wrong before you're suddenly convinced of the fact. You have to do somebody wrong and then bring somebody – that somebody back in a couple of days later and say, "I must have goofed," and suddenly find out that he has never informed anybody of this but he lives with his mother and his mother routinely and regularly, and so forth, tells him that he's being blasphemous because Scientology is against God and he is after all a Christian, and tells him this every morning at breakfast at some length. But he somehow or other has just not noticed this. You see, we spotted the wrong suppressive the first time.

Now, the phenomenon is this. You say, "Well, your uncle is a suppressive and we've got that now."

And the person says, "Yes, my uncle's a suppressive. Yes, good, yes."

"I want you to disconnect from your uncle." No, you haven't got the right one.

"No," he says, "no, I don't – I don't see how I c... don't see how I – disconnect from my uncle. Hadn't got anything to do with it at all."

Well, you haven't found the right suppressive. You haven't indicated the right bypassed charge, you understand? So you just better look further. You look a little bit further, and so forth. Uncle, hell; it's his boss. See, you all of a sudden say, "Well, it's your boss. He's kidding you all the time about going down to the organization because you're crazy. Is that – is that the fellow?"

"Yeah, that's the fellow."

"Well, that person's a suppressive and here is your order, now: you handle or disconnect."
Person will say, "Oh, well, the hell with him. Yeah, sure, disconnect. Yeah, nothing to it." Bang, bang. He goes right along with it zooooop. The only time you find Ethics laying an egg is when they just fail to spot the right suppressive. That's all.

Well, Ethics spots that; the person does handle the situation or disconnect or arrange for the other person to be audited or do something straight away – bang – straightens it up. Move him back into the HGC. The auditor's back at the old stand now. He starts out. He doesn't discuss this in any way.

He just starts where the processing was left off and he carries on from there. If however, it's been a case remedy or something that's recommended by Review, he will run the case remedy before he resumes the regular Grade processing. And he goes away.

So that you're left on an assembly line which is an assembly line. It just goes right down the belt pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. And the auditor is there – he's just got to put the rivet in the right place. That's all. Do you understand?

And the D of P – he's just right down the same line. He's got to make sure there's enough auditors standing there to put the rivets in the right place. And when that flat ball bearing comes up that belt, they mustn't go into a total psychotic break because they've got a flat ball bearing on the Tech belt. They just pick it up and say, "Look, flat ball bearing. All right. Where do flat ball bearings go? They go to Review." [laughter]

All right. Now, up the line up here – up the line up here, the Org Exec Sec and so forth notices there's a deterioration of statistic. That is to say there aren't quite so many people being processed up to a certain level. The statistics which are turned in by the Department of Inspection and Reports under the new organization will show that there's a declining statistic. In other words, processing is not as successful lately in the Tech Division as before. Now it is time to go and look at all the Review chits. And they find out that auditing cycles are out on several auditors. They tell the D of P about it. Actually, he sends those auditors for special training and he puts in the comm cycle on these auditors very, very good and that smooths it out again. Do you understand?

Now, that's teamwork action. And out of that action, as poorly as it is in, in several orgs at this particular moment… It's in very flimsily. I won't say poorly but very flimsy. They haven't had Sec EDs on this more than a couple of months.

Do you know these outfits are starting to turn out Releases on the same cotton-picking processes they were running on people before? Isn't this peculiar? Oh, I should think that would be very peculiar. It's the same process. It's the same org. It's essentially the same personnel. But it's not the same result. Entirely different result. And it's gotten so bad in one org that they're challenging any reason for the Power Processing; they're doing so well on the lower-level processes all of a sudden. It's fantastic. They haven't had any new technology. They've had new org pattern. They've had new teamwork. And even when that's in poorly, it starts working pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa.

Now, let's say two Class VII Auditors go to HASI Podunk which is a small org and which is having all of its staff released but it's growing. Well, they're the odd men out, aren't they? This HASI has got its – it's running on its assembly line on ordinary processes, review-
ing its ordinary… See? But there's no review for a Class VII on Power Processes, is there? Well of course, the Power Processing would be done from Review. That is to say, those two Class VII would simply be attached to Review and would be releasing staff one right after the other in Review. But how do they get around this liability? Well, they never do their own folders. Each one of them is the Case Supervisor of the other one. And by the time they've balled up two or three cases, we will have the third Class VII there to be their reviewer. Do you see how it works out. And you'd be an absolute fool to do your own case folders, complete fool. You should never, never go auditing around when you don't have a Review handy, because you miss the main reasons for the case decline.

So there are several things that you want to become. You want to become an absolute whiz-bang as a Review Auditor. Just learn to assess, for God's sakes. Just be able to take a pc and assess lists and service facs and forms and lists and make lists and run an E-Meter so that you never miss a read even for a split second and so forth, really make it sit up and talk. You want to be a darn good, darn good assessor on a meter. And you want to know what all the processes are that are called for on a form and all the processes that might possibly be run because they're of interest.

And then, as a very, very excellent Review Auditor, be able to do in the HGC a completely standard, unvarying job of auditing which requires no assessment, requires no frills and nothing but read the TA, run the process, handle the pc's origins, start and end the session.

I'm not now talking about Class VII at all; I'm talking about ordinary, run-of-the-mill 0 to IV auditors is what I'm talking about. And then right in that same category, you want to be able to sit there and be able to knock out case folders bang, bang, bang, bang! Know exactly what to look for in a case folders and so forth. Be able to take over the whole load as a D of P. Do a Case Supervisor job to end all Case Supervisor jobs. Just learn to do it totally by statistic. Never miss. Know exactly when to send them to Review and when not to send them to Review. Know when to investigate one of your auditor's comm cycles or not.

Of course, you realize that after you've had one auditor send three pcs in a row to Review and so forth that it might not all be pcs. And you've had a couple of pcs sent to Review that Review couldn't find anything wrong with. Well, don't blame it on Review. An auditor's comm cycle can louse up a case. Might be right there in the HGC; so then you start reviewing auditors.

Learn to do those things. Learn to be able to sit there and do a Case Supervisor job to end all Case Supervisors. What is a flat process? What are the processes to be run? How long should they be run? What is the next process to be run afterwards? What are the good indicators that can be read from a folder? What are the bad indicators that can be read from a folder? How much TA is TA? You understand?

Along that, I could recommend a course in cryptography. Cryptography is the skill of reading secret writing. I have become quite remarkable at this. I have a very powerful magnifying glass that sometimes by getting the impressions on the paper I get so that I don't have a misunderstood word on the thing in front of me. And one night I was actually able to invoke the assistance of four HCO personnel and the HCO Exec Sec, and we managed to work it out,
and we finally found out what it was. So it'd be very good for you to develop a certain telepan-
athy as to what did the auditor mean. Of course, an auditor's writing fast and furious, don't you 
see, and they very often don't get all down. The word is "a veuoooo – (squiggle)," you know. 
Now, learn to do that.

So what are these three things? Learn to be a perfectly marvelous Review Auditor. Be 
able to do an assessment to end all assessments. Know all the processes that have ever been 
run on anything anyplace to any result. Know them all. Be able to run a meter so doggoned 
good that you just never miss a read. Know all about metering. Know any process that might 
even vaguely or dimly be connected with that form of the Review. Just be a whiz-bang as far 
as that type of auditing is concerned. The highest type of auditing there is. Be very good at it. 
And be absolutely, fantastically good at turning out the meat course. Just be terrific at turning 
out the meat course.

Sit down, start the session, fix it up, clear the auditing command, get a couple of but-
tons straightened up, handle the pc into the session, get the body of the session going, utter 
the first auditing command and keep your auditing comm cycle going straight through to the 
end of the session without a single whimper, yip-yap, goof, misduplication or failure to ob-
serve your end phenomena and so forth – just a perfectly standard, straight, terrifically 
straightforward bong, bong, bong, bong job of auditing.

And be able to step aside from that 100 percent and be able to do cases without ever 
looking at an auditor, talking to an auditor or looking at a pc, talking to a pc, going around 
asking for any information or anything of the sort. Just read it right straight out of that case 
folder, know exactly what that pc's doing and know exactly what PC to keep in session and 
continue and what PC to move out.

With that goes a certain sensitivity to the frailties of certain auditors, particularly on 
lower level. You may have even a 1 today or even a 0 auditing in an HGC. You can do it pro-
viding you've got your ethics in and you're cracking the whip and you know your business. 
Yes, he could only run a 0 process, that's for sure, but with proper supervision that could hap-
pen.

You'd have to have a squawk-box system for one thing. You'd have to have it so that 
you could listen in on a session occasionally and find out what the hell was going on in the 
session, and then not use the data particularly for anything but to correct your false attesta-
tions if they came through. One thing is being audited but another thing is written in the 
folder. You know, that sort of thing. You have to be because you find their ethical standard 
matches their case standard which is usually pretty low when they're low on their classifica-
tions. But you could still do it, you understand?

But as a person move up the line, you'll find out that some auditor... You're handling 
nonreleased auditors, don't you see. And we've done it for years so it can be done. And you 
know that this auditor – you just never, never, never put him to auditing another man. Just 
never. He'll just cut him to ribbons. Or you know a certain auditor there, if you have anything 
to do – you – if you put this auditor on a young man, he will just butcher him. He seems to go 
round the bend on this particular subject, you see. And you know that you've got a matronly
lady and you know very well that you had better never, never, never, never, never put her auditing any young person because she just chops them to bits or goes into a cave-in on them.

And you learn certain things. You'll gradually learn your auditors and that there are certain types of assignments they're very successful on and certain types they're not, and there're certain types of this and that, that have really nothing to do with cases.

But this is just auditor assignment which is another subject entirely. How do you assign the auditor to the pc?

And then there's another one which you might dimly be interested in: the – a D of P, of course, also has to be able to assign rooms. And at Saint Hill this is done by magic – [laughter] there being no rooms to assign, don't you see. And that's the main trick of room assignment, is assigning rooms which don't exist and still getting auditing done. That's the main difficulty.

But now, if you were able to do those things and if you also knew the – if you also knew the general situation with regard to the org board and the relationship of the Technical Division to the other divisions, and if you knew those things, why, boy you would really be very, very, very successful. People will really like to have you around, man.

Now, you drop one of those skills out and you're that much less a producing auditor. It's a lucky HGC staff that could detach almost any one of its people to the Qualifications Division to act as Review. That would be a very lucky and a very, very well-trained HGC. Generally it'll be quite different. Some Qual Sec and so forth will be haggling and fooling around with the Org Exec Sec trying to get Zilch transferred from the HGC to the Department of Review to be the new Case Officer because somebody has gone up to Director of Review and has left a hole.

"Oh, you can't have him!"

"Why can't I have him?"

"Well, he's the best auditor I've got."

Why, I ask the question at that time. Well, what's goes with this fellow as a training officer that he's got a "best auditor"? At least he ought to have three best auditors. And of course, you'd find he was being very cooperative, too, because he wants a good auditor over there in Review; otherwise his case supervision becomes unthinkably difficult. His technical statistic will just go to pieces promptly and at once. He'll find out that then he'll have to take over his own case – his own review and case supervision.

Now, we can see, we can see a city office just formed in north Chicago or something like that which takes care of the suburb of Euphoria. And they – the fellow in charge of that, he hadn't learned better yet, but he has his own ideas about all this and they're different than Ron's. And those... and he's decided that it's a waste of personnel to have somebody in the Qualification Division because they're not big enough yet, you see. So therefore, he has the D of P do his own review and also audit a pc – that's what seems logical. And then he wonders why, after he had a sudden burst of pc sign-ups, he doesn't have any more pcs. Oh, he doesn't have any more pcs because his tech is out.
And the quickest way you can get rid of pcs is not deliver good technology, don't deliver good results. If you don't deliver good results, why, you don't have any pcs. That's elementary.

Actually, you can run a bad HGC longer than you can run a bad Academy. A bad Academy — one that is... what — where tech is out in the Academy — will fold up in a matter of days or weeks. It's the wildest thing you ever wanted to see in your life. All of a sudden tech goes out in the Academy exclusively and then you're suddenly looking at an empty Academy. You wonder what happened.

I don't know how students get it on the grapevine. I really don't. And you change the D of T and you straighten it up and you get the lines in, and all of a sudden the Academy fills up in a matter of two weeks. Where'd they all come from? This is one that — actually I'm not joking. This is bit of a baffler. It's absolutely true; it's quite factual that this does happen: When an Academy goes bad, it empties. And when it goes good, why, it fills right up again — very quite quick. There's no comm lag.

There is a comm lag on the HGC as — I've measured one as long as six months. But boy, when the collapse comes, it takes six months to recover. And if you go in an HGC without any results for six months — without any good, standard, uniform results for six months — if you can build that place back together again in eighteen months, you're doing well. It happens a bit slower in an HGC but it's more permanent. When dey kills an HGC dead wit' bad technology, dey kills it much deader than you would suppose possible.

So anyway, the net gain here is that an auditor in training is not in actual fact merely being trained as an all-around auditor who does a one-man band and so forth. The auditor who's doing a one-man band — doing his own review and his own this and then auditing his pcs all night and trying to run a course and doing his own case supervision and so forth is — just gets sloppier and sloppier and sloppier, and he'll get tireder and tireder, and next thing you know he isn't auditing. And it's happened to a lot of people. Well, that isn't the way you do it.

What you do is get in a city office, put it together in its proper formation and so forth. And then when you are training as a Scientologist in the vicinity of technical, and so forth, remember that there are now these zones. I don't expect there ever will be any additional zones. There'll be data, philosophic, organizational areas and that sort of thing, oh yes, but these quite — are really a bit different subjects than that of being an auditor.

But an auditor should know very well how to do those very things that I've enumerated. If an auditor can't do those things himself, he really will never quite understand what's happening while he is auditing. Do you follow? He'll never quite understand what's going on or what should be going on. And then his lines tend to go out because he's ignorant of what — which way to send the particle, don't you see, or what's happening. He'll sit and look at the folder in bemazement. If he's — if he's just doing a routine job of auditing and he doesn't know anything about folder marking and that sort of thing, and he gets his folder back and he's absolutely baffled. Why should he change the process? and so forth. The thing was — he won't have any reason for it.
Well, he'll finally begin to believe in the implicit faith that the D of P is always right. And this implicit faith is touching but is unnecessary because it happens the D of P, if he's well trained, will be right. But the point is that there's no reason to be in mystery about it. The reason you change processes and do these things are very, very standard reasons.

So you should know something about case supervision. You certainly should know the main course of auditing: Just how do you sit down and bang one out, man. Bang out that session just as standard as standard is standard – standard comm cycle, standard processes, standard responses, standard auditor's reports. The fiendish glee with which a person can knock this into shape is quite something. It's a direction of "no difference" to be trained in that is a – has its own rewards.

Now, the only thing that ever makes you break a standard operation is when your pc goes nonstandard: Pc goes out and gets drunk the night before, their mother-in-law comes to visit them – something happens in their life, don't you see. They all of a sudden come down with sciatica and you can't figure out why. Actually, it turned out not to be sciatica but a dose of fleas they got from their dog. We don't care what it was. The net – the net product here is the pc went nonstandard. What do you do with a nonstandard pc in a standard session? Well, you better send them to where they handle flat ball bearings. Let's not blame ourselves as to what happened. No, let's just have the place where we handle the flat ball bearing – the Qualification Division – let's have that very well functioning.

Now, the auditor himself ought to be able to know how to do one of these things, not because he's going to do one in his standard sessioning, because as the org grows up and as the ranks of well-trained auditors thin in the Tech Division, there's going to obviously be a need for more Review Auditors. Because you're only holding your tech line together by the dint of the fact – you see, now you can get very – you can get almost sloppy because you know nothing is going to go wrong. You can put anybody onto auditing practically. By process of elimination, why, you will eventually get those off that shouldn't be there and those that are good will stay there, don't you see? But you should be able to do a good Review job, a good bang-up Review job which basically consists of: how's your metering? How can you assess? You should know these zones.

But then, of course, if you don't know the pattern of an organization around these things, then it's a great mystery. Why do you send anybody ever to Ethics? "We shouldn't punish people!" God, if I hear that one more time, I'm going to pull somebody's rug out from underneath them. Who the hell is punishing people, see; we're trying to make people well. If you – you can't take a highly enturbulated environment – it's brutal to take a highly enturbulated environment and try to push somebody through without ever trying to find out why or make them straighten out their environment. What are we going to do with the guy, just let him fall on his head? If you've got technology out in an area, you have to have some means of getting technology in; otherwise you can't help anybody. Punish people? If all justice had been with the same purity of Scientology justice, the universe would not now have to be completely overhauled by us.

Of course, I use that advisedly. We're not out on the big kick, of course, to take over this planet and take over the universe and that sort of thing because that's – that'd be pretty
bad to do that. We're not on this – we're not on that kick. No, no, you needn't worry about a
full conquest of the planet or something like that because, frankly, it's nothing to worry about;
it's just inevitable. [laughter, laughs]

I was – the old gag about the people that had this sector a long time ago. They used to
call themselves "The Espinol United Stars This Quarter of the Universe Is Ours." They said it
all in one breath and so forth. "The Espinol United Stars This Quarter of the Universe Is
Ours," and so forth. So I thought for a starter, for a starter, why, we ought to start somewhere
up along the line in a year or two – after we'd done it, you see and so forth – we ought to start
calling Scientology – never call it just Scientology, see; just use it all in one breath, you see –
"Scientology This Planet Is Ours," see.

That would seem to me to be an appropriate name, because the funny part of it is, you
see, nobody's taken any ownership of it, you know. Nobody owns this planet. It's quite pa-
thetic. Here's this planet lying here unowned. People are always fighting to own it. I think
that's very silly. Why don't they just own it? Seems to me to be much more direct.

But we would have to earn the right to say that in many ways, and the way to earn the
right to say that is just go on and do exactly what we're doing right this minute. And if an
auditor's an auditor, why, he ought to know these various sectors and actions. And the organ-
izational pattern we've got is working out, man, it's just working out smooth as grease. We
keep on along the lines we're going on right now, it would inevitably happen. And we're on
our way. We're on our way right this minute. It's mostly a question of how fast do we make it
or how slow do we make it. And the extraordinary solution – any extraordinary solution put
on the line is put on the line simply by the smallness of time still operating.

But anyway, we'll try and get there before it all goes bang because I hate to see all that
– all that plutonium and so forth wasted. Looks to me to be a terrific waste of the stuff. Be-
cause, you see, look at all the fresh water you could make out of sea water for Los Angeles
with it or something like that, you know. It has other uses, other uses than surfeiting the appe-
tites of the paranoids. So I think we'll probably make it all right if we work hard.

But anyway, I thought I ought to give you the word on what I considered a well-
rounded auditor was these days and exactly what you should be able to do in order to consider
yourself well rounded and well put together.

And I want to thank you for your very good attention today and apologize to you for
not having talked to you... One of those weeks was mine off, the other one was pure pique
against IRS and so forth over in Washington trying to seize Scientology in the United States,
and I had to tell them no. And I told them no. And they're told for the moment. Now I will
draw a deep breath and wind up some more steam and say no a little bit louder next time, and
then maybe they won't try again. It isn't that there's huge trouble on the line; it's just that any
time you're connected with a suppressive you are to some degree a potential trouble source, so
I didn't want to make potential trouble sources out of you last week. [laughter]

Thank you very much.
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Thank you.
Thank you.

Well, I've missed you, too. [laughter] But I had somewhere between forty and fifty case folders on my plate every day and I'm getting some help on those now, so all is well. And now I hope I don't have to put in all the extra time because I'm not doing it all, having to get in and patch it all up. I'm sure I won't do that – where is he? But I will say, I'm still curious about what's happening to some of them, you know? It's like a continued story, processing people on the Power Processing. [laughter] What happened today, you know? Was Little Nell saved? [laughter, laughs]

All right, now, after all that, what I've been up to is nothing more serious than figuring out the various aspects of releasing people. And one of the interesting things about Releases is that we've been making them for years and years and years and years and years and the auditors have just been passing right over the top of those floating needles and going right on their way, process, process, process. And I suppose that I shouldn't mention it but Org Secs in charge of getting in income in orgs haven't been paying any attention to those free needles, either. Because you'd have to end processing, don't you see? And with all this – with all this, it has made a rather catastrophic situation in that the earliest Releases that we're checking out, and so on, are back in 1951. And if we dug around amidst the old-time Dianeticists, why, they were probably in there by the ton.

In other words, we were making this condition all the way along the line. In the earliest days there was some excuse for it: we weren't processing on a meter. But after 1958 there had been no excuse for it at all. When I made that tremendous rash of Clears on an ACC one time, they were Keyed-Out Clears but those needles were floating gorgeously. From that time on, people should have been alert on the situation because – I think it was about 57 – all those things were – all those rules about meters and so forth were released, what a free needle looked like, what a floating needle was, you know? And how it all behaved. This – and how one and all just seemed to be able to sit there and watch those needles float and the thing at Clear read and keep right on auditing, I don't know. Because they actually, up – from that point there on, were cleaning a clean, as far as the state of First Stage Release was concerned.

And they just went on cleaning that clean for years. And the longer they cleaned it, why, the more upset people became. You see? We were up to our ears with success and didn't even know it. Now, the thing which we didn't know, in some exoneration of all of this, is that you cannot and must not run a process beyond a free needle. You just must not! And that rule
extends right straight on up to Clear. It goes all the way through. Don't you run something which has already went.

Now, you'd have to get the whole aspect of processing backwards in order to do this. You'd have to get the idea that something else happened, the pc spouted fireworks out of his ears or something like this occurred at the – as the end product of the process.

But it doesn't matter – and now nail this one down in brass, please, because this rule is all the way from BS on up. And even applies to Self Analysis. We've got people who went Clear on – what we were calling Clear – on Self Analysis in 1952. Book's out, they all of a sudden went free needle on the subject.

Well, that meant that any recall process from there on was verboten on that person. See, you might have run some upper-level process and then cleaned that up. Do you follow? But you can just crudely group all lower-level processes as just one type of process. So there's the objective, there's the subjective, there's this, there's that, there's the other thing. We know all about that. But all of those processes, of course, are just skimming the top of the case. Cases go to many levels.

And the first level off of it is, "Is there a room?" you know? Where am I? You know, that kind of thing. Just a recognition of the environment. So if you just ask somebody to look around and spot where he was, you have more or less gotten rid of the Objective Processes.

Now, if the individual was asked to look around to find out where he was and that needle at that moment floated, you've had it! As the auditor you've had it right then! You can't run any CCHs. That's it. All Objective Processes are now fftt! Gone! You follow? That whole class of processes is now null and void. Now, it isn't that it isn't nice to run them. It's that you'll practically kill the guy if you run them! Do you understand? Because you're cleaning a clean.

Now, I don't know if you've ever sat across from an auditor who is industriously pre-checking and who was reading the meter with a periscope from down in the – some implant period. He sits there and at that moment that you ask him this question, "Do you have a present time problem?" – at the moment that he asks this question, you get a slight twitch or something like that. A fly lights on you, you know, something like that. And the needle goes "tick." And it's set at a sensitivity 128, see. And over here at 32 and it's all gunned up and new batteries and everything, you know? And this fly lights on you, and it goes "tick."

And so he says, "What's the problem?"

And you say, "Well, I don't have any problem." you see?

And he says, "Well, one reads here! I know my job, I'm supposed to clean this meter! What's the problem?"

And you say, "Well, there isn't any problem!"

"Well, I'm going to find this problem if it's the last thing I ever do!" [laughter]

Of course, there is a problem. There actually is a problem. It's the auditor thinks he's got one and he hasn't.
Now, from that moment on, have you ever seen a session deteriorate? Well, look at that same circumstance. Look at that same circumstance on the broad picture of processing. The guy doesn't have any more bank sitting there. It's gone. And now the auditor tells him to run something. And the D of P tries to figure out this unusual case. Case can't run on the CCHs. Can't run on anything. Well, he's oriented. He's oriented in his environment. Poor guy has had it, don't you see?

And from there on, processing him on anything even vaguely resembling an Objective Process would be a cruelty that makes war look innocent. This is the main thing that was missing. We didn't have this datum that you must not process beyond it. See, that was the missing datum. And when I discovered that one, wow!

Now, it's a funny thing that it still – it still carries on through, right up to the Power Processes. And your Class VII gets to know this with violence. Let's say he's running a process and the expected end phenomena has not occurred, of the process, but the needle floats. Even on a process of that magnitude, he's got to quit. That's it. Softly, quietly, however, that's it, see? We don't care why it floated. But we mustn't run that process anymore.

Now, you don't have the whole class of Power Processes go out, fortunately, simply because a needle floats on one of them. Each and every one of them, because of the difference of things they're directed at, will now pick up more charge off the top of the bank, you see. They really – they don't just sweep the road off lightly, with a kid's toy broom, you know. They clean up the cement highway, too. And you can always find a little more bedrock. But on any one of those processes, when it goes free and floats, that's it! Poof! You've had it!

Now, our main problem then, from the most fundamental processing straight through to the most complex, is overrun. Overrun. Now, this happened to me along about… This has happened to me a dozen times. Two dozen times, three dozen times. I lost count. Auditor's sitting there, saying "can't get the – can't get the…" [laughter] And there I'd go again. Well, of course, I was doing research and I'd get plowed-in and so forth. And I think most of the time I must have been – the last half of all of my research and so forth, on lower-grade processing, I must have been running on other peoples' banks! [laughs]

And I used to catch myself mocking up somebody's case and running it so that I could find out how it worked! I'm pretty good at that one. London one time sent me a telex. There was some kind of a pc in difficulties up there in London, and I told them to do some kind of a list on this pc and find the item on it, and I said, "And when she finds the dog, why, run this process on the dog." And London, next day sent a telex back, "The strangest thing – it was a dog!" [laughter] What did they think? [laughter, laughs]

Anyhow, the net action here with regard to all of this is you have to know when to quit. And when I came back from Las Palmas, why, Suzie was sitting back in the room and I was trying to run some R6EW, see? And she's watching the needle. And it was falling off of Set. You couldn't keep the needle on Set. You couldn't set the meter, in other words. It didn't matter how low you put the sensitivity, you couldn't set the meter.

And R6EW at that moment was flat. It had flattened somewhere along the line, I'd been running it when I was down south. And it had gone to floating needle.
Now, Phyll Stevens wrote me in today, and she's found eight or nine hundred end words down in Australia and she's in terrible trouble because they don't seem to have any bypassed charge. I told them to do an L6. That's all right. But they couldn't seem to find any bypassed charge and the needle the last session had stopped being between 2.0 and 3.0 with the needle floating and now was up at 3.5 and so forth and the needle was stuck. They'd run R6EW to floating needle. You couldn't go beyond it. Do you follow?

Now, actually I could no more run R6EW today than fly to the moon on a washboard. That's very embarrassing to me, because I'm fixing up sequences of end words. But I can only work with the actual GPMs now. And it – I just had a horrible – I was forty-four down the line, letter-perfect, no flaws, nothing, and I suddenly found that one of the GPMs right up at the top was a lock. And I had to go clear back up to the top of the bank to run this GPM. I was swearing like a pirate this morning.

Now, I suppose that that R6 GPM, my running GPMs by items, I suppose, in the R6 material, is the one thing of this that isn't true. Because all of the things float on that and that is what you pull the pc out of. And when you go down the line on GPMs sooner or later your needle's going to float. Sooner or later. But that doesn't mean they're all gone, it means you can't contact them. And then you're in trouble. You follow? Because you wanted a total quietness of the bank.

Now, R6 is the only process which is dealing with a total erasure. All other processes are dealing with locks on R6. Now, if you look at your various levels of processing, then, it begins fundamentally with the R6 bank. There is just the guy, and I suppose the fundamental on that is the possibility that he could get aberrated. I suppose that's the first possibility, and on top of that the R6 bank is built. And then on top of the R6 bank is built this tremendous accumulation that we know as end words and so on. And on top of those is erected a whole series of whole track incidents and other types of GPMs known as implants.

People wonder why you didn't stay Release. Actually it was these implants that were done against the original bank restimulating the original bank that eventually cut people down to size. It's just the repetitive restimulation. The later implants are nothing. But they restimulate the basic R6 bank and tie it up. And that's how you less and less frequently were in a released state.

You understand that in your highest state in this universe there has been – you've never been any higher than Release, see? You've been a temporary key-out. Keyed in again by implanting or some experience. Well, on top of the implants and so on, a lot of engrams would build up. Whole track. The whole track type of engram is built up, and they're sort of sandwiched amongst the implants. And then the next piece of the cake are secondaries, which is emo... misemotional experiences sitting on top of these engrams. The engram containing pain and unconsciousness, the secondary containing merely misemotion.

Now, on top of the secondary sits what we call locks. And locks are simply moments of restimulation of engrams and secondaries. Engrams are, in actual fact, restimulation of end words. End words are restimulation of the R6 bank itself. You can pull an awful lot of end words off of the R6 bank, you see, without actually going into the R6 bank and getting the actual words. That is the little spook that is here. So that if you get too much R6-ish type ma-
terial into your R6EW, you're liable to get into a bit of trouble, don't you see? Don't add those endings quite right, just get what you get. That's the whole trick in running R6EW. Just get what you get! And then you're actually running locks off the bank, you see?

Now, do you see what these various stratas are? Surrounding all this is a thing called the physical universe. Now, you may have noticed this around. If there's any further bank than the R6 bank, it would be the physical universe as a bank, considering it a bank. It hardly is considerable as a bank, but you could, in a dim way, consider it such, don't you understand?

Now therefore, what you're doing with a pc from the moment of inception on down the whole line is carving away at this stack of stuff. Now, it consists of significance and masses. It also contains spaces and energies. It also is plotted against time. But that's all there is in it. There isn't anything else in it. Now, you say there – a machine. Yes, there can be a machine in it. There is a thing called a machine. And there can be a thing called a circuit. But these are actually specializations of what I have just mentioned.

You see some guy's being talked to by a circuit sometime and it's a laugh. What it is is a valence. But it's merely a combination of energy and significance, you see? And this comprises a mass that sits there, you know, and the net... it sits in its own made-up space, you see, and it's plotted against the pc's experiential track, known as time. That's all there is in the bank.

If you think there's anything else in the bank and so forth, why, God help you! So what you – what you got there is a – is a – some part of the bank is telling you something else is there, don't you see? And this is long experience on this line, and every time somebody thinks he has something else in the bank besides the items I've just mentioned, why, he's in trouble from there on.

Now, Freud and the psychoanalyst actually had more popularity mostly because they had more R6 in their technology than anything else. In other words, they didn't direct attention to it as bank but they had – they had some root and end words on which they were basing everything. But they actually recognized recovery in terms of "the release of affect." Now, "release of affect" is a technical term in psychoanalysis. And I very often misexplain their technical terms, according to the modern psychoanalyst. But I've got a laugh on him. I had the original definitions, see?

Transference to him today is something very weird and is something very hokus-pokus. Well, originally what Freud meant by transference was he meant transference. And he meant the patient flipped into another valence, we'd say. And the optimum valence, according to the psychoanalyst, is the analyst. And all kinds of wild things, you know?

But now, this release of affect is interesting because they simply mean by that a mis-emotional discharge. You know, pc – their patient cried, see? But they frankly didn't really – didn't recognize that there were other emotions besides grief. Which is interesting, because there's apathy, there's fear, there's hate, any one of those things could be the content of one of these secondaries. Now, a secondary depends for its force exclusively upon the pain and unconsciousness contained in a mental image picture called an engram. If you haven't got any engrams you're not going to collect any secondaries. So when you see – when you see somebody boo-hooing like mad and nothing has touched them, don't be mystified about it. In simi-
lar circumstances someplace down the track they got shot to pieces in similar circumstances. So now this similar experiences makes them realize that they're about to be shot to pieces, you see, so they cry. Do you follow?

But you'll find that this – here sits an engram and that's unconsciousness, pain and so forth, mental image picture of; and sitting right on top of it will be that secondary. I spotted this back in 1950. It was very interesting. We've – we got to a point where we'd start to run the secondary, and actually we could go on a little spur track, you know, and go right straight down through the engram, right underneath, and cut the secondary off the top of it.

Well, Freud got as far as grief of the secondary. But all anybody has ever been trying to do, when he was sincerely trying to help somebody with his mind, was reduce the effect – reduce the effect of this thing called the reactive mind, as for the unconscious mind or the subconscious or the re-conscious, or the – whatever it is – upon the individual himself. They've been seeking to reduce the effect of that upon the individual. That has been the main goal of decent and honest psychotherapy. See, where it has existed, that has been the object in view.

There were many therapies of this character on the whole track. Some people wonder if there was such a thing as Scientology on the whole track. Personally I doubt it very, very much. But you wouldn't really know. Do you see? If some guy had discovered it all by himself. I think you would know if somebody had discovered it while working with many other people because it would have kept on going on a wave basis. But if somebody discovered it all by himself you wouldn't know about it at all, don't you see? He would simply have freed himself and along about halfway through he would have said, "Well, the hell with the rest of the human race," and taken off, don't you see? That crude! "Ah, what am I doing around here?" Don't you see? And would have gone.

So you wouldn't really know. But as far as people's banks is concerned, there has never been a trace of it. There has been a trace of people attacking their R6 bank, and you'll occasionally find a GPM in a pc that the pc had gnawed on. He wishes he hadn't, too! Because it's something like stirring up the fire with a stick of dynamite, don't you see? It's not a good cooking implement. But you'll sometimes find – you won't find large stretches of track gone, don't get that idea. Somebody trying to tell you, "Oh, well, my R6 bank went in eight…"

"What are you doing standing there in a body?" That would be your immediate question.

Somebody says, "Well, I got rid of my R6 bank eighty-nine trillion years ago and so forth and…"

"What you doing with a body?" You got him, see? He hasn't gotten rid of any of it. But people have collided with it. And they've chewed an item or two out of a GPM. And you'll sometimes find an item in one of the GPMs that's got a big mouse hole gnawed in the side of it. Frankly that's just that. Or it's just squashed or crushed. You know, he just says, "What's this? What's this? I'm tired of this!" You know? And he took a couple of beams or something of the sort and he slapped it! And he wishes he hadn't. That isn't the right way to as-is one.
But as far as marks of psychotherapy on the track that actually go down to the fundamentals of the R6 bank, beyond that one I have mentioned of a thetan occasionally running into it one way or the other, all these things are tied up with pictures.

Pictures is about the – as high as they got, and Freud didn't even get the pictures but he could touch emotion occasionally. Now, some of the psychotherapies used – I won't bore you at long length with some of these things – but what they'd do is take a photograph of the area where you had just had the experience and then hit it with a clapstick. Make two sticks come down [claps] like that, against [claps twice] as though they were exploding the photograph, do you understand? Actually they take a photograph of the area where you had the experience and – you weren't in a body when they were using this kind of therapy – and they'd sort of get you dazed in there and then they'd show you this photograph and then they'd go [claps] like that with it, with a big clapstick in front of the photograph, and it'd look like the photograph was exploding. And after a while a thetan who was sort of anaten or goofed off or something like that – "Oh!" you know, even – they'd only use it when somebody was more or less comatose or something of that sort and they couldn't get him up and so on. "Oh!"

So he'd take the picture of his own misemotional or engramic or painful experience and he'd hit it himself [claps] with a couple of beams. "Oh, that's what you want!" Ppssswwww! See? And he'd snap out of it. And he'd be all right. That's whole track psychotherapy. That's about as high as they got. That is the practice of the Galactic Confederacy at this particular instant. That's what they do. That's what their psychotherapy is.

Now, there were many other technologies which came up that had no idea of helping anybody. Suppressive technologies. And these things tend to get confused with helpful technologies. They're easily mistaken for one another because it is very simple to see that they have some similar words, phrases or points of view in them, don't you see? But they go in two different vectors. One is trying to help somebody out. The other one is just trying to fix him up, but good.

Now, implanters learned quite a bit about thetans. They knew that they could freeze them into immobility, they knew they could do various things to them, they invented things like sleep lights and so forth. There are any number of things which have been developed to have an effect upon an individual. And when you get a suppressive and he tries to study Scientology, he studies it all from the viewpoint of trying to have an effect on people. Not trying to lessen the effect of the bank on the individual, but trying to get technology which will have an effect on somebody.

And he equates all of his processing on the basis of "Did it have enough effect on the pc?" Not "Did it make the pc better?" Well now, on some of these processes you do get a – quite an explosive effect on the pc, but immediately he comes out of it and is better. Do you understand? It isn't the effect you're after, it's the betterness you're after.

Now, the whole subject of alchemy was devoted one hundred percent to throwing into total restimulation the entirety of the R6 level and letting the guy cook thereafter. It had no other goal. Their original people that monkeyed around with it might have had some kind of an impulse in this direction. But certainly their books and writings and things they told you to do and how – what they told you to practice and so forth in this old field of alchemy, which
we know today by the way as turning lead – transmutation of metals – it had nothing to do with alchemy. Transmutation of life was what they were talking about. There was the lead of human beingness to the gold of spirit. This was where they went – original – got their – their comparison.

And you read these long books on this particular subject, and boy, they're just full of R6EW dichotomies. They don't run them out. You just get in deeper and deeper and deeper and deeper. And you get one of these boys on the Power Processes that's been into some such practice like that and he gets onto one of the Power Processes and nothing comes off but dichotomies. Boy, you have to get him out of that. He's just been plowed into the R6 bank since time immemorial. And you have to pull him out of it and find the practice that got him in there and run the practice out. Otherwise you can't fish the boy out. One of the tricks by which this is done.

But there are several of these things. There's hypnotism. Hypnotism is nothing but to make people more suggestible or more compliant. Not to make them any better, don't you see? And some hypnotist gets a hold of hypnotism, tries to make hypnotism then work in the field of healing or something like this. Well, he's on a reverse vector because you have to wake people up to make them better, not put them to sleep.

So you discover that there were innumerable practices on the whole track which were devoted to simply having an effect upon the individual, making him weaker, making him more compliant, making him more easily controllable by the state. You take some of these states that ran on the basis of a thought tower. They had a thought tower and if you had any hostile thoughts to the state, why, the thought tower was supposed to pick these up and record them and you instantly reported to the chief police's office and had yourself brainwashed. This was one of the wildest swindles that ever heard of it, because they never have had a thought tower which ever did pick up anybody's thought. But the person was implanted with the idea that if he had a hostile thought it would be picked up by the thought tower and he was under compulsion to go and visit the police office! Crazy stuff!

All sorts of control mechanisms of one kind or another. They used to take a (quote) "piece of a thetan" and keep it in – this is very early track – take a piece of a thetan and keep it in a laboratory or something, and if he escaped, why, they would then touch this with hot rods or something and this would hurt him, and he would have to come back. And of course he's simply told this, on a compulsion, that this is what is happening. But the person was implanted with the idea that if he had a hostile thought it would be picked up by the thought tower and he was under compulsion to go and visit the police office! Crazy stuff!

Do you notice the common denominator to all of these things, which merely try to have an effect upon the individual, is lies? Common denominator is lies. Falsehoods. There's always a pitch. Now, the common denominator of things that set men free is truth. So these things are two opposite vectors. And they can be very easily confused. You'll sometimes have a Rosicrucian suddenly stumble into a Scientology organization and start telling you all about when you grimace at yourself in the mirror a horrible apparition should appear over your shoulder, and yes, he's been through all that, he knows about exteriorization because he's been deep in his skull for a long time, and you try to straighten the guy out. Well, you're never on
any talking basis. You apparently are speaking about a similar subject, and what's missing there is it's going that-a-way and we're going this-a-way. We're going in two different, opposite directions. And one of the earliest rules about processing is when the pc was headed for succumb and the auditor was trying to get the pc to survive, there was insufficient agreement in the session to let a session run. And that rule still holds and you run into it today.

Pc's tired of this life and he wants to be processed and exteriorized so he can kick the bucket. He's got some heavy, heavy, heavy PT problem, he has no idea of confronting present time, all he wants to do is kick the bucket and drop down to the local maternity ward, see? And pick up another body. And there the auditor sits, trying to get the pc over his sciatica or lumbago or something like this, you see, and the pc is trying to acquire a lot of lumbago. If he could just acquire enough lumbago then he'd die and he could pick up a new body, you see?

So the auditor's going up and the pc's going down. Well, they can't agree, you see? Now, you very normally then find yourself in an argument with somebody who is a hypnotist or something like that. And he can't understand you and you can't understand him, even though you appear to be talking in some tiny, similar points about the same mechanisms. Well, that's because he's going down and you're going up. He wants to make people more suggestible; you want to make them more self-determined and aware. These are two different directions. And this is the main thing that you have to be alert for when you are studying philosophy or the field of the mind or anything like that, is. "Which direction are these guys going?" That's the first thing you should ask. And there are many tests by which this can be done.

But the whole test of sincerity is: Is the fellow doing what he says he's doing? Or is he doing something else? And it's these two questions that have to be answered about any government or any movement or about any individual. Is this fellow doing what he says he's doing? Is what he says he's doing what he's doing? Do you understand? Or is he doing one thing and saying he's doing another, or is he saying he's doing another and doing something different than what he is saying? In other words, the single test of this is therefore whether or not there is a falsity in the line.

All these downgrade subjects, implanting, hypnotism, electric shock, prefrontal lobotomy (to get very, very medieval about our modern practices) all have this pitch in them. They've got a falsity in the line. In other words, they sit there – they say they're trying to make people well, but actually – that you understand, but they don't understand this at all. They even explain to you glibly, "Well, a person would get out of the hospital three weeks earlier on – uniformly on the average if we didn't use any shock at all." And you in some horror look at the psychiatrist and you say, "Well – wait, why – well then why do you shock them?" And he looks at you like you're stupid.

Well, of course you've assumed something, and so has the state, so have the parents of the insane person, or their wives or sisters or mothers; they've assumed that the psychiatrist is there to help the person out. And he isn't. See? There's the apparenty. But the opposite action is: with psychiatry in charge, is the world saner? No! Their statistics are runaway. They're not just down! Here's a runaway down statistic, you see? It's hitting the chute.
Since psychiatry has entered the field of criminology New York Police Department and the British police have uniformly brought forward statistics showing you that law and order is on the decline and crime is fabulously on the increase. And it's on the increase to such a degree that it's out of control. It's like a forest fire rolling.

And they criticize the sociological approach and other such approaches to the field of crime. They've been working too hard with those rather than law enforcement. So crime is a runaway. So under this type of thinking, are things getting better? Well, things are not getting better because there's a falsity on the line. What you understand he's doing is not what he's doing. Do you follow?

Now, it – the test – the test of the thing is to this degree: is, is the individual doing what he says he's doing? Now, you have a reality on that as an auditor. You know that you can sit there, and if you find the problem, you get a reaction, a discharge on the meter, and the individual feels better. You've got – you've got this. Well, why is that? Because as long as he is saying it's some other problem, it won't blow. Well, that's because there's a falsity entered into it.

So we get the sole crime that can occur in this universe is actually not making things, not doing things, actually not destroying things; these are not the basic crimes. The basic crimes are altering things. Masking or hiding purposes. Masking or hiding truth.

Supposing you had a research line going somewhere, where every time they found a datum that didn't agree with their other datum they threw it in the wastebasket. That would be dishonest research wouldn't it? Every time they found anything that – in variance with what they were doing they would threw it in the wastebasket. And yet I've now described, I'm afraid, psychological research the way it is practiced.

Now, it can't be practiced that way in the field of engineering or no trains would run and no buildings would stand up and everybody could see they were false. But on some subject where somebody is telling you, "Oh, well, you have to be very learned before you know anything about this." Field of art is one of these. You ever listened to a cubist painter? Maybe there is something in cubism. Maybe there's even art connected with cubism, but it sure isn't what they say it is. I got a couple of kids in here who can draw better abstracts than the abstractest abstractor! They do it very well. They undoubtedly mean something by it, too. They don't tell somebody they mean something by it.

There you would have the same practice. There is such a thing as abstract art, which could go in two different directions. One, to mask the fact that the fellow didn't know anything about art at all. And the other direction, that he was trying to express something that so far had not been expressed. Now, it'd be up to you to detect which one it was. If he was having any trouble with his art or any problems with regard to his art, then you would know there were just that many falsities in his art. Do you follow? Just that many lies on the line.

So it's just a test of how many alter-ises. It's always just a test of how many alter-ises there are. Any subject has a few alter-ises in it. Otherwise it would disappear. But to the degree that it has very, very few alter-ises in it, it will help people. And to the degree that it has many of them, it will hinder people. Do you follow that line of reasoning?
Well, this is what makes the north and south vector – the vector of survive, help people, what do we think of as the good things and so forth. Then there is a minimum of falsity in that line – a minimum of pretense, a minimum of falsity; the other direction of "Let's do them in, let's have an effect upon them, let's produce a new gas which makes all men have purple faces! Now, that would be a good contribution." You'll find there's tremendous falsities along that line. What we normally associate with the evil practices are actually designated or, that is, these are actually identified by the number of falsities in connection with them.

So you can almost define "good" on the basis of truth. Now, you'll find out the worse off a pc is, the more he thinks he's got in his mind. It's quite an interesting index. You can get somebody finally that's got old tin cans and broken bottles and so forth in his brain. He will accumulate, like a junk man, any past psychotherapy, Aesculapian or religious practice or something like that, and he's got all of these. If they've got a complex of some kind or another and he stumbles across it anywhere, he'll collect it. Like a pack rat. Looking for boojum. He's trying to find it. He's – it's something. But he'll just add it. He must have that, too. It's like a young doctor studying in a hospital or a young nurse studying for her nursing certificate, and so on. They pick up – some of them – pick up all the diseases they read about. They go around with symptoms of angina pectoris and symptoms of irresponsibility and – if they read it in a book of diagnosis, they've got it, don't you see? They hear that – they hear that rheumatic heart is accompanied by a certain curvature of the fingernail, and they're looking there at the – and all of a sudden they look, by George, they've got that curve of the fingernail, don't you see?

In other words, they're on an addition. They're on an additive line. Additive. In the direction of additive, then, we actually approach evil. And on the direction of subtractive we approach good. So what is the basic theory of Scientology processing? Scientology processing is based on subtractive actions and truth. It's based on truth.

The is-ness of the thing is what we care about. We don't care about the alter-is-ness except to the degree that the individual has alter-ised it, don't you see? Now, once we've gotten down to this, there is – there is the is-ness of what really is there. What is in the mind? We don't care why is it in the mind! The hell with that question. Let's leave that to Hegel and Kant and some other boys that didn't make it. Eh-heh! I shouldn't – that just slipped out; I just wanted to point out to you they're dead! Nobody noticed. They couldn't have known so much about philosophy after all. Anyway, they pretended that it was a very difficult subject.

Now, the thing then that you must recognize is that cleaning a clean brings about the manifestations of evil. I know this is a very esoteric point I'm making here; I'm riding all over the plains and across several rivers to get back to it, but I wanted to show you exactly where this thing is, see? You clean a clean, you're adding. Why? Because there's not anything there to be cleaned. So therefore the pc's got to put something there or the auditor's got to put something there or somebody's got to put something there before anything will happen!

Now, if there are just so many things in the mind, five, six general classes of things, whatever they are, I've just enumerated them, don't bother to count them. They – you should know them in your sleep, they're nothing to them. There's just that many things and when there's no more of that particular type of thing or that class of reaction in the mind, in order to
do any more processing on that you have to put something there or pretend something is there, in order to run it out.

Now, there are these two points which are very, very clean-cut here.

One: there is – is a reactive bank. And it is composed of certain exact, definite elements. And there isn't anything else. When you have disconnected the pc from that class of element, he has ceased to be an effect of it and all intents and purposes you can regard it as gone.

Now, it's either temporarily disconnected or it is gone. The thing that won't get gone until it's all done is the R6 GPMs themselves, complete. And they are not going to disappear by somebody changing his postulates. Because they are the fanciest concatenation of postulates that anybody ever got tangled up with. Every postulate you could make is booby-trapped in it. Now therefore, nobody's going to get through the R6 bank by changing his mind. But there wouldn't be anything else in the mind if there weren't an R6 bank there! There would be no other thing in the mind. The individual would be able to confront, to be familiar, be this, be that, be the other thing, see? He'd do these things. But there would be no thing there. There'll be no is-ness. You follow?

So you've got this other stuff built up on it. And here's this R6 bank in its totality. And then on this R6 bank a guy gets kind of woggy and woozy on the subject of postulating because he learns not to do certain things and certain other things, and he learns to think carefully, and – so he gets his thetan block knocked off if he doesn't. And he accumulates an R6EW series of locks on top of this. He has certain purposes, so he actually – along with the R6EW locks there's another strata of actions which are goals.

His own goals pile up on this thing and get all stacked into it, too. Which is also an interesting phenomenon. But that we put in along the line of implants, you see? Here's your next little grade up above this, and they last as a sort of an overlay, and they're quite similar to the GPMs. And then you have now engrams, whole track variety engrams, which are mental image pictures spaced in certain times which have certain experiences contained in them, and they consist of energy and thought. And they've got some space connected with them, you see? Certainly some mass. Mental mass.

And then lying on top of those you get a strata of secondaries, which is to say, moments of misemotion. And the person became misemotional because he had moments of pain and unconsciousness in restimulation and that upset him. So he got upset and he misemoted. See? People mistake how many mis-emotional states there are. There are quite a few misemotional states. You find them in the Tone Scale and so forth. Anything below 2 or anything that's ever been named below 2 we're finding as turning up on Power Process secondaries. The pc will feel apathetic for two sessions. He gradually – all of a sudden he runs an apathetic secondary, you see, or he's run this thing out. It's the misemotional strata.

And now we get onto the whole subject of locks. And a lock is simply a restimulation of the engram-secondary package. In other words, it'll be on this basis: A fellow sees two cars run together; he has himself an engram of two cars – he's in one and he got hurt and he went unconscious, so he's got an engram on the subject of cars running together – he sees two cars run together and he's assaulted by the concussion and explosion and the screams of the
maimed and dying. The main goal of the – I think, of the highway department and so forth is "no motorists," the way they control things. Anyway, the final – he'll get a secondary. See? He'll experience a tremendous amount of fear when he sees these two cars go together. Now, he wasn't touched, it didn't threaten him, he didn't own either car.

But you'll find him crying about this. Now, if he had a friend in it, you'd have a real, honest-to-God, full-blown secondary! He'd feel terrible over this, see?

Now, your next stage up from this is he sees a picture of two cars. Or he sees a wrecked car in a junk yard. Not at the site of the wreck at all. He's not connected with it any way, shape or form. There's been no action, he has no experience whatsoever. He doesn't even notice that he's seen a wrecked car, but he comes away from there feeling blue. Yeah, he just isn't quite up to snuff. He's now got a lock.

And eventually he begins to record everything he ever sees, thinks or does. He is one walking concatenation of every instant of time is a lock. Because it's connected somehow or another to some secondary or some engram someplace on the track. So he gets a full time track. There are no blanks. You can run this guy back through yesterday and it runs like an engram. But you can! You can run him through it and you can recover practically everything there is in yesterday. I think it's fascinating! I used – I've done a lot of this, and it's sort of a lost art these days because it's not that significant. We've got the whole of Dianetics all wrapped up, you see? We can run an engram on anybody. He's black, sees black all over his – you know, and – view, he never sees anything at all. No pictures. "Naw, there aren't any such things as engrams." Boy, you can take and get the duration of the incident that he's looking at and it all opens up. And there he is, staring at the burning city. You got the idea? There he is!

So where we've got an individual occluded, even that today – we can turn off the occlusion, see? We can run him on the track. Now, what's the setup here? It's simply that when he finally became human, he had 100 percent track. Every moment is – his life was becoming time track. He was now going down scale at an accelerated rate. They're all locks.

Mental image pictures. He couldn't look at anything in the universe right now, without it hanging up on some experience he's had that he didn't like. You got it?

Male voice: Yeah.

Well, there is – there's the bank. Now, the individual also happens to be surrounded by a thing called the physical universe. I don't know if you've ever noticed it. But there it is, around. And this physical universe can generate such a thing as a problem. It's him versus it. Or it versus him. And along with the physical universe there's the other fellow's universe. His fellow being has also got a bank, with a different experiential track than his, but based on the exact same R6 bank. They're fundamentally, basically, the same bank, but this other fellow lived different. And he lived a different track, so they have, at first glance, different banks. But they don't. Their basic bank is identical.

So you've got the other fellow's universe and you got the physical universe. Now, the other fellow, in his universe, can cause you problems while communicating to you through the physical universe, and the physical universe itself can cause problems, and so we can get a thing called a present time problem that doesn't have anything to do with a mental image pic-
ture. Doesn't have anything to do with the reactive bank, but it can restimulate the reactive bank and make it harder to solve the present time problem. But a present time problem can actually exist. That's one of the things that auditors don't always notice.

The guy's in jail! Well, you say, "Well, let's run out all the locks and secondaries," and so forth. That isn't going to do him any good, he's in jail! And actually he can't get his attention on his bank. And if he does, he'll just go back and run other times when he's been in jail, millions and trillions of years ago... worth of locks on the thing, and he'll just keep running this. And he won't get any better because he's running up against this unalterable fact: He's in jail.

Now, if you could run him all the way down through and he could solo audit himself through the R6 bank, there wouldn't be any jail that would hold him. But is his worry so great about being in jail at this particular moment that he can't get his attention on his R6 bank? And if it is, he won't make it. If you find a pc who was chased way down the track, he is probably there – or a pc who's going mad with his problems or something – he's probably way back down the track, but actually he's being driven there by a problem with the physical environment and the others with whom he associates.

And that problem is so great that it's the physical universe that is out of gear. And therefore we get a pc making no gain in the presence of a present time problem. Now, you can handle this present time problem, usually – usually on the simple basis that it's a problem because he doesn't think he can handle it. He's entered a lie into it. He doesn't think he can do anything about it, which is the lie that is entered into it. And so he doesn't do anything about it, so it remains a problem. Do you understand?

So then if the auditor could audit around the fringes of this problem and get the person to take the problem apart, and confront its elements and get the lies out of the problem, then he could probably confront the problem and he would either have to do something about it or he wouldn't have to do anything about it, because it ceased to be a problem. Do you understand?

But you get – your – you get caught in the idea that the problem is something totally dependent upon the individual's mind. No. No, it really isn't totally dependent on the individual's mind. When you've got your hand caught in a clothes wringer, man, it has nothing to do with your backtrack! Your hand, you need it in your business... [laughs] True, we could get over wanting to have hands. But this is the other element in processing.

Now, therefore, if an individual has tremendous present time problems, you're not even going to get him to confront locks. And you're at a very shallow level of no case gain or something happening to prevent the case from gaining. But there's one just a little bit higher than that, and that's an ARC break. An ARC break is a person who thought he was going to be helped, but felt he had been kicked in the teeth, but he's not sure what kicked him in the teeth and he can't isolate it and some lie, of apparent hostile nature, has been entered into his environment and he's in restimulation but doesn't know where. And he goes into a confusion and so forth, so he can't concentrate on either the bank or present time or the auditor. So that would be the first thing you could get a person over. In actual auditing you have to get a per-
son over an ARC break before you can audit him. I don't care what process you're running
him on.

So it isn't necessarily part of the bank, but it's made up from lack – an ARC break is
merely an incomplete cycle of some kind or another. That is all there is to an ARC break.
ARC break is no more complex than that. It's a lowering of affinity, reality and communica-
tion and so we call it an ARC break. It's a sudden downcurve. It's a highly technical term. It
means exactly what it says, but its incept and so forth is an incomplete cycle of action. It
couldn't complete it because the guy died before he got there, don't you see? Or it's been lost,
or somebody said it was everywhere and it was only Joe, and there's some big lie entered into
it probably, but nevertheless, however it was, he didn't get a chance to do what he was trying
to do. And that's his main upset.

And he's not auditable. He's wondering "What-what-what fog?" You know, not "What
wall?" but "What fog am I in? Wha-who is shooting at me?" You know? And you know a
person can get so puzzled as to who is shooting at him, that he can't put any attention on his
bank or his environment and so forth.

Now, all of us as human beings have, to some slight degree, an under-the-gun exis-
tence. See, we're never completely out from underneath the gun. There's things called eco-
nomics, there are well-meaning friends, there are shortages of the – of materiel, the lack of
time. Things like this that make it hard to get along with the physical universe and others. But
you can tolerate quite a bit of it. Unless you're on a bit of a skid in the first place. Let's say
you're tipped over somehow or another, and you've just had a bad shock of some kind or an-
other. And then you'd be surprised how things that didn't irritate you yesterday irritate you
today. Well, similarly, a person can be processed under a certain amount of duress. That is to
say, their environment can give them a certain amount of duress and they can still react well
to processing.

Well, I'll give you an idea. Right now I am totally aware of the fact that if the US
makes just about one more mistake, why, we've had it. See, they've specialized in them lately.
And they must have a textbook on "How to make a mistake in three easy State Departments"
or something. They're gorgeous at it. They just make mistakes. Making military mistakes,
diplomatic mistakes, wrong target mistakes. Well, they can't afford any! When you're in a
rough spot, don't make a mistake. Don't allow yourself the luxury of an error, in other words.
Because it'll worsen the situation all out of proportion.

For instance, your pc is all caved-in and hysterical. And the auditor makes the slight,
tiny mistake. The pc just goes appetite over tin cup. Pc is feeling good, the auditor forgets to
acknowledge, drops the E-Meter on the floor, it just doesn't mean much to the pc. Do you get
the idea? So the amount of duress that an individual is under is proportionate to the degree
that he thinks it threatens his survival.

Now, I know that right now, the only reason I'd be vaguely interested in the United
States alleged government – the only reason I'd be interested in that at all is because I'm an
old hand at this sort of thing. I know how easy it is for some guy to make enough blunders to
wind things up in a nice, juicy bunch of mushroom clouds. And I don't want to grow any
mushroom clouds, lately! I mean, we've got no use for them, they're a waste of time. And
fallout – we're not interested in fallout. We might be interested in mocking up radiation, but not interested in somebody else's fallout.

In other words we could get here to a point where World War III could catch up things and that's the big bang, don't you see? It's – it would be too destructive. It isn't another type of war. And that could interrupt things. That operates as a present time problem. I never worry about it to amount to anything, unless I'm already getting my head kicked in close up on something else, don't you see? Now, I'll find myself all of a sudden in auditing or something of that sort, saying, "Well, how much time have I got? Really, we haven't got enough time, don't you see?" It's pressure of time which makes a present time problem out of it.

So there's always a certain amount of duress that the pc is under. See, there's always a tiny bit. It's what is their tolerance for that much duress at that particular moment that makes the difference. Do you follow?

Now, a pc who is more or less ARC broken with life, has tremendous present time problems, all of them unsolvable, and doesn't even know he's got a mind and is believing a bunch of erudite lies that have been told to him from all around the clock, through his education – in other words, a standard, better, well-off human being today – this bird hasn't got a chance! You try to process him first off the bat and you already are dealing with somebody who's up against too many unknowns and too many ARC breaks, mmmll rrrlmmm mmmm ooh!

Now, you make much of a mistake with this bloke, few little, tiny errors, and they're blown up out of all magnitude. Now, supposing – supposing you'd gotten this guy and by some miracle had gotten him over his present time problems, gotten him over his ARC break with the environment, show him he had a mind, showed him where he was going, showed him that he really could be headed someplace, and then – and then he made it! The ARC breaks with life are gone or you got rid of all of his present time problems, and the needle floated! You disconnected him, temporarily, from the remaining banks, don't you see? And now, at this point, he could confront these ARC breaks with life, he can confront these problems with life, he sees exactly where he sits, he knows what's bugging him – it's been this mind. And you go on auditing ARC breaks? You go on auditing present time problems? Of course you've directly and immediately invalidated the individual, you are cleaning a clean. You're adding things that weren't there.

All you had to do was notice the needle floated, the guy now – let's say you've gotten the problems mocked up and he was all set and his needle was floating on his life in general. You say, "Boy, that's it! You're okay now, that's fine, that's all. That's it." Well, he would have said, "Well, I think so!" and he would have stayed pretty doggone stable, from there on. You would've let him have his win, in other words.

But if you went on auditing him and auditing him some more, and auditing him for more problems, you're sort of telling him at the same time that he can't confront problems. He's starting to have to dream up difficulty with problems in order to have a case to audit. You couldn't audit on that strata anymore. You would've had to have audited now in a direction of Recall Processes. You would've had to have audited now in the direction of Recall Processes. I don't ask you to be this precise about it because frankly we haven't got any bank
of experience on exactly who goes released on an Objective Process, exactly what process
could you run him on next. I would much rather jump him from a free needle and take no
question about it at all, up to next stage, Power Processing. Because we know those can be
run on him.

There's some possibility, for instance, that you could run some more of this or some
more of that or something on the low-level processes. If there is, I haven't made a close, de-
lineated list of it. I'm really not that interested in it. Because you could probably – there's
some corners of it that you could go on and clean up. But I'm not that interested in it, because
there is such a thing as Power Processing. It's sort of like dabbling around with – it'd be al-
most cleaning a clean anyhow. See, what gain could he make on this basis? Well, he'd better
make the gain – his next jump had better be on Power Processing. And then we're fairly safe
and we don't have to teach people so many.

I don't say then that there isn't any other lower-grade process that won't do anything
for the pc. But certainly everything that you have handled on that pc up to the moment when
he went free needle can no longer be run on that pc. And that I tell you for sure. Because
you're now cleaning a clean and you're upsetting him. Because in essence that's no longer
bothering him. And you, by auditing it, are selling him the idea that he ought to be bothered
by it.

Now, waiting for him, at the moment he went clean on locks, let us say – supposing
you got rid of some locks. You ran some ARC Straightwire and you saw yourself sitting,
looking at a floating needle. Uuh! My God, don't even utter that next command, you know?
What's this professional thoroughness that has to utter two more auditing commands before
you end the process? You just saw that needle float free. And you have just uttered the first of
six commands. You say, "All right, you – you've been trying to say something there for a
moment, what was that?"

"Well – oh, well, yeah, I feel pretty good! I feel quite remarkable and so forth. I had a
cognition a few minutes ago."

Well of course, to be a good fellow your immediate thought would be you should
say – to be social you should say at that point, "Well, what was the cognition?" No, no, no,
no, no, you don't – that's too much. You've gone too far. No, you don't give him the second
command, see? You don't say, "Oh, well, what was that cognition that you had?" Leave it
alone, man. The – this – that's it. You say, "Well, we seem to have attained where we're going
here. So thank you, thank you, that's it. I want you to go over and see the Examiner, and
he…"

"Why? What's happening? Did something happen?"

"Yes, something happened, now you go on over and see the Examiner and get your
declare. Goodbye!" Don't even let him stand around and talk about the session, you see?
You're a restimulator, the next little while. Because he's used to obeying your auditing com-
mand. Anything you say to him is liable to be… The Examiner who opens his mouth three-
eighths of an inch when he only has to open his mouth a quarter of an inch is a fool. If there's
something wrong with this pc, we should take a glimpse at the folder and see that the auditor
has said this and see that it's okay. And take a look at the pc and see if the indicators are in and move the pc over to declare, don't you see?

If there's something wrong with the folder, that sort of thing, send him over to Review. Let Review worry about it.

But one more command and you'd be cleaning a clean, man! Now, you've got to fish him out of the fact you're running something that isn't there any longer. Now, you see, it can turn straight over onto the negative side. You subtracted him from that class of aberration known as locks, let us say; he's out of it. Now, this I haven't been saying very hard about Release. They're gone. There isn't any more of that. See?

Now, you get – you get tripped up in this when I tell you, "Well, you pulled him out of the R6 bank." Yes, you've pulled out the lock disconnectors – the lock connectors to the R6 bank. But they're gone. He might have two or three more around that he'll kick into it sooner or later, but leave him alone, they'll blow sooner or later. You'll even find a Second Stage Release that has run through the first stage engram. See, the – and sometimes two or three days later they'll stumble along and you have to give them another – you – the best thing to do is to give them the other punch. But they weren't stopped on a free needle. They were stopped on the end phenomena, see? And somewhere in that series of commands, exactly following the end phenomena, the needle would have floated if it were carefully watched. You understand?

Now, if the needle floated, they've not only gotten rid of their engrams and secondaries, but they have also, you see, floated the needle. Do you follow? In other words, the two things took place. When those two things went together you haven't got any more worries about it. But if the auditor missed the free needle and went on, even on – I'm – only reason I'm talking about Power Processing, I'm not trying to teach you how to run Power Processes, I'm just telling you even at this level and so forth it would just be one more command after that float. Honest, you're liable to be auditing the pcs for days and days and days and wonder what in the name of common sense happened. Well, what happened, normally, was something floated the needle and it's been missed by both the auditor and the pc. And boy, you talk about finding a needle in a haystack from there on out. A needle in a haystack is nothing because you at least have a visible needle and a visible haystack.

For the pc, you're looking in the gone-ness for the what-went-ness. Through a mass of it-wasn't-there-anyway-ness afterwards. That's pretty hard to do. So these overruns and so forth are a very poor show.

Now, there would, theoretically, be precisely – be precisely, a sort of a – of an objective environment type of release. But it doesn't show up, normally. Once in a blue moon somebody will be running the CCHs and accidentally, when the person's feeling pretty good, put him on a meter and find out he's got a floating needle. But normally it's after somebody has run – I don't know of many of these "Look around the room" and the needle goes free. I don't know of any of those. So I just neglect this one as possible, because I – it – I think it would be a very freakish case and it would certainly be nothing with which you would classify something on.
The next one would be – he'd also run right away on Recall Processes, so why bother with it? Get your Recall Process, if you're running Recall Processes, which is locks of some kind or another. If that needle went free – or Communication Processes or Recall Processes, same thing – needle went free and floated, that's it. You just might as well wipe out all of the lower-grade processing from that point on. But you might have to go through Level 0 – and in most cases will – Level 0, Level I, Level II grade, Level III grade and Level IV grade, and finally they float off the launching pad on service facs. That you could normally count on making. Providing you didn't overrun something and providing you flattened the processes that you were running and providing the D of Ping was good and the auditing was good and – you know. Why, he would make it.

That's the way it was designed to go, and sure enough, we've had – we've had several go this way. See, just recently. But that's a First Stage Release. So you just say, loosely, any time this happens below this particular state why, it's a First Stage Release.

Well, what's a First Stage Released OT? People ask that question. Well, he not only went free needle, he went free body, too. Now, it's no more – no more complicated than that. How well can this fellow operate? Well, some of these guys can operate and some of them can't operate, and some of them, they – truth of the matter is, they utter about two postulates in the humanoid world and so forth and they're back in their head or fallen on their head or something of this sort. But if you don't acknowledge the fact they did go out and take a look around and they do feel that they can do this, if this is not acknowledged in any way, shape or form, why, you sort of ARC break the guy. So you've got to tell him – you've got to – you've got to classify him as he is. In other words, he's First Stage Released OT.

The fact that what – it's merely – it says that he went free from his body as well as free on the meter. Do you follow? It doesn't mean anything more significant than that. Now, your second – of course, that's enough! – Now, your second stage – your second stage, in actual facts, takes care of the secondaries and engrams. And you're knocking out the bank on secondaries and engrams and fortunately we have the technology which does this. But it is terribly powerful technology, it is very easy to dish a pc with an overrun. It's very delicate action. But the odd part of it is, is as you would suspect of a very powerful process, it runs in a great purity of delivery. In other words, this process has got to be delivered as itself, it can't be altered in any shape or form, because it is too close in to the truth, don't you see? And you start adding things to it, you – it just goes unworkable on you. And you wonder why the pc is in there forever. Well, somebody's doing something else. Or the pc's doing something else. Or he's not – he's not running with the very great purity of the process itself.

You could run, for instance, Level 0 pretty sloppy. And you aren't deep enough into the bank to affect anybody very hard. But if you would – ran a Power Process with no better than a Level 0 comm cycle – erk! Horrible! I mean, oof! There's too much there, don't you see? You're pushing the case around too fast and furious and you got to be right on the ball. But what are you getting rid of there? You're getting rid of the whole track secondaries and engrams, is actually what you're getting rid of.

Now, there's a Third Stage Rel... well, supposing that this Second Stage Release, while you were doing this you got the individual knock out the secondaries and engrams and so on
and pulled the pin on that section of the bank. What if he also went free of his body at that particular time? Great! But you just designate him – you just put "OT" on the end of the thing. In other words your designation of Second Stage Release and Second Stage Released OT. Second Stage Release simply means he went free on the meter. And a Second Stage Released OT means he also went free of the body. Got that?

And now you get to your Third Stage Release. Well, actually there's a process known as R6EW, which waits for him on the other side. And that's fine. And R6EW is not part of a Third Stage Release. It can still be run on a Third Stage Release. But the Third Stage Release leads him through the physical environment contact with the bank. Let me be that – that esoteric. And ends up with cutting off the R6EW top. Going just – going off the top of those floating end words. You can get him – you can get him off of what pins him into those end words. You can just separate that.

And those are the – it's a little series of four processes, they are very delicately run, they don't take long on a Second Stage Release. But therein lies the hooker. It doesn't take long, but it takes – it's a shorter time as it is done delicately and correctly. I suppose you could go in for this and make a lifetime profession out of it, if you missed all of the free floating needles. And you run each one of those processes to a floating needle. And there's four of them there. And you run them to a floating needle. Each one is – attains to a subject. One has to do with people and one has to do with where he's been and so forth. Do you see? And so you get that. Well, you run each one of those things and then the needle is really floaty, man.

Now of course, he can dive off the shade of this and he's got no protective coating now between him and the R6 bank. It stands there naked and raw. He's got the R6EW spans that are lying in amongst the GPMs and so forth, boy, there they are! And he can run those like a shot. But it's quite interesting. It's quite interesting, that R6EW can run to a floating needle. So there actually is another state of Release before you go to Clear.

There actually is a Fourth Stage Release. It's made on R6EW. Fourth Stage Release. Then your Fifth Stage Release, I suppose that it can occur running the GPMs. But I'm also very sure that I'm not going to give it much attention, because it's – my main worry in actually – in running GPMs, has been to hold on to the cans. Well, that's a worry. You got to get it all straight, and it's very complex and so forth, and it's very tricky. It's one of trickiest mental gymnastics anybody's ever asked – been asked to do, from a subjective viewpoint of it all. But the truth of the matter is, is you could run that up and there probably are ways you could short-circuit it. In other words, you could probably run it in such a way as to detach yourself from the body and so forth, and you'd still have some fragments of R6 bank. Well, the end product of that would be a lot of bunk. Because you wouldn't be able to sit there and hold on to your cans very well and get yourself in connection with what's missing on the R6 bank until all of a sudden you just cease to mock it up. And somewhere up the line you had missed a whole span of these things and they keyed in again.

Well, the hell with that racket. Let's do the job, don't you see? So your last fear on the line of when you're going to – what you would call, I suppose, Fifth Stage Release, which would then be Clear, would be: "Don't get sent before you're ready to went!" [laughs] You see
the dilemma? Because let me tell you, it's awful hard to sit on cloud nine and run an E-Meter which is way down there on that shiny planet. I can do it, but it takes some doing sometimes.

Now therefore, you have these various stages of Release and they all wind up in the state of Clear. But that was because we never before had the state of Clear. We didn't have this state in view. People would consider Clear this and argued about Clear, and there must have been something wrong with the word Clear or we wouldn't have argued about it to the degree that we argue about it for so many years. What we've meant all that time was Release.

Also people were arguing about what was a Release. About every few months you'd get a query, "What is a Release?" Well, it's – you have, then, a series of gradual key-outs. Now, at any given one of those key-outs the individual detaches from the remainder of his reactive bank. But there is the next section that you could attach him to and get him to tackle. And you better had, sooner or later, because life's going to connect it with him anyhow. Do you see? If you don't, life will.

So what you do is like slicing a large cheese. You're just cutting more of the cheese off. But the trouble is every time you cut a piece of the cheese off, the individual floats off and he hasn't got any more worries about cheese. And you have to whistle him up, if – and say, "Well if you don't – if you don't watch it, in the next few years or the next few hours or the next few minutes, another – this – this cheese bank is going to show up again, so let's take another slice of it off okay?"

And you have to bring him back and actually the first commands of the next stage – now remember it's got to be the next stage – the extra command of the old stage that he's finished it's – it would find nothing, don't you see? But this next stage, that first command, actually keys in the bank again. That keys in that next slice of cheese, see. And then you'll finally move it down and find there isn't any cheese.

And the individual says, "Is that what I've been worrying about all this time?"

"Yes, that's what you've been worrying about."

Those are the various states. I thought I had better give them to you rather graphically and try to explain to you exactly what we were doing. You get a false impression if you believe that the individual just sort of flies out of his bank and flies into it again. That's an oversimplification of what happens. Actually it's a certain strata of his bank disappears. It is, in actual fact, erased. It's more than just release. Because what proves it is auditing him on it any further is just about as kind as blowing his head off with a shotgun. It's the wrong thing to do!

So when a section of his bank or a type of his whole bank is gone, why, it's gone, and you've to grab another handful of the bank in order to get it. The odd part of it is you can rehabilitate these stages. You can rehabilitate these stages by getting key-ins and getting key-outs and so forth. But I – there is one word of warning about rehabilitation. You can rehabilitate it, but actually in rehabilitation you're already working on the next stage. Do you understand? And it has to be done very delicately, because rehabilitation processes are not designed to handle the next stage. So there's a little – there's really a limit by which you could rehabilitate one of these states.
The easiest way to rehabilitate a Clear is spot the thing, get rid of all the additive processing that was cleaning cleans, rehabilitate it to that degree, don't you see? Just get rid of that and then get him into the next stage going on up. And that is the best and most sensible way to handle it, rather than just keep a program going for "A rehabilitation a year keeps the bank away." You know? [laughter, laughs]

Well, I've given you some data on this I thought you could use in general and maybe give you a little clearer understanding of this thing of Release. I've been working with it hot and heavy here for many months and we've got lots of data on it now and it's very predictable, it's easy to do, and simultaneously with this all over the world right at this particular moment, why, there's a stampede on. Starting up here, there and so forth, amongst old groups of Scientologists and so forth. And even someday it'll hit the Dianeticists. Even someday, why, even though they're off the communication lines and so forth here and there, why, they'll suddenly start turning up and say, "You know, I think I was Clear."

I got a letter the other day from an old-time Dianeticist, said, "Hey! Hey, I've been released! I've been released! And you know who did it? You did!" And I was giving him some processing one night, and I released the guy, I made him First Stage Released OT. And I remember definitely somebody processed him the next day, and you never saw anybody cave in so hard or go so low.

So no wonder he was so happy. After all these years, why, he'd gotten rehabilitated. His total number of hours in processing was, I think, fifteen minutes. I wouldn't count on doing it that fast. But that was a record.

All right, and I hope the information will do you some good.

Thank you very much.
Thank you.

Well, you probably won't applaud so loud when you hear the kind of a lecture I'm about to give you. You know – mean.

This is what date?

Audience: September 21st, AD 15.

Twenty-first of September. Isn't that awfully significant in some way? What happened on the 21st of September? Fall or something? All right. I gave a lecture on it. I guess that's what's significant.

Well, you see, I have reformed. I have reformed, and I've decided to lecture to you once in a while. But, truth of the matter is, there are so many lectures on tapes, you see, it's rather like gilding it all and putting an unnecessary coat of paint on it and that sort of thing, you see?

But the truth of the matter is, what's happening at this particular moment is we're in the eagle's-eye-view position. Do you see? An eagle's-eye view. That is, we're way up at the top of the Gradation Chart looking back down the lines. Now, that's a very optimum position to be in, because you can see at once what's necessary and what's unnecessary. You can take a look at this and you can say, "Well, that stuff over there, that just went into a slight diversion, don't you see? And this material over here – well, that was not too important. That datum right there, though, boy, that's right straight through. That's important." Do you see? So that when you're taking an eagle's-eye view of the situation, you can select importances of data.

Now, the one thing that the poor bloke down at the bottom of the line, about – along about HAS – he's got an entirely different attitude. He's got an entirely different attitude. He's in a sea of data, and this sea of data is overwhelmingly and overpoweringly general. Every drop of water in the ocean has the same importance of every drop of water in the ocean. He's unable to differentiate between one drop and another. He's in this sad state, then, of drowning. Now, he isn't drowning – actually, he doesn't start his drowning in Scientology. He starts his drowning in life, and that is much more general than Scientology at its early stages. Scientol-
ogy at least tells you "Scientology is important." But life is liable to tell you "life is unimportant" and "life is important" almost in the same breath.

In other words, did you ever hear anybody say, "Well, life is unimportant?" Hm? "It doesn't matter," and so forth. And then they say, "Well, life is very important and earnest," you know, next breath. And then they say, "You should revere your parents. The trouble with you is – what's wrong with you is you've revered your parents." See? "Now, the trouble with you is, Mr. Jones, is sex. Here – haven't had enough." And when you get all through, you feel pretty groggy.

You start going through school, for instance (when you pick up a body, you get into kindergarten, and so forth): Every teacher tells you that every datum in every part of a subject is very important. And not only that, but each teacher tells you that only that subject is important really. And when you get all through, you've been told so much is important that you generally just go on a retreat from the whole thing.

And the hardest thing that a thetan has to do, and the most significant thing he can recover across the boards is his ability to evaluate importances – what's important and what isn't. Now, processing, the basic scheme of processing – what is it? The duplicative question. The examination of the mind for the apparent answer to the question. The knocking out, then, of this, that and the other thing until the individual can take a look at it and see before him some data that is important. Do you understand?

Now, you mustn't underestimate the value of the administration of processing as an entirely separate thing than what is processed. In Scientology we have developed the repetitive process which permits the individual to examine his mind and environment, and out of it select the unimportances and importances. Now, yes, additionally he knocks out of restimulation, he does a little erasure, he gets things out of his road, he clarifies his view, he can see better – oh yes, all of those things too. But remember that all he's basically doing is taking a look at the situation and finding out what is important and what isn't important, but to do that he has to find out what is and what isn't. That is even more fundamental.

So in all of the processing as you come up the line, you are following, in actual fact, a duplicative system of questioning, which is in itself, new, strange, and totally unique to Scientology, which makes the other things work. Other things work because of this. Do you see?

So it comes back, in its original stages, to the auditor. Now, yes, an individual can listen to a few tapes, and he can read a few bulletins and read a few books. Yes, he'll get a great clarification of various things, because all the time what's happening is is I'm presenting him with certain vistas of existence and conditions of existence, and he's examining them, and he's taking them in or knocking them out and handling it and reorienting himself, don't you see? Now, as he does this, he however is straightening up his own mind. And his real gain, when the chips are all the way down, largely depends upon the auditor. And the auditor is very, very important.

Now, the individual who is drowning in a sea of life receives a repetitive question from an auditor, and his statements on it are – the pc's statements on it are handled and asis, and those statements are then acknowledged by the auditor, making a full cycle of the
situation – only then can get up to a point of where he himself might, all by himself, confront his own mind.

He's got his own mind and life so mixed up that man has completely forgotten what a mind was all about and, in a large numb – the majority of cases, isn't even aware of the fact he has a mind. He thinks the mind is himself. He's made the same mistake that the religionist makes. And the religionist has a ball; he talks about, "You must save your soul." How you are going to save your soul, I'm not sure, see, because your soul happens to be you. But it would be too self-centered and egotistical for you to go out on an all-out crush of saving you, wouldn't it?

So we have to divide this out so that it is "save your soul." And where is your soul? "Well, my soul is over there," some theetie-weetie will tell you. "Yes, I am over there. Oh, I know I'm exteriorized now. I am over there by the radiator."

Now, how can an individual be over there by the radiator? Well, he can't be over there by the radiator, because if he were exteriorized he'd be "Oh, I'm over here by the radiator." Do you see that?

So what is all this now? It means that the importance – the big important gain… These all look important to you as you go up the line. They all look important to you. But the big ones – the big ones, actually, are not at the top; the big ones are getting started. And you get some of the most startling gains from some fellow who walks in off the street, and he starts to orient himself just by the fact that Scientology exists, that there is a body of knowledge that leads somewhere, that there is a road out. He starts orienting himself; he gets tremendous gain.

Now, under expert handling by an auditor using a duplicative question, he is able to look at life and his own mind and himself and his circumstances and so forth, and he's able to come up with additional gains. And we've got tremendous numbers of things that can happen to this individual on improvement, because it's a long ladder; it isn't a short ladder. Of course, we live in a society which rather demands of the individual that he takes a twenty-two-gauge needle and receives it in the gluteus maximus with just one shot, and at that moment goes, "Whee, I'm Clear!" You see? Society has originated, "All you've got to do is eat one bowl of Wheaties and you are Superman." Well, I'm afraid you have to work for it.

It isn't that Scientology is slow; it's that man has gone so far down. To dig him out at all is pretty heroic! And the first step in making him come up the line is, of course, making him aware of the fact that such a thing as Scientology exists. This alone will give him a start. But he actually makes his real first gains on becoming aware that there is a road out. Because he's sure there is none; he's heard that before. He's been told that all he had to do was eat a bowl of Wheaties and he was Superman, you see? And he ate bowls and bowls of Wheaties and he's not Superman.

So what's the – what's the dependency here? A basic dependency is upon your Course Supervisor – the person who is teaching Scientology. That's a basic dependency. There's a slightly prior dependency. That's the fellow who disseminates Scientology. He's doing something for the society all like that – just like that. Even though you get somebody up into arguing of "is it or is it not," he's better off than not being aware of it at all.
So you get the disseminator of Scientology, you get the teacher of Scientology – as in an introductory lecture, as in early classes, that sort of thing – these people are performing a tremendously important function. And it's a function that you, knowing the gains that can be achieved from auditing itself, are prone to overlook. If you present this acceptably and if you teach it so that it reaches in its early stages, you will find the people right in front of your face are experiencing remarkable recoveries up along the road.

These things you don't ordinarily see, because they're not on an E-Meter, they're not being categorized as an individual. But I'll give you an example: I took a rather raw crew of students one time and I did nothing but lecture to them – nothing but lecture to them at all – and got some of the best graph changes I have ever seen in an ACC. I didn't – they didn't receive any auditing for six weeks at all – no auditing at all. They just had lectures.

Now, some individual hears about Scientology, and having heard about it – that there is a road out – hope resurges. He thinks, "Well, maybe I'm not totally licked." Well, that is something like finding a straw in the middle of a vast ocean of nowhere. Something exists.

Now, the suppressive counters this, of course, by saying it doesn't exist, and it isn't, and it isn't any good, and it isn't that. Because all the suppressive is saying, "Boy, the last thing in the world I want to have happen to you is that you get any better. Because if you got any better, you would then get stronger. And I'm having a hard enough time murdering you now".

So therefore – therefore, the person who begins with the dissemination of it – he reaches people; he's giving them the straw in the very tumultuous ocean, something to grip on to. Then the fellow who tells them about it, who teaches them – why, he gets another upward movement. And then it comes into the hands of the auditor.

Now, in the auditor it's in very sure hands, because there's ways to audit and ways not to audit, and there's ways to do a good job on a pc and ways not to. And the big upsurging gains that the individual makes that can be marked on a chart, and so forth, are of course found in auditing sessions. But remember that if the disseminator and the teacher did not do their job first, that person never gets into the chair of the auditor. So the biggest mistake you can make is not to disseminate Scientology and to teach it in an unacceptable fashion. Those are big steps that can be very badly muffed.

Now, when you reach into a society at large and try to get some common denominators that you can get people to agree with and walk on forward with and so forth, you're talking to very confused and very distracted people, so that you actually could have many approaches and probably many answers as to how to do it. One of the soundest of those answers is speak to them about communication and teach them simply, one, that Scientology does exist, that he has got some friends somewhere in the world, that there is somebody interested in what happens to him. This is all part of the message that Scientology exists.

And then your next line that you throw to him, and so on, is that there is some value in being able to communicate. You teach him the datum, really, that if he could communicate to his environment better, he could handle it better. Now, that's dicey, because some fellows know that if you communicate you will be punished. Do you understand? So you're selling across that line that he's afraid to communicate and you tell him, "Well, it's all right," and he
eventually does get the idea that if he could just communicate a bit better, he could handle his life better.

Now, of course, that's – that is one of these horribly obvious truisms that you as a – as an auditor are so familiar with that you forget that this is a new, strange and startling datum to the man in the street: That if an alarm clock is rolling off the table, if you stopped the alarm clock from rolling off the table, it would be better than letting it drop on the floor. And therefore, when you reach over and stop the alarm clock from falling off the table, you are then handling your environment. But if you don't know enough to reach over and stop the alarm clock from falling off the table, you are not handling your environment. You get the idea?

Well, he agrees with this. "Of course," he says, "Well, that's silly!" And you say, "Well now, if you talk to your wife about the situation, it probably would straighten up better." Now, that's getting adventurous. And he looks that over. So you fix it up on the basis that he might... You say, "Well now, he might be – she might be rather upset at first, but it'd come out better in the long run." And nervously he tries to communicate to somebody and he has some wins, and he has some loses, and gradually it moves into his perimeter that there is some truth in this: that if you communicate in your environment, you can handle it better, and if you don't communicate at all, you don't handle it at all, and you just get worse.

Now, when the auditor moves in on it, and this fellow has never been able to pass a driving test in his life, and the auditor says, "Touch that car," and "Withdraw from that car," and so on, and he puts him through a familiarization of just a Touch Assist on a car, the fellow goes out and passes his driving test. Now, that's very convincing. That's very convincing. He finds out all kinds of wild things happen with a – such a basic and fundamental thing as a Touch Assist. He's now being brought up right, he can now see the gains and so forth.

So that your first wins on dissemination and teaching Scientology do not naturally have to follow a perfect line. They – it can be a pretty wobbly line and you can still get them along it.

But when it comes to that auditing line, that, if it is wobbly, will sink him. In other words, our first touchy operation that we've really got to know our business on is auditing. And that doesn't matter whether you're auditing a little child or you're auditing a dog or you're auditing somebody on very upstage processes. It doesn't matter; that auditing has got to be good. It's got to contain its auditing cycle. It's got to be addressed to the general condition of the person whom you're auditing. The questions have to be understood and acceptable to the person you are auditing. These conditions have got to be straight and you've got to be able to do a good job.

So that, although it's very important to move the person in toward auditing, remember that when you have moved him in toward auditing, then we are now in a position where technology is technology with an exclamation point. Up to that time it's debatable. It's debatable what is the best way to disseminate Scientology, because you're disseminating into such a confusion: Life as it exists. It's also debatable what's the best thing to lecture to people about Scientology. See, that's also debatable. Now, it's a little less debatable, but it's still debatable, and we can have lots of opinions on this. Do you see?
The only common denominator we have – well, we tell them about communication, and that sort of thing; people seem, in general, to be happy with this. But that's still subject to a number of questions. See? And we can debate on this and find out this system is better, that system is better, what you tell students when they first come into Scientology should be, and then we can have opinions on it, and we've had personal experiences. You get the idea.

But when we move it into tech we are no longer in a debatable sphere. That is such a highly sophisticated, highly developed technology, that it works only if it is right along the line – one, two, three, four. Do you see that? So we move out of the debatability of life into the precision of auditing. And auditing is very precise.

Now, when we say technology is out – although we might also include that we have Instructors who refuse to let students study bulletins or something like this – technology would be out, you see, if the Instructor was never in the classroom, and wouldn't give the students any bulletins and refused to teach them anything; we would say that it was out. But anybody would see that it was out. Do you understand? Anybody could see that fellow wasn't teaching Scientology and so forth. That – well, that's easy to see!

Ah, but auditing – the ability to observe auditing and tell whether or not it is good or bad – is far; far more precise. That is much harder to do. We can observe whether the teaching is right or wrong; that's easy. But to observe whether the auditing is right or wrong, that's much harder to do. In the first place, the auditor can make little, tiny mistakes – little microscopic mistakes – that sufficiently upset the preclear that the preclear then acts up and the casual observer would then say, "That is simply a difficult preclear." Do you follow? Where as a matter of fact the auditor goofed somewhere. You have to be a very, very good auditor to be able to perceive good and bad auditing.

Now, in the earlier days, particularly the newer students on course would be observed to miss, on TV demonstrations, the most horrible auditing goofs you ever heard of. You would ask them for an analysis of the session they have just seen. And the new student, being relatively unfamiliar with the subject of auditing, he wouldn't be able to find any. And quite uniformly he would say the best session there was the one that had the most goofs in it.

Here, I'll give you an example: He sees the auditor sitting there, and the pc is a little bit critical, and the auditor, with soothing syrup, sort of butters the pc down and the pc subsides, you see? And they say, "Wasn't that a wonderful job of auditing," and they're absolutely amazed when the Supervisor would say, "Well, that guy has flunked. Get him back to unit so – and – so and get him trained." And the new student says, "Get him back to unit so – but the guy – absolute genius! Look at the fellow, he just said, 'Now, now, that's all right,' or 'We'll take that up later'". You get the idea of this? They weren't educated enough in it to see whether it was goofed.

Now, frankly, almost any auditing is better than no auditing. So, therefore, what you're bargaining for is only about 60 or 70 percent of the gains of auditing. You'd get 30 or 40 percent of the gains of auditing, you see, if it was all goofed up. Just by duplicative question and somebody being interested in the fellow, you're going to get some gain, see? But how about getting real gains out of this?
Well, when we say "out-tech," – which is what this lecture concerns – when we say "out-tech," we don't mean, in actual fact, that some auditor isn't sitting there interestedly auditing the pc. We really don't mean that. It's not as corny as what's out-supervision, see, or out-instruction. We mean that they're just not getting that 60 percent of the gains. See, they're settling for 20, 30, 40 percent of the gain and letting it go at that. We mean tech is out because they are not getting out of auditing what they should be getting out of auditing, on a 100 percent basis. Do you follow?

This, in other words, is "the niceties of the thing are not with it." So that we can have an HGC which is auditing with mad enthusiasm. Pcs are coming in and they're being audited and they're being set a goal and all this. And this is all going on and we say, "Goodness, isn't that a busy HGC and the auditors are seldom late for auditing sessions and that sort of thing. And whenever pcs blow they get them right back to Ethics. Really snap and pop, see?" And we say, "Tech is out."

Somebody will say, "But, that's impossible!" Oh, no, that's not impossible at all. They're just only getting 20 or 30 percent of what they ought to be getting. Why? It is simply and entirely and completely a matter of: The fine points of auditing are missing and what really goes wrong with cases is not understood. They're sitting there giving the auditing command, yes, but making lots of goofs with it, yes!

Now, what does it take to make a good auditor? Now, a fellow who is a good auditor is so far above "somebody who can audit" that it would take an expert, in actual fact, to differentiate the difference. In other words, you'd have to be an awfully good auditor to watch the difference and watch what he is doing. You'd also have to be something of a Case Supervisor. You'd have to know these various phenomena. So a good auditor is what it takes to get good results.

What's a good auditor? Well, let's take up here the first part of this – the GAEs. Now you've heard of this GAE a long time and this has not, really, to any great degree been published. It's not really been published the way it could have been published. These are the five GAEs and there are only really five GAEs – really only five.

*Can't handle and read the E-Meter.* Gross auditing error – GAE. Auditor is sitting there. He's got a meter in front of him. He's got a pc connected to the meter. He's getting blowdowns. He's getting this and that, and he sees falls – falls occur, but he doesn't see these falls. Do you understand? He's getting tone arm action, but he never adjusts the tone arm so as to be able to record or note the action. You got the idea? Or when he brings his tone arm back to set, and so forth, he overcompensates so the pc is getting 435 divisions of TA for two-and-a-half hours. In other words, he just goofed up on this subject about the E-Meter. That needle moves, he doesn't see it; that tone arm moves, he doesn't see it. The needle doesn't move at all and he sees it move. This type of error – big errors. Now, it'd take a fellow who could run an E-Meter in order to detect whether or not somebody was running an E-Meter. Right?

Oh, a man can look terribly competent! You know? I see a lot of these medical instruments, and I see these fellows around in white coats and lead aprons and – although why they use a lead apron, I wouldn't know – but they – here are these fellows and they're all duded up, and they're reading meters and dials and turning them on and off. Honest, some of
their machines cover the wall. And when they're all finished reading that and looking so scientific, and so forth, they don't know anything about the person whatsoever. And an E-Meter could have found it out a long time earlier without any white coats and without a whole wall.

It doesn't, then, matter the \textit{pose} with which you handle an E-Meter or the \textit{attitude} with which you handle the E-Meter. The E-Meter just is – reads; do you see, it read? You see? It doesn't read; do you see that it doesn't read? I mean, it's elementary. When you adjust the tone arm, well, have you adjusted it or have you overadjusted it or not adjusted it, you know? That's it.

Now, let me assure you, every time you see an auditing session break down, one of these GAEs is going to be out. One of them is going to be out, man. And don't go looking for whether or not he was worried about his girl-friend while he was giving the session as the reason for giving a lousy session. It's never that. It's always a \textit{gross} auditing error. It's always a \textit{big} one.

So out-tech, when it comes down to research on out-tech, if you go around looking for specks of dust on the session, you're going to be wrong. What you want is a boulder. And there are only five boulders and one of these boulders is going to be in that session. I assure you, there's one place where the Case Supervisor very often takes his finger off of his number. He forgets these GAEs and he thinks it's something about the pc, or it's something about the process, or it's something about this and something about that. And if that Case Supervisor went right down to it and looked real hard, he would find in that session one of these GAEs.

Well, we've covered the meter one. Let's get the next one: \textit{Doesn't know and apply technical data}. Now, actually, the original writing of that was: \textit{Couldn't read and apply an HCOB}. That's a gross auditing error. That also comes to the Case Supervisor. The Case Supervisor says, "Give the person an assessment for any present time problem." And this auditor who has this as a gross auditing error (you'll find out it's rather consistent with this person) will simply say to the pc, "You got any problems?" And then write, "Assessment negative." Do you see?

So you gave one instruction and some other action resulted. Well, it's a gross auditing error not to be able to read and apply auditing directions or a bulletin or something. You should be able to read it and apply it. It isn't necessary that you have to \textit{do} that one, but don't do something else and think you've done that one. You see, that's the gross auditing error, really. The ability to read and apply data. That's all. Now, that actually moves into the zone of the next gross auditing error.

And the next gross auditing error is: \textit{Can't get or keep a pc in-session}. Boy, you will just be amazed how often that is the case. The pc is flying all around the place and saying, "Oh well, my – I'm terribly worried. You know, I have an appointment with Bill this afternoon, and I want to make sure that I've gone and – and – ."

And the auditor says, "Here's the next auditing question."

"Yeah, well, I hope I make the appointment with Bill all right."

The auditor says, "Well, here's the next question: Do birds rap?"
And the pc says, "Do birds rap? Do birds – I think – yeah well I don't know about that. But I do want to get out there in time to catch Bill when he drives by."

"Well, all right. Now, do birds rap?"

You see, that can be so gross that the auditor doesn't even see that the pc is totally out of session; pc isn't with it.

Well now, getting and keeping a pc in-session is a little body of technology in itself. Part of the communication formula is you've got to get somebody's attention. See? You've got to get somebody's attention before you can tell them something. Well, if the pc's attention is flying all over the MEST universe, how are you going to get his attention long enough to get in an auditing command?

So what you ought to do is try to find his – where his attention is going to. It actually doesn't matter much how you do it. Don't do it on an endless itsa. But where is this guy? What's he thinking about? Well, naturally there's only a few things that he could be thinking about. He could be ARC broken or he could have a present time problem or he's got a withhold or he's got an overt; I'll take those up in a minute. But that's – the auditor who can't get the pc in-session and keep the pc in-session, and so forth, is actually committing a gross auditing error. Because he's sitting there applying a process to a nobody in a nothing. He hasn't got any pc to audit.

Now, the ne plus ultra of this is, of course – is, of course, down in silliness. These are all pretty gross, but this can get that silly that he just didn't tell the pc to come to session, didn't have a pc in session and didn't himself appear.

And you'll be very surprised to find out how often that was the source of no gain for your pc. You'd just be amazed! I know you say, "Well, such errors as that can't possibly exist." The devil they can't, man.

We had somebody around here who was just having an awful time a few weeks ago, and the HCO Exec Sec and Area Sec and Ethics Officer were about to shoot this person down in flames for just raising the devil all over the place. An investigation – I heard about this, and I said, "You wait a minute." See? I know my auditing. I said, "There's something else here. You'd better look at that just a little bit further – little bit further" And they looked, and I'll be a son of a gun, that pc had been ended and wasn't audited for five consecutive days, although a top-priority pc.

Gross auditing error! Didn't audit the pc, much less just didn't get the pc in session. You follow me? So, at the bottom of all this stew and stir was, sure enough, one of these GAEs. Do you understand? Pc wasn't being audited. Of course, the pc was upset. Pc paid for auditing and wasn't getting audited. Obvious. Auditor never appeared in session; pc's name never appeared on the assignment board. You got the idea?

So a gross auditing error – don't you go looking for dust motes. Now, *Can't get the pc in-session and keep a pc in-session*. Well, that is very broadly stated and purposely so, because there are innumerable ways to keep a pc out of session, such as locking the door. Other ways is the pc comes right into session, sits right in the chair, is totally in-session, says, "I've got the answer to that. All night long I've had the answer to that next question, and I've got it,
and so forth, and I had a terrific cognition on it." And the auditor says, "Well, we'll have to go over the rudiments first." So part of this could be the PC is right there in-session, madly, you see, and the auditor carefully picks him up by the scruff of the neck and moves him right out. "We'll have to find out if there's some reason you can't go into session before we audit you."

Now, I'm making jokes here, but honestly, these things occur. And that's a gross auditing error, and that's gross auditing error number three.

All right. Now, gross auditing error number four is: *Can't complete an auditing cycle.* The auditor simply can't complete an auditing cycle. Now, it's quite remarkable that all this obsessive itsa you see will lay right here in this number four. You know, the PC just talked and talked and talked and talked and talked and talked and talked, and you couldn't get a question in sideways. What's wrong with that pc? Well, in life or in auditing sessions he has been prematurely acknowledged so often that he feels that he's never been acknowledged. Premature acknowledgment.

Fellow says – maybe to his mother, you know, habitually – "I've got a brilliant idea!" And his mother says, "That's very good!"

Or instead of acknowledging, they argue. "Are you sure you have answered the question I asked you? I asked you, 'Do birds fly?' and you said, 'When they had wings.' Now, are you sure that that is an answer to the question I asked you?" In other words, he stops the roll of the auditing cycle.

Well, believe me, there are literally hundreds of ways you can stop an auditing cycle from completing. One of the ways is not starting one. I've had this happen to me in the early days of auditing. The auditor simply sat there. I'd answered the auditing command, and the auditor simply sat there and said nothing. Literally, factually true – twenty minutes. I don't know to this day whether or not it was the auditor couldn't think of the next auditing command? Never started the cycle to finish. You got that? That was all.

Now, there'll be something wrong with that auditing cycle. And that's a gross auditing error to have something goofed up about your auditing cycle. Now, you can get your auditing cycle better and better and better, but there is a point when it is a passable auditing cycle. And that is, you ask the question, the PC answers it and you say, "Cheers," you know? If you can do that, why, from there on it really isn't a gross auditing error, it simply needs refinement and polish.

No, a gross auditing error, when you come down on it as number four gross auditing error (*Can't complete an auditing cycle*), it will be something utterly mad, if it's really getting in the road of the session. It will be completely gruesome. The auditor never asks the auditing question, just Qs-and-As with every answer.

The pc says, "Well, I think my mother." You know, answered the auditing question, "Who did you know?" You know?

"I think my mother"

"All right, what about your mother?"

"Oh? Well, she had bunions."
"What about bunions?"

Where's this session going? It's going to go over the hills and get lost completely. Started one auditing cycle, never finished it off, never did anything with it, never repeated it. You got it?

No, if you're ever case supervising and you suddenly detect that your pc – he could only get in one auditing question in a two-and-a-half-hour session. What's this? It must have been that he prematurely acknowledged it, or he must have told the pc not to say it, or the pc is stark staring crazy and has been audited by somebody who only prematurely acknowledged. There's something very wrong here. And you got to handle it, man; you got to handle it. Auditing sessions will not progress, because there's a gross auditing error present here of some kind or another. And somebody couldn't complete an auditing cycle, that's for sure, and the auditor for sure isn't handling the fact so that he can. Do you understand?

You could go, even on this basis, you find out – you say, "Do fish swim?" And to the – some actual process, you see. And the PC says, "Oh, well. Now, when you bring up something like that, that brings to mind a time when I was taking ichthyology in the University of Glasgow, and so forth. And I had a professor who had bugs in his skull, and we used to have to get flit guns in the middle of class and blow them in his ear".

An auditor who listens to that very long without spotting something is in error and he's unable to finish his auditing cycle, and who doesn't do anything about it, has not even become aware that he should finish an auditing cycle. Do you see? So it's a gross auditing error in just not knowing he should finish an auditing cycle. Do you follow?

You've seen pcs wander on and on and on. They're the very low-level guys in a staggery frame of mind out in life. You get ahold of them and you start asking repetitive questions.

Psychologists are the real howl. The psychologist is certain that an auditing question is disposed of by being answered once, and it's really crazy auditing those boys. They have given you the answer. You talk about a fixated subject; every question has one answer. Oh brother! So, of course, they never discovered repetitive auditing. All right, that's number four: Can't complete an auditing cycle.

Now, number five is: Can't complete a repetitive auditing cycle. And that's a GAE. Now, completely aside from an auditing cycle, how about a repetitive auditing cycle? And you'd be – just be amazed at the trouble we had in early days of getting somebody to at least say, "Do fish swim?" a second time. And by the time they had been duplicative for about three or four consecutive questions, with somebody holding a pistol on them, their head began to burst and they started falling apart at the seams. It was asking too much that they repeat the auditing question.

All sorts of shifts were gone to, and we eventually developed the TRs. And then we also developed Op Pro by Dup – Opening Procedure by Duplication – and that is simply calculated to cure somebody of this weird malady.

But you should hear somebody who had just been caught and is just brought in for training when he is first told to do a duplicative auditing command. He's supposed to ask this
question over and over and over. Many of them get away with it, but you'll find some bird who knows the proper thing to do is vary it.

"Do fish swim?" "Have you any idea about the swimming characteristics of fish?" See? "Do you mind if we discuss fish?" "Give me a synonym for fish." He thinks he's duplicating the auditing question.

Now, in other words, these are the five GAEs. These are the five GAEs which, if committed, will dish auditing squarely and tremendously, just like that. It'll be finished.

Now, when you're case supervising and you're looking over auditors, this is what you look over when you find that you're consistently having misses. You look over this one. You look over the five GAEs on the auditor. When you're – when you're case supervising, then you tell anybody responsible for training – this is what I'm trying to relay – that they had jolly well better look over the five gross auditing errors on that auditor, because that auditor isn't going along all right. The sessions weren't going along all right, so we suspect at once one of the five GAEs, if not two or three.

We don't inspect the antagonism of this girl for large ruddy-faced men. We don't examine the auditor's case, you see? We don't do this; we don't do that. All we do, and so on is when we say, "John Doakes has been having a very rough time auditing his last two or three pcs. I want you to go over this pc – this auditor and find out what the score is," now, the Training Officer should not then get the auditor audited. Training Officer should promptly and immediately check this guy out on five GAEs.

Can this guy read an E-Meter? You sometimes find out he's been bluffing for a long time. He's needed glasses for quite a while, but as a Scientologist he doesn't dare wear them. He can't even see the blur of the needle. You find weird things like this if you look for them. If you look for the gross error, you're going to handle the situation. But if you just look for little dust specks and dust motes, and so forth, you'll never get to it. And this is the list of the gross errors.

Then you want to know – you give him a little checkout – give him a little checkout. Say, "Well, let's see. Last week you were studying up on assessment, and so forth, and we went into assessment quite a little bit in the training classes. Here's a little examination on assessment." And the fellow can't pass any corner of it. What's the matter with him? Well, he doesn't know and apply his technical data.

So now – now we could maybe go into his case a little bit. We could say, "What would happen to you if you did apply some technical data? Is there anything wrong with applying straight data? Oh, well, there isn't. All right. Well, then, what word have you misunderstood in Scientology?" And that's the secret of it and we're away. So we'd straighten out his vocabulary. All of a sudden he could know and apply technical data. You understand? So we might go into it on a case basis, but only if we reached that point there: Doesn't know and apply technical data.

We'd find out if he could get and keep a pc in-session. We'd ask him such an offhand question as, "What's wrong with a pc who's critical of the auditor? Flunk!" The guy'd say, "Flunk? You didn't give me a chance to answer it." "Huh! Gave you a second and a half to
answer the question as you ought to know that in a millisecond! You ought to know that right now! That pc has got a withhold! And nothing else!" "Oh. Well, I thought there were several other reasons." "No! There aren't any other reasons." GAE. Do you see?

"Can't get and keep a pc in-session." Well, he doesn't know the various things which take a pc out of session or get a pc in-session. So how the devil could he get a pc in-session or keep him out of session if he didn't know what took pcs out of session or got them back into session? He couldn't do that at all, could he? So it'd be a gross auditing error on his part. He just doesn't know that – that little list of things, because it's not long.

And if he can't complete an auditing cycle, we can tell that fast enough. All we've got to do is set him up with some TRs and inspect how he does his TRs. And you'll find out about – maybe he can do 1, 2 and 3 or 0 all right, but when you get him to 4, every time he hits origin – no matter how you run origin, complicatedly or simply or anything of that sort – he will go appetite over tin cup on this whole basis. He can't handle the whole package all together. The pc says something unexpected, he's thrown. Now you know what will happen; this person will Q-and-A with the pc because he gets thrown all the time. The pc originates, "Gee, the wall is covered with spiders!" And the auditor says, "That's – I didn't get that far in my drills."

And then we can't complete an auditing cycle. Well, one of the ways to do that is just go into any kind of a repetitive line. Does the pc – does this auditor get nervous? Make him say, "Constantinople" fifty times. Does this make him nervous? You'll find it will, if he can't complete an auditing cycle. Oh, boy. He knows what happens if he's in the same place twice: you get shot. Life is dangerous.

So that – that handles – where we consider out-tech – that handles what can be wrong with the auditor, and that's all that can be wrong with an auditor. And if you go and imagine a bunch of other things can be wrong with an auditor, why, that's silly, and so forth. Because even if you get to such extremities as the auditor is unable to talk at all – not having any tongue or something – well, he can't complete an auditing cycle. Do you understand? He can't even start one. So you'd have to teach him how to audit by writing his commands down. Well, he can't write. All right, we'll fix him up; so, you teach him how to write.

There was somebody around the other day we were having to teach the English language so he could run R6. It was very interesting. I think he was unable to run it in his own native language because he'd forgotten it and he didn't know English well enough to run it in R6, and so forth. Well, the answer to that was very elementary: learn English.

So these things are resolvable. But if you don't know that those are the five gross auditing errors, then you can't resolve an auditor in his training or activities.

Now, let's go to the other side of this auditing team and let's take up a pc. And although this is much weightier and longer technology and, you know, is very difficult technology, the actual fact is there are only four things, really, that can be wrong with a pc, but we'll expand it to six, just to be happy about the thing. We cover these in the HCOB of 13 September 1965, out of which we're speaking, but I did not put in here the five gross auditing errors, but could well have done so. I gave some other data concerning the analysis of auditors. I give
you now very fundamental data on the analysis of an auditor – whether or not he can audit. He'll have one of his five gross auditing errors out.

Now, let's take up pc – which is very, very important – and let's find out what about the pc. Well, there can be two things wrong with a pc that immediately don't really come into the auditing session, but tell whether or not the pc should be audited. There are only two things; these are only two things: The PC is suppressive or the pc is a PTS. Now, in either case you're running into heavy weather.

Now, what is a suppressive? Well, a suppressive, actually, is somebody who doesn't get any case gain. And that in actual fact is taken up under the later one here of the continuing overt. He really doesn't get case gain because of continuing overt. Now, a suppressive is simply defined as – for your information, regardless – this is an auditor's viewpoint, now, not an Ethics Officer's viewpoint – but a suppressive is somebody who doesn't get any case gain.

And you say, "Well, isn't that nice." That lets you out. So you don't have to get a case gain on this fellow, and if you don't get a case gain on this fellow, you just get rid of the whole thing. You don't have to do a better technical job. You just say, "He's a suppressive! Ha-ha! That lets us out."

Well, the truth of the matter is, in my experience, it's very nearly impossible not to get a case gain. Very close to impossible not to get a case gain. You're only talking about 2½ percent of the pcs in actual fact. You'll have trouble with about 20 percent of the pcs because they're SPs or PTSes, but in actual fact only about 2½ percent of the total pcs running along the line… Now, this doesn't include the society as a whole, but it's certainly people who come into Scientology or around Scientology; you're only handling about 2½ percent of them that are suppressive.

Now, it doesn't mean that you didn't get a gain in the session, so therefore the fellow was suppressive. It means this fellow has been audited by this one and that and the other one, and people have really tried, and this person gets no case gain.

Well, it so happens that we're good enough today to be able to say "SP." What makes an SP an SP? From an auditor's standpoint, he is not even vaguely really interested in what makes an SP an SP. He's just interested in the fact that you shouldn't ought to audit one and devote and dedicate your life to auditing an SP who isn't going to get any case gain anyhow. What's going to happen to this fellow? Well, I'm afraid he should have thought about that before he started going so bad! So he's still populating the universe when the rest of us aren't.

What's this worry about the SP? Believe me, he never worries about you. Now, what about this boy? Well, actually, it's covered down here under six on the same list, as I've just said: He actually is committing continuing overt. Now, trying to get those continuing overt off and trying to get to the source of those continuing overt and trying to move forward with any kind of case gain on this person at all is very, very hard to do, but can be done. And the only process that will really handle a suppressive – the only series of processes are Power Processes – Second Stage Release. And that will handle one.

Now, occasionally a person can be overaudited so heavily and so far – particularly overaudited, let us say, on R6EW or in some very powerful process, and they've just been
audited up the spout – they, thereafter, won't get any case gain. You have to go back and pick them up where they should have been picked up and rehabilitate where they were overrun before they'll get a case gain. And the funny part of it is, is during that period the person's actions will be slightly suppressive. Quite interesting.

Don't confuse, then, somebody who's been overrun and isn't getting any case gain the last few days. What you want is – on a suppressive is – he's never gotten any case gain. It doesn't ever exist. He has never had any case gain. He has never had any TA. You get the idea? That's the category. And you'll find out that about 2½ percent of the people that are around on the streets, and so forth, will come under that category.

And he doesn't get a case gain because he continually commits little tiny overts. He is so engaged in fighting some imaginary battle in the past that he has no time to have any friends in the present. Everyone to him is an enemy and each individual is an "everyone." He is the master of generalities. The world itself around him is A=A=A. He's actually in a pretty mad spin. And in institutions there are only two types of people: suppressives and PTSes. There is nothing else in an institution, from top to bottom. Therefore, the poor old ruddy psychiatrist never gets a crack at anything but a suppressive or a PTS.

That is why consistently I have said to you, "Don't fool with the insane." I couldn't give you a pat explanation of why you shouldn't fool with the insane, but I told you, you just shouldn't. Well, that is why. The insane are composed – you see, well, there's an insane person; he's always fighting an imaginary enemy. That's one of the biggest definitions of insanity. Or he's retreating madly from an imaginary enemy.

And then in the insane asylum, you will find the PTSes that the SPs have put there. And you do anything for this person – this PTS – and of course, the SP will cave him in again within twenty – four hours of contact. You're going to see this inevitably. You couldn't win if you had to. Here, then, is this whole subject of insanity.

Now, what is a PTS? Number one: the pc – a case does not advance. Only six reasons a case does not advance – number one: the PC is suppressive. All right, we could go into that. We could get the person to Saint Hill, and so forth. But remember, we don't have any padded cells here. We can't accommodate certain types of personnel here. We have no hospital keepers, guards, all that sort of thing. You'd just be surprised how many people are walking around in that society out there who do need keepers and guards. It's quite interesting. There are a lot of them.

And because the psychiatrist isn't any better than he is, he really can't spot his really insane people. Oh, he spots them when they finally wind up in his lap. His recognition is up to recognizing an insane person when the insane person is dropped in his lap. But going out into the society and trying to analyze who is crazy and who isn't, the psychiatrist, being a PTS, professionally, himself, has not actually done anything more than just give you a big generality: "Everybody is crazy." You find Menninger was saying that: "Well, everybody is crazy, you know." It's quite interesting. "Some people are more crazy than others." He's not right at all. He's not right at all.
Every once in a while a guy gets a sensation like he's going to blow his top or going nuts. That's for sure. But if he recognizes it is a sensation, he isn't crazy, because a crazy person never finds out.

Now, a potential trouble source is simply, for an auditor's - from an auditor's viewpoint, somebody connected to a suppressive. That's all a potential trouble source is; don't look for any other trimmings. And from an auditor and a Case Supervisor's viewpoint, a PTS (potential trouble source) is always recognized as a "rollcoaster." Now rollcoaster - that unfortunately adds another tough term to Scientology technology and vocabulary. But a rollcoaster is simply just that: A person goes up and he goes down and he goes up and he goes down. And it's just a jolly-o, billy-o, around the corners. "Whoop up! Ah, whee! I feel fine! Oh, it's terrific – uah – oh, I feel awful."

Now, the psychiatrist specialized in a type of thing called "manic-depressive." Maybe you remember the term. That means the guy is up and the guy is down. Manic, up; depressive, down. The manic-depressive is one of the common and standard symptoms of insanity, but in some types of insanity-"types" of insanity – why, it's manifested mainly as just frozen fish, you know? The guy doesn't go up or down and that's the suppressive. You got it?

Psychiatrist has differentiated, then, between the manic-depressive and the paranoid. The paranoid doesn't change. He's already got his types, see? But this manic-depressive action is simply symptomatic of a person being next to an undetected suppressive. And I don't care whether he's insanely manic-depressive or sanely manic-depressive. He feels good today and bad tomorrow, don't you see? That's a rollcoaster.

Now, we particularly mean a rollcoaster is: he feels good after auditing and then feels bad. He leaves the session; he's terrific. His tone arm is down. Everything is going along fine. He's had some good cognitions. The somatic is gone. He walks out of that session, he comes back to the next session, and he's on the bottom. And you say, "Oh, I've must have done something wrong. Oh, the pc must have self-audited. Oh, figure – figure – figure – figure – figure," and until you really – till you really got your wits wrapped around this important datum, you're going on figuring yourself to death about this. That person is a PTS.

And then the next little bridge you're going to cover is: "Well, he couldn't be a PTS, because he didn't meet the suppressive person between sessions. Now, you've interjected that arbitrary, nobody else has. He didn't have to. All he had to think was, "What will Jonesy think about this?" Do you follow? Person didn't have to be present. You don't have to locate the physical presence. This suppressive is around in the environment, even though they're ten thousand miles away. Do you see?

A person rollcoastering – there's only one reason a person rollcoasters and that isn't because an auditor forgets to say, "End of session," with the proper happy lilt in his voice. That person felt good on Monday and on Tuesday came into session feeling bad.

Now, an auditor can pull a couple of accidental suppressive acts, like refuse to acknowledge the PC or ARC break and make the guy feel worse. We're not talking about that sort of thing. We're talking about just pure, outright rollcoaster. And there's only one thing wrong with a rollcoaster and that is he is a potential trouble source, meaning he is connected to a suppressive. I imagine Ethics Officers around the world are learning this and unlearning
it and relearning it and all of a sudden will eventually sort it out and say, "By God, that's true," you know? Because every once in a while, they can't find the SP; they can't find the suppressive.

Why do we say "potential trouble source?" Because they always commit trouble, and that's the big generality that you can make about a PTS. Sooner or later you're going to have trouble. Any time you got – we got one the other day – I – well, the other day. We've had one hanging around the fringes for about, I don't know, five, six months and he wasn't convinced there was any SP. And no SP had been really located on the case and confirmed, and so forth. And this person was going up to HASI London and getting audited and getting tremendous results and going down to the bottom the next week, and so on. And they finally found the suppressive and got the good indicators in and straightened the person out after this long period of time.

Actually, it was just really not really convincingly locating the SP in that person's life. And that's the only thing that masks it, because an SP speaks totally in generalities. An SP speaks, "Everybody thinks you are a heel." Like, "The community believes you are a dog." You see? "Men are always like that. All men are like that." This is this type of sweeping generality and the guys are not locatable in the environment. They just sort of butter themselves all over the environment. And you try to get a case to go spot a suppressive in its vicinity and, "No, no, no, no, no. I haven't got any. No, there's nobody there." This person has spoken in generalities to such a point that he doesn't exist anymore. He's just a generality himself – he's everybody!

So in Scientology these days, we know this well enough, and somebody who sails in, and so forth, and says, "Well, everybody thinks we advertise too much..." The HCO Sec will inevitably say, "What is everybody's name?" or "Who is everybody?" And the person will think for a moment and think for a moment, "Well, his name is Sweeney." And good indicators will come in.

Now, if you audit this person, you're just setting this person up. And if you audit this person to a tremendously successful gain, you may get him killed. I say that advisedly, you know – just shot down in his tracks.

Let's say you really pulled the technology out, and boy, you really did a bang-up job of auditing; man, you really cleaned up this case and this case was just sailing. (Of course, you couldn't get the case up to Clear, which is where you'd have had to take the case.) And you sent the case home at the end of the intensive, and the person is really walking on air. One of two things will happen. This has happened: the SP has committed suicide. Bang! Just like that. Or the SP just walks out in the kitchen and pours the arsenic into the coffee, because they can't have anybody better. They're having enough trouble killing them while they're sick. Do you see that?

You really – you really can walk a PTS right straight into it, man. Maybe it's not that dramatic, but it will be that gruesome. So you really shouldn't audit an SP or a PTS. Actually, here at Saint Hill, we really shouldn't take on SPs. We can do so because we're insouciant. That's a word you can look up afterwards.
But there we are. There's the two things, now. And one of these days you will suddenly come up with a tremendously important datum, exclamation point, that "By God, Ron's right: A person rolls coasters only because he's connected to a suppressive person and you jolly well better not audit them." And most of the trouble we've had has come from PTSes – actually not from SPs, but PTSes.

SPs have incited it all, but the trouble has been made by the PTS. Quite fascinating. But see, the trouble is made by the PTS becoming better, and then the SP gets desperate and makes all kinds of trouble. Do you get the idea? So the source of the trouble is our auditing a PTS. We wouldn't get any trouble auditing the SP because he wouldn't go anywhere anyhow. All he'd do is snarl, and so forth, and make an auditor a bit unhappy and miserable, but he won't do anything like when you audit a PTS.

And it's very discouraging to an auditor. This guy was fine on Monday, collapses on Friday. The auditor is absolutely certain he has done something wrong. He hasn't done anything wrong except audit a PTS. He audited a potential trouble source and didn't recognize it.

There was another, earlier roll coaster – and this is one of the things a Case Supervisor on pcs has to be very alert to – there was an earlier roll coaster and they explained it all away. "Oh, it was because he was up too late that night." Yes, I know. The earlier roll coaster that was last week on Thursday when he was feeling so good and came back to the session on Friday and was feeling so bad – they ran that down and that turned out to be "having been up too late Thursday night." They ignore that and there the guy rolls coasters again, and so forth, and people are wondering, "What on Earth is going on here?" Well, they just weren't industrious enough locating the SP of last week, see? What was it? Who is it? Where is it? That's what you want to locate and when you've got that located – you go right on hunting until you do locate it, too. Because when you do locate the SP, why, the good indicators will all come in on the pc. But if the pc has accepted the fact that you have located the SP and the good indicators aren't in, you haven't found the SP. That's the little technology back of that that's been quite interesting. If you find the right SP, you'll always get the good indicators in. If you don't find the right suppressive person to which the PTS is connected, you will not get the good indicators in. And it's as obvious as all that.

That's another one of these simple – elementary things. When you push down on the accelerator the engine will run faster, and when you take your foot off the accelerator the engine will run slower. You regulate the engine with the accelerator. Somebody goes out and they say, "I'm very sure you regulate the engine with the brake." Well, they gets a little tiny success of regulating it with the brake. They try going sixty miles an hour and putting on the brake while leaving the car in gear and it slows down the engine, so they say, "See?" Burns the engine up, but then that doesn't much – burns the brakes up too. Long as they – as long as they don't know this very interesting little datum then they keep coming a cropper.

See, they get in there – somebody operates without a meter, or they can't run a meter, or something like this. And they try to – they found this person rolls coastered, and then they try to get on this person what person it was, and then they can't find one. Or they find one and they say, "Well, it's your Aunt Mamie." And the person says, "Oh, all right, Aunt Mamie. I'll disconnect from her. All right." No, no, no, no. No, that PTS is not PTS because of Aunt Ma-
mie. *Nuh – uh.* Good indicators didn't come in; your meter didn't blow up. Do you follow? It's very positive.

I mean it's one of these things – I'm actually trying to describe to you something. But all the points I'm describing to you in this particular lecture are the types of points you make with searchlights. See? Searchlights in a perfectly black night. I mean, they're of that value and importance. This isn't just a bunch of tiny data that is all buried with the dust motes, you see? These are the basic regulating data, is what I'm talking to you about, all on the basis of getting tech in.

So those are the first two. You could consider them technical, but actually to a large degree they are personal. And when we get right down to it, then, there are four – the remainder of the six. There are four things, then, that can be wrong with a case and *that's all.* That – we've finished the whole door, we've got it all built right there at that point, and it opens, and the corridor is long beyond it. That's the lot.

And if you're going around worrying about, "Somebody isn't being audited, because I haven't got the right process, because if I just assess something or other with my left hand instead of my right hand… And Krishnamurti said that time was the devourer of all men. Maybe he has an eating fantasy that's mixed up with sex." You're just talking in a bunch of balderdash, because there aren't very many reasons why cases don't get along well. First is the SP; the second, the guy is a PTS. All right, if you've gotten rid of those two and he's neither of those two, then, one of these remaining *will* be it – not might be it; *will* be it.

And they are: ARC broken – pc is ARC broken. Pc has got a present time problem of long duration; that comes under categories like hidden standards and all that sort of thing. They're just present time problems of long duration. And number five: The pc's got a withhold or a misunderstood word, which is a withhold of understanding; he's withholding himself from it, or reverse. And number six: continuing overt's which he then withholds and that makes a suppressive. And there aren't any more things which drive tech out than that, because a Case Supervisor who doesn't look at those things, then can't get any process to work from there on down!

Now, what are the processes? Processes are things that work if these six things aren't there. Got it? So when you say, "Tech is out in a certain area," you are saying they are trying to make processes work while paying no attention to the five gross auditing errors in auditors; and no attention, or minimum attention, to the six things that prevent a case from advancing. You follow that?

So if you ignore these six things and try to go on auditing cases, no process under the sun, moon and stars is going to work. But the funny part of it is, if these six cases are okay, practically any process under the sun, moon and stars will work, which is quite fascinating. The only reason a process doesn't work is because it has *worked* and is now being madly *overrun.* You got it?

Processes don't work beyond the point when they're finished. You can't lift any more concrete off the sidewalk than there is concrete in the sidewalk, and you try to lift more and people are going to get upset.
Now therefore, if anything goes wrong with technology from the Case Supervisor's viewpoint, on behalf of the auditor, it is covered in these five gross auditing errors. Those satisfied, if a case does not advance and so forth, then the case isn't advancing because of these six things: Pc is suppressive; Pc is PTS; pc is ARC broken; pc has a present time problem of long duration; pc has a withhold or a misunderstood word; and continuing overts are hidden from view.

Now honest, that's all. I'm talking now about an eagle's-eye view of the track and the mind and human beings. And when you look back over it all on the vast oceans of data that we could be covering here, and so forth, you find out that if tech is out, then it's just covered in that list. Either one or more of the five gross auditing errors are present, or one of these six things is wrong with the pc. That's all! There isn't whether he paid his dues to the "I Will Arise" Burial Society. It isn't because he hasn't paid for his E-Meter.

So that's the total lump sum of important barriers that stop progress in auditing. And believe me, I have been at this now for about, actually, eighteen years, and I can tell you there are no data that lie outside these data. There are no other data. And I tell you that forcefully, just mainly because I don't want you to go on stumbling around thinking that you're going to find one, because you're cleaning a clean; you're looking for something else that isn't there.

Now, therefore, analysis of out-tech would bring about getting tech in. Well, how would you get tech in? Well, you'd get tech in by fixing it up so these five gross auditing errors weren't being made, and so these six things, when – one of these six things, when wrong with a case, would be promptly detected and handled. And tech would then be in; tech would be in well. And you'd go on and audit standard processes and all goes along like a well – oiled dream. There's nothing worrisome or upsetting. You have minimum upsets along the line then. When all of a sudden something shows up over the horizon... Some auditor is on his second pc and hasn't made very fast gains on the first pc, and he didn't make very – he isn't making it very good. And he all of a sudden is having a big problem and suddenly comes up and wants to suddenly run "Give me that hand" in the middle of a Power Process.

No, don't for God's sakes Q-and-A with that at all! Don't Q-and-A with that at all! Just go back to stable data, because you're going to be led all over the pasture! One of these five things is wrong with the auditor or one of these six things is wrong with the pc.

I don't care what the auditor said. If it's some departure from what you know to be standard, or it's a suggestion that is over the hills and far away that doesn't have very much to do with the price of fish, or they're demanding that we change processes and run six of them in one session, or there's something peculiar has suddenly been presented to view; we don't bother to find out what's been presented to view. We just abandon all of that body of data, and we look for one of the five gross auditing errors in the auditor and one of the six things that can be wrong with a pc. And we just get those things looked for, right now!

All of a sudden, we find out all this time this auditor thought that one process was another process, and it was – in actual fact had never run the first process they were supposed to run on the pc, but had run an entirely different process. You would get absolutely fascinated.

The GAE, here, is indicated by the fact that the auditor also can't do a checkout on current or modern processes – second of the GAEs is wrong. So you go and look at what
they–you know, compare these things. Have they done that on this case too? Ah, well, yeah, yeah. They were supposed to run Process 1, 2, 3 and 4. They didn't; they ran Process 9, 12 and 2. And then ran them with the wrong wording. Do you see?

And as far as the pc is concerned, why isn't this pc making advances? Aw, there's no reason to stand around and try to blow your brains out and worry and lie awake all night saying, "Let's see, could there be some confusion with the collusion?" There's no sense in lying around and lying awake on the thing. Relax! You got a pc you're worried about, roll up your sleeves and say, "This pc has got one of six things wrong at this minute. One of these six things is wrong."

Now, the funny, funny, funny part of it is, you say, "Oh well, yes, you can overrun processes. That could also be wrong with the pc." No, that's one hell of a problem to the pc, and it either will wind up as a problem or an ARC break.

I set up this exact run to be run a little while ago by the Qual Sec on a test case – not a test case particularly – a case we wanted to handle. (And I already knew this bird.) But I set it up, and sure enough he got case overrun showing up as a little tiny tick which, when he developed it, developed into a blowdown. The process had been overrun and had previously not been detected. A case state had been attained which had never been acknowledged. It showed up on a problem. So there isn't even overrun.

Ah, you're worried about what's wrong with this case? Well, just have a good night's sleep and in the next session you just hammer at it. Has this – just ask yourself (look over this case's folders and so forth), "Has this case ever got a case gain? Has this case ever roolly coastered? Is this person ARC broken? Does this person have a chronic present time problem?" Which would include hidden standards and overrun processes and unacknowledged this and that. "Is this person running along here with a withhold or something misunderstood that they're not telling us is misunderstood and pretending they understand? Is something wrong here in the withhold department? Or is this person every time they leave the auditing session casually go out and phone the FDA to give them some more data on us? Which is it?"

Well now, if GAE number one, Can't handle and read a meter... If an auditor can handle and read an auditing meter, I assure you, you can assess those things, and you're going to find the right one every time. There isn't anything else that can be wrong with a case. And then if you handled the five things that can be wrong with an auditor and if you handle the six things that can be wrong with a pc, then you won't ever have to worry about tech being out, because it will be in. And when it starts out it will go straight back in again.

But you talk about the sea of data–tremendous, tremendous sea of data where we could have anything important anywhere – I pity you, drowning amongst the data of life. "Is it really my father that drove me mad or was it my Uncle Jim? Or on the other hand, was it the teacher in the seventh grade? Somebody drove me mad. I wonder who it was?"

And you're absolutely certain that if you just solve that point and find out who it was that drove you mad, then you will be totally sane forevermore. Well, in the first place, you couldn't be totally mad if you were trying to find out what drove you totally mad, because the definition of a madman is, he's the last one to know. He thinks he's totally right.
And you think, "If I just dig up that data, that's what Clear means. All I have to do is
dig up that one datum and I'll be there," and eventually get run on a process and you find out
it wasn't any of those people; it wasn't any of those people. Actually, you did have a playmate
who was rather mean to you and suppressive, and you locate him, and you'll feel fine, and
you're shut of that problem, and you have made an advance. But you have made an advance
of one little chip in a vast ocean.

And when you look at all of the multitudinous data of your own past, all the confusing
data of your own present and add to that a sea of data that you're given in Scientology, you
say, "How can I possibly ever pilot my way through all this? Look at all these bulletins. Look
at all these tapes. And all these things seem to be so important, and everything seems to be so
important, and nothing, and that, and so forth. And all I'm doing is sitting here trying to find
out who was mean to me when I was five."

Well, just remember the saving grace is, one, that people are making it routinely; and
as you get on up the line, the selection of importances becomes more and more an ability that
is easily practiced. In other words, you could be more and more capable of selecting import-
ances; given sixteen data you can select the one that is important out of the sixteen. And then
you find out that you're really getting somewhere.

And when I tell you, looking over all the auditing of the past, that there's just those
couple of things that can be wrong with an auditor, and it's just those six things that can be wrong
with a pc; all you've got to find out is how to apply and remedy those five, and how you've
got to apply and straighten out those six. Do you understand?

And frankly, there isn't an interminable body of data behind them. There are only a
couple of data behind each one of those. And when we get down to it, that is what keeps the cases
rolling; that's what makes them come on up the line in auditing. You generally look on it and
say, "It's processes that do." Oh yes, that's perfectly true. But if the case is going, why, the
process will work. But if the case isn't going and the process isn't working, why, then it isn't
the process that isn't working, you understand? It's one of these five things. One of the five is
wrong with you or one of the six is wrong with the pc. You have to decide which it is and put
it right, and all of a sudden it'll all run like a bomb.

That should give you a terrific orientation. Furthermore, it should give anybody who is
in charge of any activity or getting anything done, a terrifically keen insight into the situation,
because the whole environment is trying to feed him different data than these. And these are
the data, and the only data he can afford to look at. And when he pays attention to those, all
works! When he ceases to pay attention to those, the whole world becomes a complete sea of
confusion again.

All right. Well, I hope that'll help you out. I hope that it narrows the field down. I
wanted to talk to you today just to give you a fast reorientation on the subject of what you're
looking at. Yes, processes are important. Yes, all the things you're studying are important. Yes,
you have definitely got to know how to run a process and what are the manifestations and
phenomena of the process. But when it comes right down to it, it isn't because you're running
a process badly, in actual fact, that you're not getting case gains on the pc, it's because either
you are practicing one of the five gross auditing errors undetectedly or the pc you're auditing
falls into one of the six which I have listed. It isn't that you're doing the process badly. So if you think that just by constant shift of process and constant changing everything around and constantly trying to invent Scientology all over again in the middle of a session you're suddenly going to get a gain on a pc who isn't gaining, you're going to have a lose every time.

What it takes is standard processing with all five gross auditing errors remedied in the auditor and none of those six things present in the pc. And if you've got that all straight, then it really doesn't matter, you'll get gains even if you run "Do birds fly?" Do you follow?

And you'll find out, if you pay attention to this and learn how to handle these as a set of tools, that auditing – application of – becomes very, very simple indeed. And when you're very quick off the mark with these six things – particularly the last four are the ones that you really work on – and if you're very quick off the mark with those, and you can spot them, and you can handle them, and you can get rid of ARC breaks, PTPs and withholds, misunderstands, overts (you know, that little category of things; you can handle those brrrrtt! why, there isn't a pc in the world ever gets away with a thing as far as you're concerned. You've got it all taped, all nailed. Sessions just go bzzoom! onward and upward, because you're not auditing a pc who is having a bad time, you're auditing a pc who is doing all right.

And I invite you to partake deeply of this wisdom, because you will be very, very much happier as an auditor thereby, and a Case Supervisor, too.

Thank you very much.
The whole situation boils down to this, is there are three data which I have not been able to teach orgs or Tech or anybody else. There are three data. They don't know these data as key data. These data don't have any either/or's or qualifications or "there are other cases," do you see? There are three data that are just smashers as far as cases, and so forth, are concerned. Our concern is with one of these, which is the second one. But what I'm going to – giving you your briefing – that I'll tell you what these three data are that we just can't really seem to get across – that I don't have any luck getting across at all.

So the reason why I'm talking to you is, in Review then, you will run into these three data all the time. Because they won't have gotten across in Tech. The Tech Division won't have gotten it across or the rest of the org or Supervisors won't have gotten them, don't you see? Or Ethics doesn't get them, don't you see? And they don't get these three data! See?

And the first one is that a high TA equals overrun and that there isn't any other reason for a high TA. There aren't 192 different reasons for a high TA. There's just one: it's overrun. And that's the only, the only reason you have a high TA. From a Review standpoint, then, you have to find out what's overrun. Do you see? From a Review standpoint.

All right. Covering this, then, a high TA always equals overrun and equals nothing else and is the problem of Review to find out how and what was overrun. The Review Auditor's problem is to find out what and how. All right. Therefore, raw meat walks in off the street and he's got a TA at 5. And he's never been audited and he has never been anywhere near Buddhism, mysticism, anything else. Well, you've got your work cut out. Do you see?

I'll plead with you. This isn't any reason to throw away the datum. Do you follow? Because the easy way out is you say, "Well, we can't find out what's overrun, so let's just throw away the datum." Well now, that's what the HGC auditor did; that's what the field auditor did; that is what Ethics did; and that is what the Course Supervisor did. They all threw away the datum. And they're looking now for mysterious reasons why the TA is high. And therefore, in view of the fact that they're all looking for it, as a Review Auditor, for heaven's sake, don't you do it, too! Do you see? Because then we can't repair the case and nothing patches up.

Now, you're going to find some interesting things when you get into this. You'll see there's a TA sitting at 5. All right, it's an overrun. You're liable to get into some case and find
out the fellow went into Christianity and had a big datum in Christianity and went release when he was six years old in Sunday school. And then he kept on studying religion. Do you follow? It's overrun. You got it?

Now, this bird took up a health course and he walked out there and he just was walking five miles every morning and he was getting up and he was doing sitting-up exercises and he was... terrific. He'd been an invalid and he used this therapy and there he is, boy! And he gets into terrible shape. And his TA is stuck at 5 and you want to figure out why it's an overrun. Well, he just did one too many push-ups. Do you follow? He didn't knock off the regimen when he was winning. You get the idea?

Ordinarily, I would say there was some kind of treatment or wisdom back of it which he then went beyond release. Because don't think we're so special that just because somebody is in Scientology then life all behaves differently. No, we in Scientology, and so forth, progress because we parallel what life is doing and we know more about it than people out in life, don't you see? But that doesn't mean the phenomena of Scientology doesn't happen elsewhere. It does, all the time. It isn't specialized to Scientology.

Now, I should imagine, these poor blokes in practically every therapy from Aesculapian, the witch doctor, the juju, anybody under the sun, has run across the overrun-release phenomena. Can you grab that as a datum? So we look on these things as all failed technologies. And we don't know what the original technology was – let me point that out to you – because it got alter-ised and they all went the route that we almost went. And I'll call to your attention that we almost went the route. We almost did.

Fifteen years we were overrunning a state of Keyed-Out Clear. We called it originally Clear, then we called it Keyed-Out Clear, and now we're calling it Release, because there was such a thing as a Clear. And the funny part of it is all the original works talk about a pure Clear. If you want to listen to the congress of 19 – I think it was 57, 58, and so forth – it's talking about a pure Clear that we're making today. Do you see? But there was this intermediate stage and people would hit this, and that was the stage I was hitting with people as early as 1947, you see? And it made a Release, and it made an apparency of this other state. So the state had its harmonics, don't you see?

So the state is approached gradually. A Clear is somebody who hasn't got a bank. If you release somebody of the bank then he behaves like somebody who doesn't have a bank. Do you follow? But the only way you could guarantee his total behavior that way forever would be to have no bank at all. And then there wouldn't be any bank to get away from and that's, of course, clearing. Do you follow that?

So therefore, nobody else has made one of these things; don't worry about that. Clear: that's highly specialized as far as we're concerned. But these states of release is what you're handling in Review, and they're the ones that are going to give you trouble.

And the key datum of the whole thing is that a high TA equals an overrun. It isn't necessarily what was being run at the time the TA went high. And there you also come a cropper. The guy is running Pr Pr 5, and the TA suddenly flies up and sticks at 5 and the auditor can't do anything. Well, bend your wits around to the complication that you may have restimulated an overrun Communication Release. Do you follow? And the guy drops straight back into the
lockup in the bank which he had – which was an overrun Communication Release. Do you follow?

He might have gone back into that and Existence might not be flat. Isn't that interesting? The likelihood of this occurring is very slight, but it's still a possibility, do you see, that the TA is not high on what is currently being run. The TA might be high on a rudiments question.

Now, if – let's say the guy was a Problems Release, he'd been a Problems Release for many, many years, and somebody asked him a problems question in the rudiments. All of a sudden his TA goes up and sticks. And then they go on running the Power Process and the TA is up and stuck and nothing is moving with the case and then this looks like an awful bungle. So now what you have to find out is what was overrun. You see?

So your question is always asking, on this first item, "What was overrun?"

And believe me, if the auditor in the HGC did not solve it or the field auditor didn't solve it, and so forth, then it is always true that what they were repairing is not what was wrong.

If you try to fix the loudspeaker of a radio set when it is the mains plug that's broken (just to get corny about it), you can't, of course, fix the radio set. So if somebody kept on working on this and working on this and it wasn't solving it, then realize, please, that that wasn't what was wrong. So they've got the wrong overrun if they're trying to get a TA down – invariably and inevitably.

So if you look back through the person's folder and you find out they've been working on rehabilitation of former release and the TA was high and no TA, and they've been working on the rehabilitation of former release and the TA is high and so forth, don't discard the datum that a high TA equals overrun. The guy is rehabilitating the wrong release. It's just, they've never spotted the right release.

Now, we had one case here, actually, that for about five months was driving us all around the bend. And we were trying to rehabilitate former release on this person. We tried to rehabilitate him in 1950, 1952, 1958. We're trying to rehabilitate, time after time, a former release – thetan exterior. We worked and worked and worked on these things, don't you see? Having an awful time.

It happened in 1965. There was the auditor, right there. And that case did not resolve, because in the rehabilitation of the former release they had the wrong release they were trying to rehabilitate. And it was highly improbable that the case had had former releases of the states and at the times they were trying to rehabilitate them. Do you follow?

And the case had sat there and given a tremendous lot of end words to her auditor. I've forgotten exactly when it was; it was less than a year ago, wasn't it?

*Male voice: Yeah.*

And had given a whole bunch of end words and had gone Fourth Stage Release.

*Male voice: The first PC in the Saint Hill HGC.*
First pc in the Saint Hill HGC and gone Fourth Stage Release. Do you see the gag here?

Now, the first tendency is to throw away the datum that high TA equals overrun. Because, you see, you're trying to find the overrun and you don't find the overrun, so you throw the datum away and say the TA must be high from something else, do you follow me? You just haven't located the right overrun.

You see, the TA could be held up with half a dozen different overruns, but it would be held up with the one it's held up with. It wouldn't be held up with one of the others that could have held it up. Do you understand?

It is the one that it is. So all you've got to do – all you got to do – is find the right overrun and the TA will come down and the case will go release again. And the rehabilitation technique which you've got will do it, providing you have the right overrun.

Now, for instance, I rehabilitated what we were then calling a First Stage Release. I rehabilitated this release. I got a momentary floating needle. That was good enough for me; I wasn't going to push it any further. And I just came off of it right like that. But I noticed that when I came off of it the needle stopped floating. Well, I didn't want to push my luck. I didn't push my luck, because in the first place this case was going to be further audited, you see, on higher grades. So I just had the case declared and got away from it. And I started pushing the case along some other line of Power Processing and I didn't get anyplace.

And quite incidentally and almost by accident, I noted the fact that the case had been a Fourth Stage Release, and found it, and down came the TA and so forth. And the case was very, very ARC broken about Solo auditing on end words, too. Very ARC broken about the whole thing. Couldn't find any more end words that would read. She got very upset. I mean, the bank blew, and that was it. As far as she was concerned she was out of it – Release – she couldn't go back into it again, and so forth. Actually, the TA had come down and floated while she was looking through dictionaries. And I dug it all back up and refloated it and that was that. Do you follow me?

So your job in Review is definitely: if you got a high TA, don't come off of the concept a high TA equals an overrun. You just find out the right "when" and the right "what", and down it'll come – crash! And every time we've had trouble is when we haven't put this into action. Do you understand?

*Male voice:* Very well.

You got it?

*Audience:* Yes.

So that's not a datum, then, that you run away from. There's a high TA; that's an overrun. Where is the overrun? What was overrun? And the sky is the limit; it could be anything. Do you follow? You can get wilder than scat if you've got somebody that hasn't been audited very much and he's got a high TA. You're *wha-a-aw!* The sky's the limit. What was he doing that released him? That's the question. Something. You'll find out what it is.
Now, I haven't found a whole track former release, overrun, stuck TA. I'll just give you that as a little beneficial datum. I haven't found one. Now, you notice I haven't told you it doesn't exist.

No, no, I haven't found somebody that because he was a member of the Planet Builders eight – you get the idea – eight trillion years ago – he obviously was a Release then – I haven't found his TA stuck up because of that whole track release. Do you understand? I don't say it can't exist, but I do say I haven't found it. I've found them all in this lifetime so far. Got it?

*Male voice: Thank you for that.*

All right. You got that one real good? Is there anything misunderstood about it? Any question about it? Hm?

*Audience: No.*

Nope?

*Female voice: Yeah, I have a question.*

Yes?

*Female voice: That exact thing happened with me this morning.*

Well, you overran something, but it probably wasn't what you were running.

*Female voice: No.*

Do you follow?

*Female voice: Yes.*

All right, now, let's take number two, and this is the main thing I want to talk to you about: A rolly coaster equals a suppressive person in that person's vicinity. In other words, rolly coaster – PTS. If a person rolly coasters, it's PTS. A PTS is a connection with a suppressive. I'll give you the exact mechanics of it; I'll let you sort them out on your own time.

And that's postulate-counter-postulate is the anatomy of a problem. And this belongs in actual fact at Grade I. And it's just this: postulate-counter-postulate. Postulate versus postulate. That is the definition and the anatomy of a problem. And there is no other definition to a problem. There can be several counter-postulates; there can be several going out like this, but that makes several problems. The central problem is always postulate-counter-postulate.

So the guy has had a purpose in life and somebody has suppressed it, or a guy has had a purpose over a twenty-four-hour period and somebody suppressed that purpose. In other words, his purpose was his postulate, the other person saying he couldn't do it was the counter-postulate. Do you follow?

So that is simply the anatomy of a problem and it belongs at Grade I. And there is no other reason for rolly coaster. This is the "no other" data I'm giving you. There just is no other datum.

People don't rolly coaster because they got into an engram. People don't rolly coaster because the auditor misread the action. People don't rolly coaster because his father was a
Methodist and has been dead since birth. Do you understand? So don't, as a Review Auditor, ever fall for two seconds for any other reason for a roly-poly than postulate-counter-postulate. There isn't any other reason.

Now, SP is a version of this. It's a version of a problem and is a specialized kind of problem, and that is what causes the roly-poly. The individual has run into a postulate-counter-postulate since his last improvement, which makes him a potential trouble source.

Potential trouble source means the case is going to go up and fall down. And he's a trouble source because he's going to get upset. He's a trouble source because he's going to make trouble. And he's a trouble for the auditor and he's trouble for us and he's trouble for himself and so forth. And he really does make trouble. That's very carefully named.

The SP isn't making trouble. See? He's just poisoning the whole universe, you know? But it isn't – he isn't making trouble; he's just going squash! Do you see? Anybody says anything to him – squash! You see? It's the PTS who makes the trouble. Do you see this?

Now, this is the whole backbone of ethics. And there isn't anything more to ethics than the – this basic purpose of ethics is ethics exists to get tech in. If you ever see ethics being used in that throws tech out, then ethics is being used in a suppressive fashion. Now, the only way that you could use ethics suppressively is use it in such a way that it threw tech out. Because the purpose of ethics is to put tech in. If you've got ethics, you can get tech in. You carry on ethics long enough to get tech in, and that's all the longer you carry it. But in the process of getting tech in you very often will run into a roly-poly – and that is, a case worsens after it improves, as easily as that.

The case did all right in yesterday's session; comes to this session, falls on his head. That's a roly-poly. And there's no other cause for it, see, than postulate-counter-postulate.

You'll see a process come out and an HCOB come out on a process that will be called "Search and Discovery." And Search and Discovery is just to find the purposes – to find the suppressions the person has had in life. And one of the broad ways of finding it, unfortunately, will make a Problems Release in minutes. You say, "What has been your main purpose in life? Thank you very much. Who opposed it? Thank you very much." And in a large percentage of cases, Problems Release! Do you understand? It'd be an interesting percentage on which this would occur.

Of course, the person doesn't know about problems – they aren't cleaned up about problems worth a nickel – but they'll go release on the subject of problems, and they'll stay released. And now you try to run problems on them and you're going to get a high TA. Do you see? They've solved all their problems.

The way you solve a problem is to find the source of the counter-postulate. You find the source of the counter-postulate; that's the way to solve a problem. Now, man gets solutions to problems. In other words, he leaves the counter-postulate and his own postulate in place, not knowing the definition of a problem, and then solves the resulting collision, as in dialectic materialism.

You want to read that some day; that's very interesting. It's the anatomy of a problem gone mad. "Any idea is the product of two forces" is the backbone of it. It's quite interesting.
It's the – it's a current philosophy. But in actual fact, that's based on a problem. Two forces going together make a squash, so therefore, that's it!

Now, if you want to really solve a problem and see it solve in the physical universe and have an awful lot of fun with it, then you had certainly better look over the whole perimeter of counter-postulates: What is the source of the problem?

And if you hit it right – if you've got a problem with Joe Jinks and he's in Toronto, Canada – if you hit it right, don't be surprised if you get a phone call from Joe Jinks telling you the problem is all solved. It happens, routinely and constantly. And I had to run down what process was it that was causing this phenomena, because we ran into the problem very often.

We'd run Problems of Comparable Magnitude on a pc in an HGC or an ACC or something like this, and the next thing you know their long-lost husband or something, that they'd had such awful problems with, is very sweetness and light. Do you follow? You see, the problem evaporated. But the funny part of it is, in the physical universe it'll also evaporate for the other person sometimes. So that's quite interesting. And that's very interesting for you to know that in connection with ethics. Because when you see that the disconnection, or the handle or disconnect, causes an enormous problem for the person or for the other person from whom they are disconnecting, you have invariably found the wrong person.

Now, Ethics… The policy letter that moved them over to "Suppressives must be located by Review" – and that's where you're coming in and that's why I'm talking to you. We're not permitting Ethics, anymore, to locate suppressive persons. They're going to be located by Review Auditors in regular session. Do you see that? Because Ethics just flubs it too often. They're not equipped for auditing and so forth. They're interested in justice and that sort of thing, and they don't go ahead with it and do a good job of it. So therefore, anybody walking into Ethics who is PTS, who has rolly coastered and so forth, is sent to Review. And that is the route.

Actually, an HGC auditor should send directly to Review and then Review sends to Ethics. Ethics has to have some notation of this. That's the only reason they go to Ethics after Review. Do you see? Because when they're sent to… when somebody says, "Well, this person is PTS," and so forth, you could send them directly, don't you see, over to Ethics and then to Review in all cases. But I know very well that if one of your Examiners was to find a PTS, and know very well that that Examiner would inevitably and invariably send that person directly to Review, wouldn't send them to Ethics. Why? Review is closer. Do you see?

So after the person has been found to rolly coaster and then Review cleans up the SP, why, they can go over to Ethics and get a statement of handle or declare, don't you see? But it's all cleaned up. They're not any longer – they're not even vaguely worried about it. Do you see?

Now, that's the way it's going to be handled, and that's the change of route. So therefore I'm briefing you. And the reason why I've called you in is just to give you this datum and just tell you that although around you will hear occasionally that there are other reasons for rolly coaster, that's for the birds! That's not true. There are no other reasons for rolly coaster than PTS. And PTS is the manifestation of a postulate-counter-postulate.
Now, you notice that I haven't said how long. You know, the person didn't have to be a PTS for two and a half years before he became up to Review's attention – I mean, up to the attention of Ethics. He might have only been PTS for twenty minutes. And it's very interesting that you can overrun a person who is trying to tell you he's already gone Release and the person becomes a PTS. Who's the suppressive?

*Audience: The auditor.*

Isn't that interesting? Of course, the suppressive – it's merely a suppressive action. You don't declare the auditor a suppressive person. Do you follow? You don't have to then go through the endless action of "the Pe must separate from the auditor and disconnect and…." That's a lot of balderdash, isn't it? But still, the mechanics are there: rolly coaster – PTS. Well, just who? Where? How? What? And that's your job in Review.

Now, you can use listing. You can list the person's purposes: "What purpose of yours has been thwarted?" I mean, unfortunately, in handling this you're going to have some Releases on your hands. But watch it! Get them declared when they occur; that's a Grade I Release.

Now, don't let somebody shake you off of this datum that a rolly coaster is a PTS. And the definition of PTS is: connected to a suppressive person or action. See? Person or action. A guy can inadvertently suppress something. You're driving down the road and somebody steps out in front of your car – believe me, when you hit him, you suppressed him. You certainly didn't intend to and that doesn't make you a suppressive person. Do you follow?

So just looking at this from straight technical mechanics and so forth: a rolly coaster – PTS. Now, if that PTS is not handled the person does become, then, a trouble source. And "PTS" – very well named. You overrun somebody, oh boy, you're going to have trouble. They're going to make trouble. There's going to be all kinds of trouble.

What's your main consideration, then, in handling anybody sent to you from Ethics or from the HGC, in the review? Your main consideration is, promptly and immediately, this person has been up against a suppressive action or person. And don't go nutty and try to do ARC breaks on him and sympathize with how badly they've been hit. Nothing like that. All you've got to do is find the suppressive person. Now, the person may only have been suppressive for five minutes. Or the person might have been suppressive for a lifetime. But you find the right one and instantly the good indicators will come in, and watch it, because you're liable to make a Release right at that moment.

Now, also watch it that by getting off the SP you rehabilitate the state of Release which was being overrun. You see now, the person came in to you with a high TA, and all of a sudden you recognize the person is PTS, also. Do you follow? Person felt better, now feels worse. Well, your action is to locate the suppressive action or person, of course. But you might have the high TA because the person has had an overrun on a process. But it's still a suppressive action. See, completely aside from rehabilitating the process, what have you got?

Now, a suppressive person is not somebody with horns; it's a person who has had a counter-postulate to the PC you are handling. But a suppressive person who is routinely sup-
pressive in life, invalidative of Scientology and trying to keep people from getting well and that sort of thing, is a social menace.

Now, he's the problem of Ethics. Your problem in Review is to find him. And if it's just a momentary suppression and so forth, you don't go declaring somebody suppressive because he accidentally overran the PC, and the PC says, "I feel good now and I don't want to answer any more auditing commands."

"Well, you'd better answer this next auditing command."

"Well, I don't want to answer any more auditing commands."

"Well, you'd better answer this next auditing command."

The person will now behave to some degree on the basis of PTS. You not only have got an overrun release, or something of that sort is lurking around there, but you in addition to that have a PTS. Do you follow? So both of those actions would have to be handled. But please, don't let somebody shake this datum for you. Because when they can't find the SP by any means, then they will drop the datum. Do you see? They drop the datum, huh? They say, "Well, all right. It was because he ate bananas last night."

Well, I'm afraid that somebody in auditing wouldn't roll coaster if he just ate some bad bananas last night. He's not roller coastering in auditing. So he doesn't feel so well this morning; well, he knows damn well what did it. If he wanted to – if you wanted to be an absolute perfectionist on this, you could say, "Well, who insisted you eat the bananas?" Don't you see? And probably at that moment, why, his tummyache would go [snaps fingers].

But that sort of thing is too minor. We're talking about a real honest-to-God roll coaster, see? The person was doing fine in the – audited in London, doing fine; appears here, doing badly. Oh boy, that's a roll coaster. He signs all over the wall, that's roll coaster. And always there is a suppressive action or person – invariably, inevitably. And Review's job, then, when somebody sends to Review a PTS, is to find that.

Now, Review also, as I told you, might find also an overrun – may find two things while looking for one. And the only mistake you can make is, two things being present, find the wrong one and say the person is now okay, when the other one still has to be handled. See, you'd handle both of them. If two things are wrong, you'd handle both things – if the person has an overrun and is also a PTS from some other course – or source.

Now, you'll notice that whenever you tell a person the right suppressive, that's like locating, indicating the bypassed charge. It isn't the same as an ARC break. Don't get it tangled with an ARC break, because an ARC break is only cycles of communication. That's another animal. And you can't handle these things. But the funny part of it is, the same technology will locate and indicate the suppressive – source of the suppression – locate what it is, get the pc to look it over, indicate what it is. You should get good indicators. And you should get them right now, and your meter ought to blow down. And it's unmistakable.

And now if the person again roll coasters, don't say, "We didn't find the right suppressive." There's another one, that's all. It's that simple. You got – you did this and the good
indicators all came in. The person felt fine for three days and all of a sudden roly coasters again, and you have the person back on your hands. Don't let anybody berate you. And you, John, as Qual Sec, don't let anybody start berating Qual for not having found the right suppressive. Do you see? This person was infested. You see? Just find it. You say, "Aw, poo-phoo-phoo, wuff-wuff nothing, bah-bah-bah. There was just another suppressive to be found, that's all." And go ahead and do so.

If you found all the suppressive persons and actions in a person's lifetime you would have a Problems Release. And sometimes, as I said to you, and all too often, the Problems Release will occur while you're looking for it. And after that, you're up the creek, aren't you? How, now, are you going to handle this when the person gets into another PTS situation? Well, don't let it worry you, because he's a Release on the subject and he won't. Unless he goes home and starts self-auditing it.

Now, let me give you another little point on overrun here – just a point in question, so forth. You know you have auditors around who self-audit and that a person can be released and then they're so anxious to get to the next grade of Release that they dicker around and tinker around with whatever they're doing. And then they think, "That was a good command the auditor was running," and then they overrun it.

They actually will give themselves repetitive auditing commands. I'm calling that to your attention. And it is a source of overrun which is all too often overlooked. There can be, in a trained Scientologist, another auditor present: the pc as an auditor, auditing himself. He's liable to go home – ARC breaks: "Oh, gee, I felt so wonderful after Aunt Molly..." and so forth, and he hasn't quite blown it all, don't you see? And he sits down and he says, "Let me see, was there anything else that Aunt Molly invalidated me about? Oh yes, that. And somebody else invalidated me about..." Now, it's going to run, for a very short distance. And then his TA is going to go high, and he's going to have a high TA. Do you see that? It's a hidden source of an overrun.

All right. But this roly coaster, suppressive, PTP of long duration is the one which gives Ethics the most trouble, and it's being handed over as an auditing proposition to Review. And one of the reasons it's being handed over is I've solved the technology of it and there isn't anything more to the technology of it than I've just given you. And you can fancy this up any way you please. You can run fifty dozen different processes to solve the same thing. You could tailor-make all kinds of one-two-threes and that sort of thing. But it's just postulate-counter-postulate. It's just an effort to act versus an effort to – not to act. It's this, you see? It's just postulate-counter-postulate.

You spot the source of the counter-postulate and that will be the end of the problem. And that's the piece of technology that's just come up, and I think you'll admit that's ter... it's so plainly stated that you're sure I have said it before. [laughs] And I haven't said it in that two connected words.

All right. Now, the other thing has nothing much to do with those two, but it is the source of the overt. And the source of the overt is that formula whereby when something is misunderstood, a person will then individuate from it and then he will commit overt acts against it. And that is the cycle. There's a longer cycle than that; you'll find it in bulletins; it's
already been covered. But this is the third datum which is a key, top-flight senior datum that is most commonly overlooked.

Confusion or argumentation, upset or stupidity, comes from a misunderstood word, misunderstood earlier than the one the person is talking about. The word that is misunderstood is always earlier than the one the person is nattering about. That's always the case, and that's part of the original study materials. But it's just uniformly missed.

Student is having a hard time out here arguing with the Supervisor – *yip, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap*. The Supervisor will just stand there and argue about what the student is arguing about. They'll go on arguing and arguing and arguing. And they bring them over and come into Review and Cramming and so forth. And they go on arguing, arguing, arguing – oh bull! This is *terrible!* Because in the first place, how did the Supervisor not know this other part of the datum? It's always earlier than the one they're arguing about.

If they're arguing about a point in paragraph two that the student can't understand, then the missing point is in paragraph one, always. And the student will never argue about paragraph one, and he'll always argue about paragraph two. Do you see that? And the misunderstood word is in paragraph one. Do you follow?

All right. If halfway through a course they're very upset and they can't understand their material and they're being very, very stupid, then there was something in the very early part of the course that they're not discussing at all. And this is *always* the case! The person never spots what they've misunderstood!

So any confusion, stupidity or upset from the level of training always comes from a word misunderstood or a misunderstood thing, prior to the one the person insists on talking about. It's always prior to the one the guy is talking about. And to talk to him about what he is talking about is just a *waste of time*. And as a Review Auditor you get this, every once in a while.

You get – have to do an assist on a student of some kind or another. And he'll say, "Well..." and you'll say, "Well, what didn't you understand?" (I'll show you how to do this wrong.) "What didn't you understand?"

"Oh, why, I didn't understand – uh – I just couldn't understand about engrams. They just – just – oh, they're very upsetting. I couldn't understand anything about them."

"Well, was there some word in the connection with engrams that you didn't know?"

Flunk! Flunk! Flunk! Flunk! You get it? The auditor is saying, "What word connected with engrams didn't you understand?" Or the auditor says, "Well, he didn't get the definition of engrams." Do you see, this is just flunk, flunk, flunk, flunk. Guy doesn't know what he misunderstood. It's before he went into engrams.

And you say, "All right..." Now, the pat question, if you want to solve this [snaps fingers] right like that, is, "Just before you got into engrams, what was there that you collided with that you didn't dig?"

"Oh! Oh, that. Locks. I just didn't understand what a lock was or what – what – what is this thing called a picture?"
All of a sudden, *bing-bang*, now he understands it, and that's all there is to it. Do you follow? And the magic of the whole thing is spotting the *earlier* misunderstood thing from the one he is talking about. And that is implicit in the study materials themselves, but is the key major point and is the solution to it, and is the one which is consistently missed in Tech, it's missed in Ethics, it's missed all over the organization. It's missed in checkouts. It's just missed in a rash. And when the guy has missed all the way across the boards, he inevitably will wind up sooner or later in Review to get this handled or to get handled some way or another, because he will get routed down there.

Now, he very often will get routed there from Cramming. See? Cramming will get fed up with this guy and send him over for some auditing, don't you see? Now, *that's* all you do with him. Now, you can run the form 26 June on him, and you can do a lot of other things, but *this* is the one you do with him. This is the key datum. This is senior to everything else that you can do.

Now, these first two I've given you rank this way: The first one ranks as exclusively an auditing activity – high TA equals overrun.

The second one, rolly coaster and suppressive and so forth – that is really, exclusively an environmental difficulty. Do you understand? And it can occasionally incur in auditing. You'll err when you think it always occurs in auditing. But that's really environmental, don't you see?

And this next one is on the subject of comprehension of Scientology materials, and that's where they relate. And they are the key datum to each one of these activities. In other words, "high TA equals overrun"; that is the key datum of auditing. Because that's the one that can wreck all auditing. So therefore, it obviously is the boss datum.

And the second one, this can wreck a guy's whole life: PTS. And if that's not discovered and so forth… And that's the key datum that regulates the environment.

And this third one is the one that regulates his comprehension, not only of Scientology but of existence. See, that's the key datum that regulates his IQ. And that is the boss datum. That is the top dog, right there. That's the one way up on top. And it's so easy to get it wrong! It is just so simple to get this wrong.

"Oh! The reason the guy is arguing with me is misunderstood a word." That's wrong! That is a totally improper statement and it won't lead to a resolution of the problem. Do you understand? That's a false datum!

"There is a misunderstood word in what the guy is arguing with me about," and that is false. From the standpoint of a Review Auditor, that has not sufficient truth to resolve the situation. That's wrong! The correct datum is "There is something misunderstood just before what he's talking about." That's the correct datum and that's the one that leads to a resolution of the situation.

Guy's talking about steam engines: "Well, I just never dug any steam engines. Steam eng-aw-blah! It's a terrible subject. I just hate steam engines and so forth. Never could understand anything about them, I'm always having accidents with them, and so forth, even though I own the B&O Railroad. Ah, yeah, steam engines and so forth."
Well, an auditor who'd say to him at that moment, "What word have you misunderstood about steam engines?" just has missed the whole boat. That's why the datum won't work.

*Female voice:* Sure, if that was the problem, it would resolve.

Yes! The guy's trying to understand steam engines. He isn't confused about steam engines. "Just before you got into steam engines, what did you misunderstand? What did you find incomprehensible just before you got into steam engines? What were you in just before you got into steam engines?"

Let's take it on a terribly broad basis, see? "What were you in just before you got into steam engines?"

"History."

And you'll find out that his misunderstanding comes into the basis of politics. And railroads, after that, you see, is a secondary subject that has to do with the political expansion of continents or something. And he's all hung up in the subject of politics, and he doesn't think people ought to drive other people off continents or something, see? It's that wild. So he moves into this whole field of steam engines and he doesn't understand anything about steam engines. Steam engines were the source and cause of a lot of things he doesn't comprehend anything about it. There's an allied subject he was in just before he got there. Do you follow? I'm giving you a ridiculously broad example. Do you understand?

So this auditor out here, he's saying, "I just don't understand anything." He'll keep saying, "Mind? Mind? Now, what do you mean by mind?" I mean, it's this boy on course, see. "What do you mean by mind? I don't understand anything about mind." All right. His Supervisor stands there and defines mind for him and goes into all kinds of gesticulations and explanations and graphs on the board about… Honest-to-Pete, he could do this probably for the next century without ever getting his point across. You got it? He could go on and on and on.

"Just before you got upset about minds, what were you into? What were you studying just before you got to that point about minds?" That's the right question.

"Oh, I don't remember… Oh, yes I do. Yes. Yes, I-I-I do. Yes, there is something there – religion." And he'll be hung up on a completely different subject, and he's never spotted it, and you've got to actually take his wits and back him up on the time track. Do you understand? So that your Review Auditor action is always realizing that the remainder of the org possibly has not got this one straight: that it's the earlier one. If there's *anything* wrong with a guy's study, then this is the thing that is wrong. They have not backed it up one.

They're arguing about bulletin three, when it's bulletin two, see? They're arguing about paragraph seven when it's paragraph six. It's always – they're arguing about the one after when the fault is the one before. You got that?

And your Review action, then, becomes unstabilized to the degree that you don't find a misdefinition in what he is studying. You don't find the misdefinition in what he is studying and therefore you think his stupidity comes from some end word or something. You see, you'll change your mind; you'll think the study datum is gone; you'll start looking elsewhere
for the reason why. Well, the magic is all connected in: If it doesn't resolve on what you ask him, it's before what you ask him. It's the one he's arguing about and telling you all about that he didn't understand and so forth, then he didn't dig something just ahead of it. And as a Review Auditor, when you get this boy from Cramming or from course or something like this, you must back it up.

"Well," he's saying, "the au... these Instructors, these Supervisors, they just won't listen to me. And I keep telling them and telling them and telling them that I just can't understand an E-Meter."

"What were you studying with regard to E-Meters?"

"Well, I was studying the E-Meter book of E-Meters."

"All right. Now, is there something in the very early portion of that book..." – this is possible, but not too probable – "Is there something in the very early portion of that book you didn't dig?"

Well, clean up a couple. See, it's like unburdening the time track. "Well, there's... All right. Is there something just before you got into E-Meters? Is there something before you got into E-Meters?" You could find possibly that it's the word essentials. He didn't understand essentials – you know, E-Meter Essentials. It's that early in the book. But the probability is it's something that predates E-Meters. It predates his study of E-Meters. And therefore you've got to follow that down.

Whatever it is, it'll read on your meter. Do you know that you can date it before you find it? You can say, "All right, you're having an awful time learning E-Meters. You've been checked out on 850 GAEs on the subject of E-Meters here in your last three weeks of auditing." His ethics file is thick with these things. All right. Now, I'll give you the wrong question: "What don't you understand about E-Meters?" Wrong question! Won't lead to a resolution. It'll lead to an argument; it'll lead to some tiny, partial result; it has no magic connected with it.

You say the right question: "The date of the misunderstanding that's got you upset about E-Meters: 1964? 1963? Is it before 1960? Is it after 1960?" You could do it as crazy as this. All of a sudden you get a read. And that was 1962. He says, "Well, I wasn't even in Scientology."

"All right, what were you in?"

"Well, I sold books in a bookstore."

And you'll find a dictionary fell on his foot or something of the sort. And at the moment that it fell on his foot he was looking up meters or he was looking up electronic devices. Or he was once an electrical engineer... he wanted to be an electrical engineer when he was a child, and he'd forgotten all about this, but his parents wouldn't permit him to be an electrical engineer. Now he doesn't understand about anything electrical. Has nothing to do with meters. Do you find that? And you can plow around this way, but for heaven's sakes don't plow around on what the PC is arguing with. And that's my whole message.
The absolutely fixed datum here is it's always a misunderstood word and it is always prior to the one the PC is arguing about. And if you've got that, boy, can you handle cases on a Review basis on stupid students. Whish, whish, whish – there's nothing to it. It just rolls off pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. Guy walks in, so on. There isn't anything else, by the way, wrong with a student. See, that's how senior the datum is. If you use this datum you'll find the other things wrong with the student just fall away; they're all apparenties, they're all locks on what this is, you see?

You can find a lot of things wrong with a student. You could find a lot of arguments he's having. You can find a lot of upsets he's having. You can find injustices. You can find all sorts of wild things, and so forth. But if he isn't making progress in his studies, then the thing is wrong with his studies, isn't it? You don't handle his environment so that he can handle his studies better. Let me give you that as a datum.

I've been so knocked out and dragged down and so forth, casewise and otherwise and otherwise, don't you see, that I couldn't see two feet away. And the funny part of it is, I could always work on technology. You normally find in existence, the thing the person is having trouble with will resolve if you find out what caused it. And if it doesn't resolve, then you haven't found out what caused it.

But this datum about study it – don't buy any guff off the student. Don't buy any bunch of different solutions. Let him get them off; let him get off some ARC breaks. Acknowledge him. Locate and indicate the bypassed charge of somebody who wouldn't listen to him about his not understanding things or... I don't care what you do – but realize, please – make him happy for sure – but realize, please, that you're just – that you're just flicking at the froth on the beer. You're not taking any drinks of beer.

You can do all the things you want to; you can putter around for hours. You can make him feel pretty good, you can get him into good communication with you, all this sort of thing and so forth. And then you jolly well better find out what he misunderstood before what he said he misunderstood.

You say, "What have you misunderstood about all this?" And the guy says, "Well, I don't understand buttercakes." And you say, "Well, that's good." Don't ever make the fatal mistake of saying, "What don't you understand about buttercakes?" If he's got buttercakes pinpointed that easy, he doesn't misunderstand buttercakes. It's cooks. It's something just ahead of buttercakes. And your right auditing question is "All right. Well, just before you got into the subject of buttercakes and so forth, what were you into?"

Guy says, "That's a new thought!" See, he'll give you the basic on the chain, don't you see? Well, I don't care how far down you follow the basic on the chain. After all, Review auditing is paid auditing. Follow it down to the year izzard, but don't follow it into the R6 bank. Got it?

I don't care how many study points you cure up with this bird. But remember, you are handling fringes on end words and that sort of thing. I don't care how many points you relieve; I don't care if you clean up his kindergarten. You understand? It's almost a deliberate anti-Q and A. He says it's B – well, don't ARC break him – say, "Oh, yes…" cheerily, cheer-
ily, "Yeah, oh yeah, good. I'm glad you don't understand buttercake." But now give him A. "All right, just before you got into buttercake, what was it?"

"Oh!"

You're going to get some big cognitions and you'll get some big results. You got it?

All right, to summarize up here – to summarize up – you got three data, and it's the three data that go out in the org. And that's why they're key data for Review. These three data go out in the org. The org in general has many other data which they consider very important. And how to run E-Meters and all that sort of thing – these data are very important. And how to do Power Processing and everything – these things are very important. You understand? But from the viewpoint of Review, there are really only three data that are important. Only three.

And one of those is a high TA equals overrun. And if you know that, boy, you're never going to have any trouble. When was it overrun; what was overrun?

Two: If a person rolls coasters, he is a PTS, at that moment. He is a PTS and it's only a question of what was the source of the suppressive action? Do you see? That's the counter-postulate. Just get that counter-postulate, that's all. Who? It's not, by the way, good enough to get the counter-postulate. You've got to get, if you can, the source of the counter-postulate. The reason the R6 bank, for instance, doesn't blow, is because you don't get the counter-postulate – who on the counter-postulate. You can get all the counter-postulates – but who? That doesn't emerge till way late, don't you see?

You'll find the most difficult problems that you handle on an individual is he never found out who. He walked out his front doorstep and all of a sudden he had a bullet through his head and he never found out who shot him. He'll be hung up on the track for centuries. See? Who was the other fellow? And he goes around asking this question rather haunted.

Next one: Confusion of any sort comes from a misunderstood word that goes before the word the person is arguing about.

That's the whole lot.

Now, you could ask me for a whole bunch of fancy processes, one of which to handle each one, and I could probably be very amusing and be very interesting. I am going to write one called "Search and Discovery" and give several alternate methods of finding the SP and so forth, that mostly consist of listing or just asking or something like that. But actually, if you're a skilled auditor you should be able to do these.

Now, with the routing: for any auditing action required in Ethics, we're for sure going to send that person right straight to the Qual Div and the Department of Review. And no analysis of this particular character is going to be done in Ethics of any kind whatsoever. They just do nothing but make mistakes.

Oh, they spot one every once in a while and straighten a lot of thing up; I shouldn't invalidate them 100 percent. But there's too many mistakes, too many mistakes. And those mistakes have one common denominator. The mistakes Ethics makes are in actual fact failure to
spot the proper SP or source of the suppressive actions. And that is the big mistake. Because if Ethics spotted that mistake every time, then everyone would be very happy with Ethics.

And it's interesting that in the policy letter, the person is not permitted, if he's gone for an ethics action on this, PTS, he's actually not permitted to be trained or processed till he's paid for his Review auditing. Now, you'll say, "Boy, that is sure commercial. Oh, that's really commercial." No, I have found uniformly that if a person won't pay – actually the pennies and pence – for Review auditing, they didn't get it in Review. The person is usually so happy – if the person has really been handled in Review, he's so happy about it, he would actually push somebody out of his road to go over there and put down the quid or two that was necessary to handle his little bill. Do you follow?

But if he won't pay that, I can assure you that it hasn't been located. So it's just a pre-preventer, don't you see?

[End of lecture.]
ABOUT RHODESIA

A lecture given on 19 July 1966

Thank you.


*Female voice:* Take the red thing off the top. Pull it out. There.

Yes! [laughter, applause] This is a beautiful cigarette box – lovely! And a nice ashtray.

*Female voice:* Nice!

Great. Great. Anything more? [laughter] I guess that's enough. I was greedy. [laughs] Well, thank you. Thank you very, very much. I appreciate it. Most of all, I just appreciate being home, just period!

Well, might as well sit down here. It's not a formal lecture. This is what? July the 19\textsuperscript{th}, AD 16, the year of the Clears. That's for sure!

I'm going to tell you today about the adventures of somebody who went out barefooted to take a country. [laughter]

About February, why, I was holding the mock-up together with sticky plaster and the organization was running. It was running just fine. Everything was going along all right. Technology was all wrapped up and I knew it was wrapped up. But I thought I'd better put it all on wait. So I put several things on wait. Put me own case on wait in case I needed it to find out why they couldn't make it. I've done this time and time again for years. I'd get up to a certain level, then I'll stand around and wait for somebody to catch up, you know? And the seven-divisional system was in organizationally. And so I decided, why, I would take a short vacation.

So I went down to Las Palmas and I was down there for about thirty days. And while I was down there, I kept an eye open to see what was going on. Organizations seemed to be running all right. And then all of a sudden you made Clear one. So I says, "Great! But will there be Clear two?" Well, I said, "That's good enough. I've no reason to sit around here in Las Palmas waiting for Clear two. And no reason to sit around here waiting endlessly to find out what on earth can happen in a seven-divisional system, whether they go up or down. I'll go on down to South Africa and get into some mischief." [laughter]
I didn't have a very well conceived plan about it, but actually what I wanted to do was to find and found and locate an alternate base or OT base. I couldn't quite figure out why I couldn't do this. I'll tell you why I couldn't do this in a minute or two.

So I went down and I stopped off in Rhodesia. But *en route* to Rhodesia it suddenly occurred to me that there was a type and principle of constitution that would get them off the hook as a country and solve some of their problems. So I decided I would write this up, which I did in some notes. And when I got there I got it typed up. And I handed it over to the government and the government seemed to be very happy about it. It was quite an incidental gesture. I said, "Well, let's see if we can't do something in this direction all by ourselves."

And I got to looking around the place – suddenly remembered I had some assets and some stuff in southern Africa, so I decided I would go into a bit of investment. I'd put on another hat. See, I can always locate money for some peculiar reason. And this baffles Income Tax, by the way, but that's explained very easily: you don't make money – you just have it. [laughter] You want to learn that someday. Just have money; just don't bother to make it.

So anyway, I – minding my own business more or less and I decided I'd rent a house. And then next thing you know, why, I found out I could buy this house very cheaply, so I bought it. Some guy came tearing up the drive one day and told me that I could buy a hotel that was entirely surrounded by elephants on Lake Kariba which was going very cheap indeed. It was about an eighty thousand pound hotel and we could buy it for about fifty-five hundred. So I bought that. I wrote him a check. And then later on, why, I noticed a farm. It was a nice farm, so I got the farm, and so on.

But what I was watching here – during this whole time, what I was watching – was simply the economics and behavior of the wog world. Now, you know, I've been kind of gone from the wog world for a long time. I've been spoiled. I've had you for friends. And it's different! [laughter] And I in actual fact was getting a kick out of being out there cheek by jowl with just the wog world. And I found out I had lots of friends – could make lots of friends and the guys that I made friends with were pretty tough characters in their own right. I normally find it very easy to make friends with very tough characters now. I don't mean by that low grade social characters; I mean just savage-type characters that haven't reformed, you know? Unreformed-type people. And there's a lot of those in Rhodesia.

And I was getting along just fine. It's a wonderful area, a lot of sociality. They have what's called sundowners and about, well, from anytime from five-thirty on, why, people start dropping in or you start dropping in and they have some drinks and that sort of thing and then they go home. And it's typical – typical nineteenth century English, you know. Victorian in the extreme, because you don't have dinner without putting at least a dark suit on, you see. They've come off the tuxedo. You know, the Englishman used to, you know, out in the bush, you see, in the old days, why, he'd take off his sun helmet and his bush jacket and his shorts and he would get into a tuxedo – all by himself; you see, way out in... [laughter] It's true! And sit down at a fancily spread dinner, elegantly served, don't you see. And he didn't want to lose contact with civilization, so he would make it.

So anyhow, that's still hanging on in Rhodesia. Very interesting country. It's a totally sophisticated civilization sitting as a small jewel in the midst of a howling wilderness. You go
any direction very far and you start running into elephants, buffalo, lion and the lot, you see. But those sports cars and chromium-plated girls, and so on, abound inside the tiny perimeters of the areas that are civilized. Very sophisticated. Far more modern than London. It provides some fantastic contrasts.

So anyway, this civilization of course is an interesting civilization to look at. But it's more practical than that because it's got an area – I don't know how many times the size of what country – that really isn't growing anything. The thing is full of minerals and there's a five-mile mountain of chrome ore down there that they haven't even begun to dig up and there's gold and there's everything else you can think of there. But mainly, there is enough land and enough range and so on to feed, probably, Europe. And most of it untouched by the plow. Beautiful climate and so on.

Here is a brand-new country that hasn't been run downhill yet and could afford a great deal of development. Well, I went ahead and went to work on this. Kept in touch with the government. I met all the ministers and talked to them and had sundowners with them and met the prime minister and all that and had tea with his wife and, you know, that kind of thing. And I was a very acceptable bloke, I assure you. Very acceptable. I didn't say one single word about Scientology. And every time anybody would ask me about Scientology, why, I would just brush it off and not say anything about it, don't you see. I'd define the word for them or something like that and then go on talking about cows or gold mines or something or other.

Well, I probably was giving them a whole dose of no-auditing, in actual fact. But I was purposely and with malice aforethought examining the wog world. And I didn't want to unwog anybody. [laughter]

So television found me and I went on television. Radio found me and I started going on the radio. You know me, I see some situation or problem or something like that to be solved, I go ahead and solve it, you know. But by George, you know, I didn't have any authority. I didn't have any authority. I couldn't put out a Sec ED. [laughter] And by actual, sober calculation, no joking about it, I could have had them off the launching pad in about three weeks. I could have gotten rid of their sanctions, gotten rid of their poverty, and gotten them money – just bang-bang-bang. It was too easy, don't you see?

Well, although – although I didn't gi… although I wasn't giving them any auditing, I was awful near Clear. And the unreality of the fact that one could actually resolve this situation that has staggered the greatest minds on the planet, don't you see – I say that advisedly – "minds" – [laughter] left some rather baffled. But what was very interesting was that each Rhodesian, knowing what I was advising them to do, would himself agree with it, flat out, and "Let's do it tomorrow." But he would caution me that the ideas were too far advanced for any other Rhodesian to accept. [laughter] And this was 100 percent sweep, so that included all the Rhodesians.

Well, time ground on and I got in transport into Lake Kariba. It's the first time anybody had ever gone down to the southern shore of Lake Kariba with any kind of transport. And I got four-wheel-drive Land Rovers, two-tonners, and started throwing them in there to
supply the hotel. And they ran along – called the "Boomy Express." And it ran along through the lions and through the buffalo and the elephants, and so forth.

Boomy has an – Boomy Hotel has an airstrip. It's mostly an air hotel. And they actually have to buzz the hotel every now and then to get the elephants off the runway. And it sits right there on Lake Kariba which is a huge lake, very beautiful setting. But you can sit on the porch of the thing and drink a Tom Collins, you know, and watch the elephants and buffalo and so forth walking around very close by. Sometimes too close by, because they're all very wild animals. They're not even game-park tame, you know.

And baboons coming up, thumbing their noses at you and tearing the thatch off the roofs, you know, and raising the devil.

But I got the Boomy Express going. And it left every Wednesday and came back every Thursday. And a fellow by the name of Samson drove it, and he was an old Kariba truck driver Samson, he's a black fellow, and he didn't quite fit into the scene as a domestic chauffeur. He did not have the tact or polish that my proper number-one driver Frank had. But as soon as I turned him loose with the Boomy Express, why, he was in his element. I gave him a car boy to help him out, and man, he would take that Boomy Express out of Salisbury and burn the road and then he'd turn off at Karoi and go thundering through the swamps and jungles and dongas and so on and wind up at Boomy. And turn it around and come back again. First time they'd ever had any transport in there.

We couldn't put our hotel transport on it anymore. We were filled up with freight. And industry started blossoming. After all, there are thirty thousand batongas – natives – right there in the vicinity of the hotel and they fish in the lake, and there's no way to get their cargoes out or anything. And economy started to spark. And elsewhere it started to spark. I did some various other things. I got a furniture factory started, and – and odds and ends. [laughter]

And the statistic of Rhodesia started to rise. Business started picking up. Now, it was sort of on the basis, they'd look at me on TV and they would say, "Well, he thinks the country's all right, so there must be something right about it, you know?" and then get busy instead of sitting and moping. You get the idea? I mean, that was all it took. It wasn't any encouragement or the ideas themselves. But just the fact that somebody would come in and be interested and so on, where they thought everybody would be running and disinterested, made a bit of a difference.

Well, the adventures were many and time ground on. And I began to wonder how on earth am I going to get back to Saint Hill? Because to walk off at this stage of the game would have been very discreditable in the eyes of the Rhodesian. Why, they couldn't have explained how I could possibly have walked off; you see? So how to walk off? That was the main problem. Because, of course, I didn't intend this as a total profession. I would have kept it going very nicely, but how to bow gracefully out of this picture? I was woven too tightly into it, you see? And I wasn't woven into it just with the white Rhodesian. All kinds of weird things had been going on.

I had a staff – actually I employed about thirty-eight Africans, coloreds and Europeans. And my own staff – I had a staff of about nine. And they were the pick of all the consular
staffs. You see, the various nations helped Rhodesia by kicking the African in the teeth. And when their consuls and missions left, after the declaration of independence, of course they just callously sacked all their staffs, you know, and pulled out and they just left the town mobbed with the highest order of domestic African. And I sorted them out one after the other and picked out the best ones and wound up with a staff; as I say, of about nine.

But the Rhodesian was always very helpful. He was always telling me how to handle the African. And it was quite, quite remarkable – quite remarkable. The advice was very sound, very sound – at least it made sounds. [laughter] But I began to realize they didn't know anything about Africans. Truth! They didn't. Because they didn't know this about Africans: simply that Africans are people. Do you follow? They respond to Scientology formulas just like any other people. And people don't have peculiarities. But if you don't know Scientology then people could look awfully peculiar to you. They say, "These boys go sullen on you. And you have to be very careful and you have to watch them very carefully because they'll go sul-len. They'll go outside and stand around and be very, very sullen. And you have to watch for this sign and symptom."

Oh, the Rhodesian – white Rhodesian – was very helpful with this, see? I found out why they went sullen. After they'd been told to do something they couldn't do and then cross-confused, the 8-C was all mixed up and then they were bawled out, they went sullen. [laughter] Now, of course, there are two errors being made with regard to the African. One is to take a bird who does not have any background – educational or experiential background immediately – that has anything to do with politics, economics, statesmanship and all that sort of thing… They've gotten out of this line, you see, if they were ever in it. And we can't instantly take one of these boys and say, "All right. You are now an expert economist. Run the country." Because he's immediately overwhelmed and baffled because he isn't able to do it. Any more than an English laborer out here, you walk up to him and say, "You're prime minister now." Very often he'll take it and start shooting other laborers or something. [laughter]

But I see parents Scientologically – every now and then, I see Scientological families where the baby has just learned to crawl and the parents are sort of nagging at it because it isn't walking, you see? And they fail to acknowledge what the baby can do. And you'll find a very unhappy baby after a while. Little kids, you know. You know, "Why aren't you Clear?" It's the same type of invalidation, you know. The bird's trying, he's coming up the line and you try to push him too fast. Overrun it, in other words, get it up there. Overexpect, do you see? And you start overexpecting and the fellow has not been trained as an electrician – well, let's not knock his block off because he now cannot fix electrical contacts and is just stupid, you see?

But on the one side, why, part of the world is saying, "These men are totally educated, completely grooved in and should therefore be able to take over all the concerns that any other society has." And on the southern African side, why, they say, "These fellows are too stupid to live and can't learn anything," you see? Somewhere in between here there's some truth about the situation, but it's just truth about this. Well, recognizing that fact, my boys were very, very happy boys. I denationalized and renationalized them, which is one of the reasons their morale was good. I told them they weren't Rhodesians anymore, they were Americans. [laughter] And this was highly acceptable to them.
Well, when they first started to work they were a bit lean. They were a bit thin. And when I left they were very fat. They were very fat. And of course, their uniforms were spotless and they had lots of them, you see, and they really looked very snap and polish. Any guest coming in the area was practically overwhelmed by car boys and things opening doors, you know, and shoving drinks in their hand and all that sort of thing. But they served with great enthusiasm. Those people sure can work. The African sure can work. That's one thing nobody has ever quite noticed about them. They are very hard-working people.

And after a while these Africans, drifting around their own townships, going out for an afternoon off and having boys in on their own, you see…

You know, the African has – he's a very interesting character. But he has flaws just like whites do, you know. And he has good points, you know. And I used to tell Jambo, the number-one boy, I'd say, "Well, you're very good..." This almost killed him because always before he'd just been scolded and nagged at about this. I'd say, "You're a very good boy, in spite of the fact that you smoke dagga, drink and gamble." And, of course, he never expected anybody to really know that he smoked dagga, drank and gambled. But he ran practically a gambling establishment out in the boy's huts every night and boys were in there from far and wide. Terrific communication line. [laughter] And these boys kept telling other boys that there was Mr. Hubbard here, who was an American who was building everything up and he actually believed in everybody getting a break and that the country was now going to amount to something, you know? And you know how they could blow this sort of thing up. They really can blow one up.

I gave the chef one day a note – one night when it was very late – so that if the police stopped him, why, they wouldn't chop his head off. And the note simply said that if he was stopped and if there was anything wrong, to call me at once. And I gave my phone number. He showed this all over the town. [laughter] Only his interpretation of it was – is, "You see? De master tell da police what to do!" [laughter]

So I eventually, in this short period of about four months, achieved the rather fantastic position of being very acceptable to the various races. And this was very peculiar. This was pan-determinism, of course, one is looking at. And more importantly, the moderate white and the extreme right white could also agree on what I was saying.

One night I was listening to a replay of a radio program and there was one of these extreme, extreme, extreme white supremacy boys sitting in the room, and there was one of the very, very, very moderate individuals, you know – everybody should have a vote tomorrow without any limits of any kind. And after that program, why, the extreme moderate said almost in chorus with the extreme right man, "Now, if we could convince the other people to follow that, we'd all be home and dry." [laughter] Fantastic breadth of agreement, see?

So, this was all very pleasant and so on. I do not say at this time that certain elements in the area were not becoming slightly green-eyed. Now, about the fourth or fifth time somebody says to you that you ought to be PM, you know very well they've said it to the PM. They said, "You know, why don't you take this fellow Hubbard's advice on this sort of thing." Or more maliciously, "Maybe he's pitching for your job." After all, it's a very tiny community. There are only 270 thousand whites in the whole country, you know. I don't know, any day of
the week we've got more Scientologists than that, you see, so this is actually a down statistic on people number.

But look at this, look at this: Tiny community, only thirty thousand taxpayers in the country pay all the taxes. And with modern communication this all became very simple and very easy. Well, of course, I didn't have anything in mind but trying to build it up, break the deadlock a little bit, and having bought property and so forth, why, then be able to operate it because it'd be money for me. Well, that was the entirety of the game. And all the time I had me eye open on what was going on and what this was all about in the wog world. And I found out an awful lot. Naturally. Because this was in actual fact...

I'm not trying to give you an exaggerated idea of my importance in Rhodesia, although the *Rhodesian Herald* just put a call through just a little while ago to find out when I was coming back to Rhodesia and so forth. Very, very pleasant queries, you know. They think I'm great now because the Smith regime doesn't. [laughter]

And it worked out like this: a Peter Younghusband, a reporter of the *London Daily Mail*, and part of this conspiracy that's going on, on the Newspaper Proprietor Associates or whatever they call themselves, or the Mafia, or whatever it is – [laughter] this outfit considered all this sufficiently important to send one of their reporters, Peter Younghusband, down to get next to their minister of information, to tell their minister of information what a terribly bad fellow I was. He instantly, without checking his facts of any kind whatsoever, turned around and gave Smith a story about what a terribly bad fellow I was, who turned around and gave the cabinet the same story. And the next morning when the Rhodesian Front committee heard about this and charged down flat-footedly – you know, bang! – "What the devil is this?" when they heard that Hubbard was not going to have his visa extended. Unfortunately for Smith.

He was talking to a group who knew that every word he was saying was a lie. Smith in March was known to be "too fair and too honest" – direct quote. He'd been built up as a god. His popularity had begun to decline because he hadn't lead them to the wonderland, you see? He'd led them deeper in the swamp. But more importantly, he had begun to read speeches by this fellow Howman. And instead of doing an ad-lib on TV, why, he began to read speeches on TV and then he stopped even appearing on TV.

When he stood there and told this group that this action was being taken against Hubbard, because his business associates were complaining about him, he overlooked the fact that I only had three business associates and he was talking to one of them there in the committee. And all of them were trying to knock the government's doors down with rocks because they considered this action completely irrational.

That was lie one. Then he told them that I'd been deported from Australia. A glance at my passports – and I had my cancelled passports with me – demonstrated no such action. And no modern visa of any kind whatsoever for Australia. No stamp of entry. And then he said that I was wanted all over the place and had a record. [laughter] And these people knew that my credit was in the stars all over the world. People whose credit is in the stars don't have records.
And they sat there in shocked horror and looked at those clay feet. That god sure had clay feet! He was not fair at all. He hadn't inquired into his evidence and they knew that either he or somebody else was being very dishonest. And they walked out and now sweepingly through the Rhodesian front they're talking about the replacement of Smith. He shouldn't have done it. [laughter]

Now, Howman was exposed, as they very often suspected, of being sympathetic toward the left wing. And it suddenly occurred to them that Howman in many instances had dismissed anybody who had fought communist in that government. These were such people as Ivor Benson, a fellow named Hasket, Nigel Bruce Hankey. These were people that had been in his ministry and had been quite able in deterring communism from getting into the government. And he had sacked every one of them. Now, that he had pulled a longbow like this and had listened to a newspaper reporter from London – an English newspaper reporter could bring influence on the Rhodesian government? I wouldn't give much for his life. He's liable to run into a bullet. Do you see?

The situation, then, is pretty well unsettled. And an American who's been there for about thirteen years said, "Well, it's all right for you to leave now, because when you walk back in here, you'll walk back in as a hero." It couldn't have been arranged – couldn't have been stage managed better! And so I could come back to Saint Hill! [laughter, applause]

Now, after an adventure of that particular kind, it makes one wonder why one doesn't try a funding operation or a financing and so forth of the British government, or... You take it on that low, why, you should be able to take it on that high, but it looks like a slightly steep gradient to me. For instance, the bank of England had to put out twenty-five million pounds just yesterday to stabilize the pound, and so forth. And I probably couldn't dig up that – it would just stabilize the pound for two hours and I don't think that's long enough.

I've been looking this over, and I don't think that our logical next step is to assist the British government financially or otherwise. [laughter] But I now know what I was trying to locate and call OT base. That was the first thing that my problem was. Where and what is OT base? Where and what is this thing? After I'd been going for a while I found out, much to my amazement, that you cannot locate a base you do not know the purpose of! [laughter] You don't know the purpose of the thing. Naval base, you see, that would be on the sea. An air base, you know, that would be on some airfield in flat country. And an army base, that might be most anyplace. But they all have different purposes. A hospital base would be where you could get in and out ambulances and so on.

But in order to locate a base you have to know what it's supposed to do. And I know that sounds terribly elementary and often very stupid, but the great mistakes are made in life by not getting answers to stupid questions! [laughter] So I now know what OT base has got to do.

And the first thing it's got to do is put in ethics on a planetary level. Because if we put in ethics, we can then get in technology. And your worries right now as you associate with the public in general and try to tell them about Scientology are totally centered on just one thing: Ethics is out.
There's SPs walking all over the place. And just one SP, just one, all by his little lonesome, is blocking the entire Rhodesian situation, is knocking the British Empire crosswise, is costing fantastic quantities in trade and is showing up the vulnerability of England, and his name is Jackie Howman, Minister of Information, Tourism and Immigration of Rhodesia. A real garden-variety nut. [laughter] Every time they try to make a settlement, there's Howman. And he's got Smith 100 percent under his thumb. Smith's PTS. He's a rather weak man to begin with, but he's very PTS.

Well now, the major threat to Scientology is that an atomic war or political takeover may occur before we get sufficiently well advanced that the organizations themselves are able to continue clearing human beings. See? That stands as an actual threat in the road. I had this in mind. I had other purposes in this. One of the purposes in mind is, I wanted to see if southern Africa couldn't serve as a security point and another avenue. The overseas US, British organizations – they might go right on and take the planet, but if political barriers or war prevented these organizations from going ahead with their mission properly, then we at least had a base, you see, in southern Africa.

Well, I was looking at that base, and trying to make it secure and so on as just a second avenue. Now, the third avenue of course was OT base, the way I had it figured out originally.

But now I found out what OT base would have to do. OT base would have to put in ethics on the planet. Because if you don't put in ethics, you're not going to get in tech.

But there's one other thing that has to be put in, less important than ethics, but nevertheless very important. And that's economics. Man is running around with a bone in his nose on the subject of economics. I hate to be snide, but as the Rhodesian looks at the stupidity of the African, I look at the stupidity of man. Only – I can do something about it and am trying.

The laws of economics are plain, plain, plain. They are very elementary. It's a very elementary subject. And man just violates them all the time for some political advantage. He starves people and he does this and he does that and slows up production, and so on. All kinds of reasons why. And he develops various kinds of economics – all ideological. You know, there's communist economics and there's democratic economics and there's socialist economics, and so forth. Here's all these economics, economics, economics. Actually, there is only one subject called economics, but it's become so obscured, so complex and so kicked in the head by these ideological economics, that people have forgotten there is such a thing as real economics.

Well, we have to be into economics because people wouldn't have enough to eat to sit still and wouldn't be able to pay for or finance themselves for processing, except on a total subsidy. And I can assure you right now, you can't do it on a total subsidy. There is no contribution. And the moment there is no contribution you won't find those cases moving. So there has to be some economic support on the planet in order to keep the economies moving so that organizations can flourish and expand. Because the economic systems being employed are usable, if modified.

So therefore OT base would also have this in view: ethics, and to a small tiny degree, economics. And then that would permit organizations to move forward and get in tech.
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Now, of course, you still have ethics inside tech. But you take a great big bite of ethics – like how are you going to solve problems between the United States and Russia? Oh, I think that takes just a little bit more than our ordinary Ethics Officer cares to bite off. [laugher]

It's an ethics problem. But sometimes ethics requires economics assistance in order to get the problem solved. If you have a tremendous number of people who are starving to death, to try to get in ethics on them – you're not going to get very far. They're too distracted; they would rather shoot people. And you can at least have ethics in to the point of telling them who to shoot.

But out of all this we have the purpose of OT base. And the one thing that is out first and foremost in the society is ethics. That, brother, that is out. Every time you've tried to disseminate Scientology you have run into ethics. And when you didn't solve ethics, you fell back for a loss.

Right now there is a situation right here in England, which we're solving by investigation but which is an ethics problem. There are two or three blokes, one or more of whom is an SP, who have suddenly decided to spend a fortune trying to cave in Scientology.

Now, we're going to have to do something about those fellows and we better move fast because it's all too slow. I mean, it's all too slow the way we've been going about it. We've got to make up for some lost time here. But these fellows do things like get your headquarters robbed of private research papers, buy them off the thief, publish them out of context and thus confuse the theory and research papers of Scientology with the actual practice of Scientology. And I point out to you that these are two entirely different things. Because I have just reserved the right all the way along the line to write down whatever I found. But I did not put it out for unlimited circulation. You see? So they're challenging a fellow's right to make notes of what he's seen. But those research papers and books, today, actually do not much reflect the practice of Scientology, which if you look at it up the grades has very, very reasonable and very comprehensible goals. Do you see?

So what they're trying to do is bring about an identification of research papers out of context with an actual, very sober, very practical practice – do you see this? – and therefore knock you around with it. Well, unless we can get ethics in at this level, we ought to quit trying, man, but we just better get these ethics in in a hurry.

Nearly every human being on this planet that is in trouble is in trouble because ethics are out. Their lives are lives of misery – just because of that. When you see three, five, ten million troops being killed in a war, they're being killed in a war just because there was an SP in some government nobody took out. And I think that's too many men to kill off just because there's one SP. It would only take one bullet, one beam, you know? I don't say we would go into it on that level. I don't wish to frighten you.

I had poor John – I had him – I had him… He wasn't worried. He wasn't flustered or anything like that, but he was just a little bit protesty, slightly and so on. I was teasing him. I was saying, "I reserve the right to be able to tip over the White House." And nobody was to tip over the White House but me. I was snarling about something that had happened in America. He naturally took me seriously [laughter] and it disturbed him. It disturbed him. I had to
point out to him however I was not yet Clear, and therefore I had a right to want to tip over the White House. [laughter] But what I didn't tell him is after the amount of trouble I was caused in 63 and so forth, I earned the right to tip over the White House! [laughter]

Well, that probably wouldn't get in ethics unless you knew what SP was in the White House at the time you tipped it over. But anyway…

But all joking aside, these situations resolve rather readily. We have the technology, we know exactly why this is out and that is out. We could actually go and sort out what are the key SPs in the situation on any international basis. We could sort them out. I don't say we'd do anything to them. We might just be reasonable about it or so forth, because now that's into technology at OT level, which by the way at this moment is relatively unexplored. But that's OT base.

Now, if you're going to appeal to the wog world you certainly better know the wog world, so I learned all kinds of weird things. I learned for instance how to sell Scientology against an out-ethics situation, which is an interesting trick; you want to try it sometime. You say to some person – who is friendly to you but who is a little bit upset because of the bad things he has heard about Scientology, you see – you say to this person, you say, "Well, you've heard objections to Scientology." And you reach into your pocket and you whip out a Problems of Work. And you hand him the Problems of Work, and you say, "Here, read that, and find out what there is in it to be objected to. Go ahead; see if there's anything objectionable in that book."

One lady I did this with forgot to feed her family. At eight or nine o'clock, she should have served supper at six, she was still reading! So anyway, all kinds of data, all kinds of data accumulated, but it was never more visible to me than that man needn't be in trouble at all. He needn't be in trouble. I don't care how many cross-conflicts he has in his religions or political systems or anything else. It's just SPs. Some SP gets ahold of a political system and there we go. Some Stalin decides that the best possible thing to do is to kill off ten million Georgians. That's the only way he can solve the problems of his country is kill off ten million Georgians. Of course, that's the act of a madman. And of course he was mad. But he was also very SP. Russia is just now staggeringly recovering from all this. They think this has something to do with communism. Has nothing to do with communism at all. The system called communism and so on, the system called socialism, the system called democracy and so on, all these could probably live cheek by jowl with just minor theoretical arguments.

It isn't political systems anyway that make countries productive or peoples happy. Political systems only exist because no one has solved the problem of succession of a good ruler. That's the problem a political system is trying to solve. You talk to a whole bunch of people and you say, "a benevolent monarch is a fine form of government if he is brilliant and runs his country well." And you'll find every political ideologist will agree with you, no matter what he is. And they'll say, "That's true," and then they'll come right in on the back of it, "but how would you succeed him?" And then we get a political system. So they can't guarantee that they can succeed him, you know, he can't have a successor. So the answer to it is don't have successors; Clear him. [laughter]
Now, where our difficulties lie individually, personally, at this moment, is only because we haven't got ethics in in the society around us. Any difficulty you're having as an individual is only because you haven't got ethics in in your immediate environment.

Now, we ought to shift gears on our emphasis. Now we've been having a lot of fun, as I told you we would have much, much earlier. We've been having a lot of fun getting in ethics on Scientologists. We've had a ball! Boy, you've had enough Comm Evs to run out of your ears. You've had enough Ethics Orders served on you and about you and chits and so forth, and that sort of thing, to last you quite a while! [laughter] And I hope in the process you have learned something about the ethics system.

I also know that you wouldn't quite figure out how you'd get along without it, that it's a very handy thing to have. You possibly can remember when you didn't have any ethics system at all – how gruesome it was. Instructors, for instance, couldn't instruct. Auditors couldn't audit. Everything was a flap and a blow. The D of T was somebody who chased students! [laughter] But now, of course, where we have erred is getting ethics in too heavily on Scientologists and too lightly on the surrounding environment. That's fatal to do it reverse, that way. That's fatal. Too lightly on the environment around us, too heavily on Scientologists.

Now, we ought to do is reverse that and get ethics in, if anything, too heavily on the environment now, [laughter] and err in the direction of too lightly on Scientologists. You got it?

So I'm sort of turning the cards on you in this talk. Because there isn't any point in getting ethics in on a willing person. He's perfectly willing; he's trying to do his job. So he's stupid! Well, I assure you that it does no good whatsoever to get ethics in on somebody because he's stupid. None whatsoever! It doesn't do a bit of good. Just kind of makes him sullen. [laughter, applause]

The purpose of ethics is to get out of the way willful mopery and dopery on the high seas. In other words, this guy *intends* to knock it apart. This guy *intends* to knock you down. You should upgrade your idea of what an SP is. Man, meet one sometime! A real one! A real monster. And of course, him, you just – hang it around his neck, man. A real one! But a real SP is not just a difficult person. He's only about two and a half percent of the human race and he's utterly nuts and he is the guy who has been putting people in sanitariums and busting up lives and making nervous breakdowns and that sort of thing. That's a real SP. When those show up inside Scientology groups and so forth, of course, shoot them!

But you don't have somebody that's been around three years and has been doing quasi all right and has a lot of trouble with his mother-in-law, turn up suddenly to be an SP! See, SPs are real. They're real monsters.

Now, upscale, upgrade your idea: what's an SP? What's he do? You know?

Of course, you're probably a bit adrift on what they do and what they look like and what they sound like. Well, one of the first things, has this guy driven people into sanitariums, you know? Is this bird strewn nothing but wreckage around him, whether material or personal wreckage? You know, I mean, you know, social wreckage? Wrecking lives and families
and smashing things up in all directions? And is he willfully depressing the living daylights out of statistics and going all over the place?

Well, in all the time we've been around here we only had one SP that I know of. One real SP that was on staff. And he got the tech statistic right out through the bottom of the graph. He was denying everybody in the place auditing. And all the time he was protesting 100 percent. Now, whether he was SP or PTS I have not made up my mind to this date because I haven't investigated the case enough. But we were certainly better off without that person. And I don't know of another single SP that we've ever had on staff. Isn't that interesting? You see all these SP orders and so on.

Well, you take an S&D. You take an S&D. Maybe the person is being suppressed by somebody else, but maybe the person merely makes them unhappy, he's not driving them into a frantic state, don't you see? Find the real SP in the person's life. You know, a real one. Don't throw it around carelessly, because this is an – a very exaggerated condition, SP. They can look very nice, they can sound very nice, but actually you can tell one about – usually tell one a long way away.

You hear the sounds of conflict and you see the strewn wreckage long before you see the SP. Now, err by all means in getting ethics in on the environment outside Scientology. Err by all means in getting it in too heavily, because the only mistake you can make is getting it in too lightly. That can be a bad error. It's the error we're making right now with this very tiny group that is dashing around to governments and trying to knock our heads in. That's the error we're making right now. We're getting in ethics too softly – not fast enough, not hard enough. That is the mistake we're making. Well, we will go ahead and we will remedy that. I trust we are in time, without causing another big kerfuffle, do you see. But fast and hard.

Now, out in the perimeter outside Scientology; don't stand around and worry about whether or not you're going to make a mistake on what person or which. Don't worry about that. Just get ethics in. And then if you find out you've gotten it in wrongly, why, correct it. But get it in. But amongst Scientologists, why, you better be pretty careful. You better be pretty careful. After all, the guy is perfectly willing, after all he's with us and he's trying and so forth. That's why you saw me get a Board of Investigation in lieu of a Committee of Evidence.

Now, of course, the Board of Investigation just was to find out the facts for Ron in a state of confusion or upset. I didn't put in it that they should also find the facts out for Ron as to how come the Affluence happened, see? I've got to rewrite that policy letter by adding this in to its purposes. But it's seldom ethics matter. Seldom an ethics matter that you really run into.

Now, of course, the Board of Investigation just was to find out the facts for Ron in a state of confusion or upset. I didn't put in it that they should also find the facts out for Ron as to how come the Affluence happened, see? I've got to rewrite that policy letter by adding this in to its purposes. But it's seldom ethics matter. Seldom an ethics matter that you really run into.

Now, I know tomorrow, you Instructors and executives are going to be faced with a total revolt. [laughter] Well, all I invite you to do is – just raise your own ability to handle people. Learn to be persuasive and cajole, and so on. Because those are techniques, too. If you think you've got to write and send out an ethics order, why, send out an ethics order, but it's pretty serious, you know? It has an awful recoil.
But getting ethics in on the planet, the first grasp on that – oh, it'll probably be a gradient, but it better be a fairly steep gradient and better be done fast while we've still got a planet. I don't like billiard balls!

Now, how are we going to do this? Well, I couldn't tell you at this particular time. Probably OT technology. But I can't tell you exactly what that is at this time. Because first I had to find out what we were trying to do.

Well, you would just be surprised at how marvelous it was to find out that the organization could exist and continue and go on without me. That was great. That meant I really had built it up well. That was why I was then perfectly willing to stay away, but after I found that out was when I first started asking the question, "How am I going to get out of here? I'm popular I have tremendous numbers of people depending on me now. How do I get out of here?" Well, I got shot from guns, fortunately, in the nick of time.

And the other thing was, is could you make more Clears? Wow! Wow! And made number twenty-two just to celebrate my coming home. [applause]

Now, of course, I have the immediate program of polishing meself off; which I'm doing at a great rate of speed now. Everything's fine. I don't need any bits and pieces left around to experiment with in case you don't mention it. I found out, by the way – I found out, by the way, why people don't make it, is nobody actually ran, sometimes didn't rehab but mostly didn't run the release grades from 0 on up to V. Sometimes they had Grade V Processes and then should have gone back to Grade 0 and then go on up again, skipping Grade V this time and gotten to Grade VI. Then you'd find out the case would run well. But cases that aren't running just aren't properly released on the grades. That's the simplicity of that. No more fancy material is needed. There wasn't any necessity to change anything around, and so on. So I'll just go on and finish it off. And then of course I start the real research, which is OT. And we have quite a few volunteers in this particular… [laughter]

And we've already had our first lesson. Already I've handed out the first piece of information. I had Reg and Jenny and we were in some God-awful airport of Bugawugaville or something like that, flying back. I was very fortunate, the only reason I could possibly get out of there in the time I did, is because Reg and Jenny flew in on Wednesday. I only had three days, you see; something like that. And Reg and Jenny knocked all the baggage together and so forth, and onto the airplane we went and out.

But anyway, at Bugawugaville or some such place, they started asking me questions about something or other, so I gave them a scale. And it's an OT scale. Has to do with knowledge and perception and so forth. It's a create scale actually. And when we reached London airport and all of you were waiting, patiently or otherwise, they stopped me and told me that I hadn't been vaccinated, so I had to be vaccinated. But in the process – in the process of getting vaccinated… You see, I'd already given them this idea of the scale and so on, but in the process this girl simply sat there with a line of about fifty people she was going to take care of before she sent me into the vaccination room to get vaccinated. She didn't sit there long! Reg put a beam on her and she went into the office. Bang! She was kind of cross with me afterwards. [laughter] Her self-determinism, if any, had been totally overwhumped.
But that shows you how dangerous it is. He'd had just a ten minute lecture in one elementary scale, you see, on OT and there went the vaccination clerk. [laughter] But OT is something one moves up into. It is not a state of Clear. And gradually all Clears are starting to move forward and they move on up and they gradually develop this and that and they feel themselves getting a bit bigger and they start resolving some of the things that they're worried about, you know, about what's MEST and so on. There are faster ways, however, to do this. There are faster ways and we will find those faster ways. And when we've found them, of course, why, then we can get ethics in very nicely, providing we have an OT base from which to get it in from.

Now, I'm not sure whether the OT base is England or the Middle East or the Mountains of the Moon. Or the moon! I've studied it no further than that. I know what the society needs. I know what the society responds to. I got my data. We're making Clears. Our organizations are functioning; they're very functional. Life looks pretty smooth. The abilities of a being are at this moment only hinted at. And so I have to go forward into all of that.

It's very interesting, by the way, that every time I try to put together the scope of OT, I have to take it off as invalidation. No matter what extravagant statement you make about an OT and the capabilities of it, it is an invalidation. Isn't that a wild thing?

Well anyway, I won't – I won't tell you about this again. Usually old soldiers and people who have had campaigns of one kind or another sit around for ages and ages talking about how they were at Malta, or this and that. And I won't do that to you. I won't keep saying, "When I was in Rhodesia..." [laughter]

I will just take it from here.

It was so funny though. It was so funny to get back and not really be back. You know, you shocked me into realizing where I was, you know, but still things weren't too bright and shiny until Bonwick took me around and showed me the place. You know, showed me what he'd been up to, and what you've been doing and so on. And when we got that... I came into PT and writing the reports, you see, about Rhodesia has been an awful chore ever since, because I laid it off I said I would tell you about it, write some reports about it, got to submit some reports concerning it, and so on. But to me, right now, it's not very interesting.

I came up to present time; Saint Hill looked awfully good. I'm much more interested, much more interested in beginning to get ethics in on those people we ought to be getting it in on with great speed so we can get... And maybe we've entered the first gradient. Maybe we get ethics in just on a simple gradient. It occurred to me the other day that we might be able to just get ethics in on the planet on a simple gradient, just like we're going right now with the technology and so forth, so on. After all the first point of attack that we're making is one of the heaviest newspaper groups in the United Kingdom. Pretty fabulous.

Now, anyway, there's my adventures in Rhodesia. And the tale of a fellow who went out to conquer a country, to find out what he needed in order to conquer a country. And what application Scientology had on a planetary basis and how and where and what to operate from. Got all those questions answered now. All I've got to do is polish meself up, get things lined up a little bit and make the next move. You see, you just got through running me totally out of technology. [laughter, applause]
So anyway, I've got a long job ahead of me still, and I'll still have to stick around; I can see that now. And I'm sorry if that's bad news. [laughter] But I apologize for not giving you all the lectures you have missed. I will try to make up for it in quality in the ensuing weeks. I've got me 'at jammed solidly around me ears. And we've got an awful lot to do.

But I want to thank you very much for keeping the show on the road, for making the Clears, for making the affluences and for keeping everything going while I was gone. And I'll do the same for you next time.

Thank you.
DIANETIC AUDITING

A lecture given on
21 July 1966

Thank you.
Thank you.
Thank you very much, that's a nice welcome.

Well now, today we're getting down to business. We're getting down to business, and this is the 21st of July 1966, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, a lecture on Dianetic auditing.

I go away, and right away everybody forgets how to audit. No, the processes today are so fast, they're so rapid, that an auditor cannot be trained. That's it. I mean, it's as simple as that. I recognized this some time ago, and back in April wrote a bulletin which covered this which has actually not been put into action yet and which is being put into action right now, and I think went into action at 2 – 2:00 P.M. That's it. Ron's back. [laughs]

All right. The main thing about this is that if auditors can't audit, why, then no auditing gets done. Now, that's very, very horribly true. And then nobody will make it up the line at all. And it's also factually true that our first Clears are uniformly good auditors. But today I turned a pc over to an auditor, and he didn't know enough to flatten the process. Pc went unconscious so he changed the process. Huhoo! That's awful. That's awful. Don't do things like that!

So the guy goes unconscious. All right. Get your question answered. So a pc says he can't answer the question, just sit there till he does. If a pc has no more answers and so forth, the process probably went free needle and you didn't notice. It probably is already squared away. But don't just change a process because a pc went unconscious. Do you see? These are the little truisms of auditing.

Man to man and man to girl I make a plea: Follow the fundamentals. Get your auditing question answered. It's a plea. Don't change processes because the pc goes out like a light. Don't panic; don't be a psychiatrist.

Now, if goofs like that can occur, it's because one doesn't have enough drill. But drill just on the TRs is not adequate to produce the whole of auditing phenomena for the auditor, and so he doesn't get used to handling them and he – it's like a greased ball in his hands, you know? Like, "Let's see. It said in the bulletin that the next thing I huh-hah-and-yeah, and I hope that's right." And the pc goes Release – and so he says he gets no more practice with that.
Well, I can assure you Dianetic auditing carried on this way is not likely to release anybody very rapidly, and if it does, it only releases him on a chain. If you get any Releases in this, they're subzero Releases – way down.

Now, I have made Releases with Dianetic auditing, and so on, and they were the first Clears. It's not too hard to do. But of course, they were simply Keyed-Out Clears which today we call Releases. Those people remained stable or didn't remain stable or something of the sort, but it completely changed their lives. The trouble I had in those days was the person felt so good – and there was no training, of course, pre-50 – they just walked away. I kept tabs on them for some years from time to time but somebody stole my book and I don't have any idea what happened to them. But I can tell you that these people were in much better shape. They really weren't up to a Grade 0 Release but they were certainly in much better shape. Something had happened.

So there's value in this type of auditing. But I wish to make you another plea: is don't go out and use it in practice. It's practice auditing. Don't practice with it on people. Because all sorts of disastrous things will occur If you become an expert Dianetic auditor then we're all in trouble because we will start curing everything, you know, and knocking out psychosis and neurosis and doing all those poor doctors out of their jobs. And you don't want to do any doctors out of their jobs. [laughter]

But I say this in all sincerity, this leads you in to the fact that you can heal, and that is not your profession. You're trying to clear people, and these processes will heal people, even badly run. They'll cure migraine headaches and arthritis and lumbosity and medicosis and all kinds of wild illnesses. But it doesn't necessarily follow that it's uniform. In other words, you don't get one for one for one, you see, for the excellent reason that the whole reactive mind is the reason for very severe illnesses. It's the whole mind. And you can key out parts of it and make somebody quite well, you see. You can key out some very specific illness like that and have it go away but it – don't be too surprised if it comes back. So therefore, "cure" is a – is not well used. It's ill-advised as a word.

The way to make somebody well is to make a thetan Clear, and just never, never depart from that and you'll be fine. But you do need practice – I'm not – don't use "you" broadly, but you as an Instructor, you as a Scientologist and the new student all need some process which doesn't produce an instantaneous result. And then you get so that you can handle ARC breaks and you can handle a comm cycle and you can do this and you can do that. And you get practice. You can sit there and grind away by the hour, don't you see? You can use a meter; you can fool around with this and that and so on. You could go on a project like cleaning up all the engrams of the last three lives. Well, you're not likely to release anybody doing this but it's awfully interesting – great interest to the auditor, great interest to the pc. You might change some things; you might improve somebody. We're not interested in that particularly. But it's quite rewarding, quite rewarding for the pc, but we're only interested in the auditor in this particular case, you see?

Now, the auditor will get so that he knows that a pc who is being critical has got a withhold. And he knows enough to get his question answered. And he knows enough not to
overrun. I mean, the pc completely runs out of answers. Well, you should recognize that the pc has done so and it isn't just a dodge. He's not a very imaginative pc.

You say, "Where did you put the cat?"

And the fellow says, "In the living room."

Now, there's no point in now saying, "Where did you put the cat?" because there aren't any more answers to it. And sometimes you get into this squirrel cage and you must recognize these things.

But the way to learn how to audit is to get your hands dirty and the dirtiest you can get your hands is going down the reactive bank on the time track. Now, there aren't any bugs in Dianetic auditing; there aren't any bugs in it. They've all been ironed out. Even visio – there is a way to turn on somebody's visio so he can see the picture. There is a way to do this. All you do is get the duration of the incident and if you get the exact duration of the incident, the boy will have visio in it. It's the most remarkable thing you ever saw. So you'd have to know how to get the duration of an incident.

You know, if he was being hit on the head with a sledgehammer, you have to know if he was hit on the head for one minute or five minutes or one day, you see? All right, if you get the correct time on your meter and so on… This fellow, it's all black – this case is a black five; he's never seen pictures or anything like that – if you get the exact point where he's parked on the track with your meter, and then you get the exact duration of the incident, bang, he has visio. Startles him most to pieces. That's what used to chop us down in running engrams, and so forth.

Well now, one has to go into this from the most basic and elementary possible ways; the most fundamental fundamentals have to be gone into to teach somebody something about Dianetic auditing. Now, there is a book on the subject, Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health. But to give you this practice material I have condensed Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health into HCO Bulletin 3 April 1966 which is one, two, three, four, five pages long.

You get brighter as you get older, you know, in the process. And I wish to point out that HCOB 3 April 1966 is a far simpler and better method of running secondaries and engrams than Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health. So, if you're reading this and read Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health, realize that this bulletin written sixteen years later takes precedence. You got it?

Now, there's a lot of dope in Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health, but it runs engrams quite differently; it runs them by repeater technique, it runs them by phrases, it does all kinds of things, and so on. Whereas this doesn't run them by repeater technique and run phrases. Now the main danger that you run into, then, is not really reading what it says in this bulletin and actually trying to run Dianetics secondaries and engrams the way it is described in Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health, you see? You let some of the old Dianetic technique get into this bulletin and you will have to that degree just this much trouble.

Now, a Dianetic session today would look like a repetitive auditing session with this single exception: that it takes longer for the pc to answer the question. If you tell him to go through it and tell everything that has happened, and so on, that is an auditing command, but
it may take him five minutes to answer it. And I – the only danger is, is I don't want you to pick up the idea that your pc ought to gab, gab, gab on Grade 0 processes, and so forth, any more than it takes him to answer the question. We don't want the pc continuously itsaing.

Well now, he isn't continually itsaing. He's told you – you tell him to go through it and say what happened. And when you tell him this, why, he then goes through it and says what happened. When that finishes off why, you give him a final acknowledgment.

 Sometimes he gets scared or lonesome and you have to give him an "Uh-huh" to encourage him, but this is a sort of a half-acknowledgment. If you give him too many of those, he'll start talking to you obsessively because he feels that he's got more to say and you've already acknowledged him. So get your half-acknowledgments really half, you know – "Uh-huh," you know? "Uh-huh." Don't say "Good!!" you know? Now, if you really want to start him talking, just do that to him a time or two. Then he'll feel that you're stopping him from talking, and so he will then talk more and more and more. These continuously talking pcs, where the auditor never has a chance to get a question in edgewise, have either been trained in the field of psychoanalysis or the auditor is overacknowledging and the pc is trying to get past that acknowledgment.

So anyway, you've got a lot to learn about auditing, and it's about auditing that you are learning while you're running Dianetic auditing. But to use Dianetic auditing at all you have to know something about Dianetic auditing.

That brings us back to a subject called the human mind. Now, there was a fellow one time called Sigmund Freud, and Sigmund Freud started out on an adventure in hypnotism with a fellow by the name of Breuer to explore the entirety of the human mind. And he explored it down to a light lock at three years of age and figured out he had done the whole works.

That's something like looking at a mountain, telling everybody you have found the entire mountain because you now are holding a pebble. See, a little pebble came off the top of the mountain or the tip of a blade of grass growing on the top of the mountain, then you'd say that's the whole mountain, you see?

But he had this occasional experience, that after he had let somebody chatter for a while he would find some kind of a childhood experience of some kind or another – and maybe that was his own case he was running, who knows – and he would – he would take some charge off of this, and all of a sudden the person would feel a little bit better and then he would be told, "Now if you are very, very careful for the next thirty years, you will not be neurotic anymore."

That was psychoanalysis – 1894, he released the libido theory saying that all life is based on sex. Now that is maybe an unkind statement with regard to the libido theory – libido for love – but nevertheless that was it. Later-year psychoanalysts had an awful lot of trouble trying to explain away this and say that what Freud really meant was that life was based on social things as well as sex. But Freud didn't say that. He said it was based on love.

Now, this guy Freud, in spite of all of that, was a sharpie, and he did discover that there was possibly some coordination between mental reaction or mental experience and psy-
chosomatic illnesses or illnesses – physical illnesses stemming from the mind. He discovered that there was this relationship, only he didn't have any proof for it, and how medicine has gone on believing it ever since has got me staggered. Because he couldn't do it one for one. So of course, therefore, it was not really proved.

But medicine today believes there is such a thing called psychosomatic illness. You understand? They think there are physical illnesses that stem from the mind. Well now, how they know this, I don't know. Because, you see, they've never proven it, because they can't take somebody's lumbrosis and get away with it by doing something with the mind. You follow? But we can. So it's quite factual that physical illness can result from mental aberration.

Now, we're not much interested in the vagaries of neurosis and psychosis and all that sort of thing. Let somebody else worry about these, or use more basic processes. Or if you got a psychotic, put him someplace where it's nice and quiet, and where he gets something to eat and nobody disturbs him for a long time, and where he feels safe. And let him look at a motionless object that has some mass as the common thing for him to do, and you will find out that he generally will come out of it.

As far as neurosis is concerned, neurosis is – the difference between neurosis and psychosis is that psychosis, the guy is just generally the effect of everything, and in neurosis, why, he's more or less singly the effect of things. It's – he's a deranged being on some subject.

Now, all of this is very easy to say today, and it's very easy to cover. If you want to know more about it, read – read some things about – on psychoanalysis and so forth. Good practice for you to do so. Nobody is trying to make a psychoanalyst out of you but it might – you might be curious about it. You won't find very much there, and knowing Dianetics you will read far more into what you are reading than was ever there. They didn't know what was there.

Now, let's get into this subject called the mind. The mind is a record, a literal record, of experience plotted against time from the earliest moment of aberration until now, plus additional ideas the fellow got about it, plus other things he may have mocked up or created on top of it in mental mass, plus some machines, plus some valences. Joe Doakes is a monster, Joe Doakes beats him up, therefore Joe Doakes is the winning valence, and after that he can keep a valence called Joe Doakes. Got the idea?

Now, it's just those pluses. But all of those pluses – you can audit almost any of those things. The least profitable is to audit the machines. It's very often a lot of fun to audit a machine. When I say a machine, I mean it has wheels and smokestacks, and so forth. And every once in a while a thetan has got a machine parked out there. This isn't very uniform, but you have to comment on it. You have to comment on it.

Now, valences are interesting because they make circuits, and these circuits will talk to the being. He can talk to them and they talk to him. Oh, he has a ball. And very, very disturbing, this idea of circuit. This gave the Arab his psychotherapy. And the Arab psychotherapy was to chase out the demons, and what he was really talking about were these valences.
Now, the auditor can actually talk to the pc and get the pc to talk to the demon or the
valence, and have the valence talk to the pc – talk to the auditor. It gets that complex. What it
is, an endowed life object.

Now, when we say record or when we say mass and so forth, we are speaking of men-
tal mass. A thetan is quite capable of mocking up mass. He actually is quite capable of mock-
ing up matter, energy, space and time. He's quite capable of doing this, only he mocks it up in
a very – in his aberrated, wog condition, he mocks it up in a very thin – very thin indeed. Its
proportionate weight would be terribly slight compared to the real objects which he is mock-
ing up a picture of. He mocks up a picture of a car; his picture of the car would probably be
one-hundred-billionth of a gram would be the total weight connected with it, and the car
weighs two tons, you see? But nevertheless, he can mock up a full picture of a car in his aber-
rated condition. When he gets better and when he's no longer sick or human, and so forth,
why, of course, he can mock up a car. But that's beside the point. We're getting off into more
advanced therapies now.

Now, here's the score with regard to the mind, then. For auditing purposes, it has these
valences and that's what you are working with when you do what's called a Search and Dis-
covery or an S&D. You're not working with mental image pictures; you're working with va-
lences. You're trying to find the valence that is raising the devil with him. Every once in a
while you miss because he is the valence that is raising the devil with him. Sometimes, if you
wanted to really do a profound S&D that went the whole track, you'd say, "Who are you?"
You'd possibly even get a suppressive. But that'd be a very, very fundamental S&D.

The psychiatrist and the psychoanalyst more and more began to try to address what the
person was creating, and they began to consider that everything there was there, it was what
the person was creating. I said there's the things the guy mocks up in his mind, you see. Well,
so they addressed the things that the person had himself created, and they are not very aberra-
tive. They're the lightest of aberrations.

So the fellow says, "I think the room is full of Martians," and their immediate therapy
is "You're just imagining it." You possibly, through accounts of hospitals and that sort of
thing, know that that is the standard response. Well, that's because they're addressing the illu-
sion or the unactual. They think the unactual or the illusion is what is wrong with the person.

Actually, what is wrong with the person is that he is producing illusion and you want
to find out why he is producing illusion; then you have to get down to the cause of the pro-
duction of illusion. Not, "Oh well, you're just imagining it, Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones is crazy; he
thinks he's prime minister, see? He thinks he's Napoleon," and so forth. Illusion.

So the psychiatrist attacks illusion and he's trying to get rid of that. And that is some-
thing that you neglect entirely. You're only interested in experience. He would have gotten
much further had he actually attacked experience.

Now, sometimes a person gets delusory after they've had an experience. This is per-
fectly true. But you'll find out that that is a minor problem, because as the person confronts
the experience, he will lose the illusion and get the actual experience. Illusion is a surface
manifestation which disappears when experience is consulted. So what you are doing is audit-
ing – with Dianetic auditing – you're auditing experience. Now, don't get all clouded up about
is it illusory or isn't it illusory or wah-wah, you know, this or that or the other thing. No, just skip that.

Now, you've got processes, advanced processes, that handle valences. Those are by assessment and they're summed up today in Search and Discovery. If you want to change somebody's personality graph like that, why, audit a few valences, because the personality graph is actually a picture of a valence on any human being. He himself is not really enough there to have a personality. He's very subdued.

So, we take that out of Dianetic auditing. We take machines out of Dianetic auditing; they're fun but they don't do anything. You think I'm just joking probably about these machines or you think it'd be some little object someplace like that, but actually – actually every now and then you will run into one that's got great big red flywheels and brass – a body, you see, and little whistles and things and it's something that produces predictions for him or something like that. It shuffles them out to him, you know? It's crazy, man. These people aren't insane. Their perception has to be much better than the average in order to perceive that they have these things.

So, we're going to neglect that and then we're going to neglect illusion. Now that – you must remember, you must neglect illusion in Dianetic auditing. That's very, very important, because illusion is simply the product of the actual. And if you attack illusion, you prevent him from reaching the actual. Now, the actual is so bizarre from a viewpoint of a human being, it is so strange, so weird – the actual is – that of course, people are all too prone to call the actual and the illusion both illusion or hallucination, see?

There are people around who work on the basis of making somebody hallucinate. You know, there's a whole – the whole play dedicated to it called Gaslight. You know, they work on this – guy works on this girl and works on this girl – by changing the actual physical universe, makes her think she's crazy, you see? Till, "Where did you put the staircase, Paula?" And anything that happens, he does it and then he blames it on her and she can't remember doing it. So she thinks she's gone mad. So therefore, she thinks she's having illusions, you see, or hallucinations. So people work on this all the time.

For instance, the newspapers would like you to believe what they print. You only have to read stuff about yourself in the newspapers to know doggone well there isn't a line of truth anywhere in the paper. But somewhere in the human world there was probably some event that had an actuality on which the news story is based, you see? There probably was something. You get down to more solid objects like trains run off bridges, it's easy for them to write something like that because it's at their tone level, you see? Disaster, and everybody messed up and, "We'll sell lots of papers!"

So – but it's remarkable how much illusion they'll even write about a train wreck. There was a train wreck, but what appears in the paper is very often quite different. No, as I say, you only have to read about yourself in the press a few times to then wonder about the story to the right of that story and to the left of that story. You wondered if Senator Snodgrass was even in Washington at the time he made the speech, you see? It's spooky; it's spooky. What a river of lies. So that is the social illusion: what normally, laughingly, is called news.
This is based on old women's gossip. There used to be gossips occasionally who were put in stocks because they said nothing but vicious things about everybody and stirred up trouble for everybody and ran all around doing this sort of thing. And they just made nothing but trouble and told nothing but lies, and so forth. Well, the modern gossip is the newspaper. And if those characteristics were in one human being, that human being would be driven from the community. Why everybody buys newspapers, I don't know. I'm tired of them myself.

But I'm just giving you an example. The newspaper is the illusion of the event. Well, very often a person will get an illusion. You can expect a pc running things to get an illusion of the event. The event was too much for him to confront so he dreams up what it was. Now it's – if you're really running a real engram – illusion will often come off of it. The fellow will start changing his mind about it. Well, for heaven's sakes, don't fix him with the illusion till he reaches the actual! Don't stand around saying, "Well, the last time we ran that – last time we ran that you went off the bridge. Now apparently – now apparently you weren't in the car at all." And yourself, don't be baffled, because the fellow couldn't confront the experience. So he partially confronted and partially dreamed it up, see? The part he couldn't confront, he dreamed up. Now as he audits this, his confront gets better and he sees what it is.

Now a pc quite often will get himself confused because he says, "The mental image picture is absolute, and that is what I see the first time I run it through. And therefore, I am very upset because the second time through, the woman has a red hat on and she wasn't wearing a hat the first time through. So what is this? This then isn't a real experience." Well, it's not for you to evaluate for him. Just put him through it again and he will say, "Oh, I-I guess I never could confront her," you know, or something like this. You get the idea?

So actual experience is at the root of all illusion, and you are not in the business of evaluating the content of secondaries and engrams. That is not the business you are in. The business you are in is the alleviation of the incident – mental image picture of the incident itself.

All right. So what happens in life? A thetan is a busy little bee and he will make a picture of events as they occur and then he clutches these pictures to his thetanish bosom, and wonders why he's so sick. This is not very bright, but he does it. Now he has a great loss. All secondaries depend upon loss. We say secondary, and the reason it's a secondary is because it depends for its charge on an engram which contains pain and unconsciousness. It's secondary. It does not contain pain and unconsciousness, it contains emotion. Any emotion or misemotion may be contained in a secondary but, of course, pleasure and so forth does not make a secondary and it also doesn't make an incident. It doesn't make an aberrative incident because he was so happy.

A person, however, can have a win which is so magnitudinous and so unexpected that it hangs him up forever. He's always going back to this big win, you know? Very often old men will sit around and go over their wins with one another. And it was always amazing to me as a little boy listening to former road agents – which is to say robbers, and who were now very respectable – cattle rustlers, ex-sheriffs, not much difference to choose between them because actually they swapped their hats almost at random, you see – talking about the horses they had stolen and the cattle rustlers they hadn't shot and all of this sort of thing. It was inter-
Interesting to me that their stories never wore out. And while I would find their stories of interest, sitting around as a little tad, I would very soon become very familiar with all of them.

And they would still tell them. And one of them would be talking and the other one would simply not be listening at all but be waiting to talk in his turn. And it was interesting to me that those incidents never wore out. They never desensitized at all; they just were good forever like an unperishable phonograph record. And that is true about pleasure moments, and so forth, is the thetan just goes on with them forever.

All right. So, we're talking then, when we talk about a secondary, about misemotion – grief, fear... Well, you'd – actually it's the old Tone Scale. We got the old Tone Scale from the fact that as you run a secondary, if you run a classic secondary, it will come up from below apathy into apathy and move right on up the Tone Scale in its tones. And it will finally wind up at boredom, and that's the wrong place to stop, because there's enthusiasm just above that. And at that point he doesn't care about it again. But that is a secondary. It's misemotion. The Tone Scale was plotted from the behavior of secondaries under auditing.

But to have a secondary – a moment of loss which is aberrative – an individual must have had an experience containing pain and unconsciousness and that is an engram. An engram is an experience – mental picture of an event of pain and unconsciousness. A person had to hurt, and he had to have gone unconscious to greater or lesser degree – and sometimes they just go unconscious during the center moment of the hurt, but there's always a little unconsciousness connected with great pain – and the mental image picture of that event is the engram.

Now, the word *engram* itself comes from "trace on a cell" – is what it means. And at the time I was first working with this, I was thinking in terms of cellular memory. I didn't know where these things came from – it was way back when – and so I chose a word which was preferably different than other terms being used, and that was the first consideration. Second consideration was that we could define it and say what it did mean. Anytime an individual was hurt, like a faithful little idiot he made a complete record of the event. A complete record of the event was manufactured at that moment.

You'd be surprised how complete it is. Do you know that you could take somebody through a tonsillectomy with a stopwatch? You can even have a doctor there who knows the speed and action connected with a tonsillectomy and have him criticize the quality of the surgeon doing the tonsillectomy. You can move the person right through the tonsillectomy by calling off the time in the tonsillectomy – one minute deep, two minutes, three minutes, four minutes, five minutes. You know, you can get the event and so on, you can put the time in it.

A thetan is fantastically accurate in terms of time. Time is something which a thetan has a good, solid grip on. He has a very, very solid grip. A being does not make errors reactively about time. Analytically he gets confused about time, but right down deep, right down deep he never makes an error about time. He knows reactively exactly when it happened and for how long, but he now is incapable of confronting the fact, so he makes (quote) "errors" while he's wide awake. You ask some girl how old she is, you'll understand what I mean. She sometimes looks very vague.
Very often the person can't tell the date. Well, that's because he doesn't particularly want to confront dates. But if you went at it with a meter, you would pick up the exact date. It is recorded but is unconfrontable. So he records what he can't confront, and that is where he gets engrams and secondaries. I find that very amusing, though. Why would he record it if he can't confront it? If he can't confront it why didn't he just skip it? But the truth of the matter is, he didn't. See, we're only dealing with what is, not what should be, you know?

So, we have a time track, let us say – well, we have a consecutive series of events beginning with the first aberration of the being on through to the present. And the wonder of the E-Meter is, is that as a person is more capable of confronting, the E-Meter will reach just below, to what he slightly can't confront and will give you a read on it. The E-Meter sees deeper than he does. That's very interesting. But the E-Meter doesn't say – see all the way down.

You'll run right straight across events that won't register on the E-Meter but they're improved by auditing, he comes up, and then all of a sudden you'll find the E-Meter is registering on those events that it didn't register on before. That's because they're closer to being confronted. So the E-Meter will register on anything that is close to being confronted, and it reads deeper than the thetan can confront, which is quite amusing.

It's like life is at this level, you see – four feet off the floor – and then we have the E-Meter able to sound a foot deep. See, the being himself can only see this strata four feet off the floor but the E-Meter can see three feet from the floor. See, it can see one foot deep. But that doesn't mean there isn't event between three feet and the floor. See, there's tons of event in there.

But as the being becomes more familiar with his own mind and his own past, and as he becomes more able, then this depth increases. But of course, the four-foot level is now very, very easy for him to confront, the three-foot level where the E-Meter was seeing before is now confrontable by the being himself, and the meter is now confronting to two feet. And eventually the being can confront as much as the meter can confront. But at that time, unfortunately for auditing, the individual is Clear.

Now, therefore, the function of the E-Meter is not a sees-all, end-all seer of some kind or another with a swami-type turban and a big glass diamond. It's just something with a little bit better telescopic sights. It can see a bit deeper than the being himself. Don't feel completely reassured because there is no meter read that everything on that subject is gone. No, everything that is in restimulation that will have any effect upon the thetan is gone. Do you see? So, therefore you can easily unflatten things which you have flat.

In other words, you've gotten something down to a point where it no longer registers on the meter, and you say, "Good, that's flat." Now we go over it again just to make sure, and now we get things reading in it again. I want to caution you about this in auditing engrams, because you can flatten them and you can unflatten them just as easy as scat. So you want to get it down to where you aren't getting tone arm action, you more or less got it.

Now, the mind, then, that is being approached by Dianetic auditing is the mind of event, and the things which are aberrative in that mind are the engrams and the secondaries. They are very often visible through their locks or tiny surface manifestations.
A guy is hit on the head with a hammer. That makes an engram. There's physical pain and unconsciousness in it. A few days later he walks into a hardware store. He doesn't like to be there. He can't tell you why, because he can't confront the incident of being hit in the head with a hammer but there are hammers in that hardware store. He doesn't even see what is restimulating the engram. He just is uncomfortable and he will take a picture of the hardware store as an uncomfortable place.

So you chase a guy down the time track and he has a picture of a hardware store. Well now, you couldn't possibly guess why he has a picture of a hardware store. He might have been hit with a blow – hurt with a blowlamp; he might have gone bankrupt, making a secondary. We don't know why he's got this little picture of a hardware store, because there's no pain and unconsciousness in connection with a hardware store. But with a meter and with getting him to look it over and think it over and look around on the incident, and so on, we could pick up what it was the lock on. Now, the lock is in view and the incident is out of sight.

Now what a person knows about is not aberrative. This in – I've had more people walk in and say, "Oh, I know exactly what it is. My second husband – and he beat me all the time with a club, and I've been in terrible shape ever since." And they go on and on and on and on and on and on. Well, we point out this interesting fact: They know about that, and they have – you're the thousand and first person they have told about that and it hasn't blown yet, which is to say hasn't disappeared, hasn't erased. So obviously, that isn't what's wrong.

Now, it'd be your job as the auditor to discover what was wrong. Now, maybe in actual practice that would be an exercise in finding valences like you know, listing and assessing lists for individuals or things they have known. But we're talking about it from a Dianetic approach. This is the processing we want to work slowly. We don't want any speed out of this process.

We would go on down the line now to find out what was this all about. And this is her second husband and according to her, her first husband was a knight in shining armor. That's illusion.

You know that you could say to almost anybody, "Who – uh – who was..." You notice this fellow is terribly silent, see, and always silent, never has anything to say. So you say to him, "Who is the most talkative person you ever knew?"

"Oh, my Uncle Bill. Oh, he just talked all the time."

"What did he look like?"

"Oh, he was a tall fellow, and he had green hair," and so on. And so on. "He just talked continuously, and he's the most talkative fellow you ever..."

You say, "What's the matter?"

"That's funny. I can't ever remember him saying a word."

He's in Uncle Bill's valence, don't you see, resenting everybody being talkative but he's actually transferred valences. So his valence at the time has now transferred to Uncle Bill's valence. You get a swap.
You ought to try this sometime just for fun. You notice something about a person and ask him who was the reverse. And watch him get all confused and mixed up. You notice this girl is very sad; she's a very sad, moping-type person. "Who's the happiest, gayest, most enthusiastic person you ever knew?" You want to ask her this, see?

"Bessie Ann."

"Well, tell me about Bessie Ann."

About halfway through the dissertation: "You know Bessie Ann was the most sour sourpuss I ever ran into in my life."

They themselves had loses in being enthusiastic in trying to cheer up Bessie Ann. You get the idea?

That's a valence problem which you're not interested in but this comes into auditing because in engrams they sometimes swap valences. And if you want a real tough engram, you will find somebody has been the scaffold, the headsman, the ax, the block, his wife, a little boy in the crowd, an egg, a hen… You've got this incident and the game in running this thing is to find out "What was he?" And if you run it long enough, why, you'll generally find out that he was the guy being beheaded, or he was the executioner. And you'll – you'll run into valences just to that degree.

Now, if an individual is looking at himself in the picture he is out of valence. You can actually briskly tell him to get into valence or just run it; he eventually will.

Now, there is a danger in running Dianetic engrams in that you run too late on a chain. Now, incidents of similar nature, strung out in time, are called chains. Now, let's take the automobile-accident chain – the auto-accident chain. Now, this is a fascinating thing, but the individual will tell you he's been in one automobile accident; when you start checking it over, he's been in three. You have to have the earliest incident on the chain before you really start grinding away.

But you can get too enthusiastic about this and you can work too hard to find the earliest incident on the chain, because unfortunately, even though the psychiatrist doesn't like us to say this and even though the church is quite insulted occasionally, when we mention that their converts have lived before this life, this is one of the first phenomena you run into in Dianetic auditing. And you run into it in everybody.

Now, a this-lifetime address to the situation is recommended, because the number of automobile accidents the fellow has been in may be nearly infinite. He might have been in dozens, hundreds, thousands. In – maybe he's stuck in an incident in a space-opera society where a – where a flying car hits him, you see, and that last truck accident, and so on, is simply hung up on it. But you can't always insist that he stay in this lifetime, because it's very hard for him to do. So he'll skid. But the danger that I'm telling you about is not a danger of him going into a former lifetime, but the danger is trying to erase something that is getting more solid. It is – the reason for that, it is too late on the chain.

There's two mistakes can be made here: You can continue to grind, grind, grind and it's just getting tougher and tougher and harder to do, or you can hit it too lightly and go back
too quickly, and then go back too quickly again, and then back too quickly again without taking enough charge off and the guy will become a – become just a ball. He'll get all messed up.

Let's say we have fifteen automobile accidents, and we can only find the fifteenth. So we take a light pass through it but we get all the charge of it off, and then we go to the fourteenth. We think that is the earliest one now, see? That's what it registers on the meter. And it's a bad thing for you to always be using earliest one and so forth, because you quite commonly have a lot of earliest ones earlier than the one you're running, you see? So it's better auditing terminology to say earlier – the earlier incident.

So you get the fourteenth. You don't know it's the fourteenth by this.

See, you don't know it's the fourteenth yet; you think it's number one. And you go through it but it also behaves in a peculiar fashion, and if you started to grind it too hard, why, you'd be in a bad way. So you find the thirteenth, and here's where you would enthusiastically make a mistake: You just note that there's a thirteenth, note there's a twelfth, note there's an eleventh, a tenth, a ninth, and all of a sudden bu-thuth-thuth! ffft!

What you did is you tried to shoot him down with the same perception as the E-Meter. There's not enough charge off. You should have gone through those incidents. You should have gotten enough charge off of them so that he could go through them and go down earlier on them. Do you follow?

So an auditor can make this error, and it's a very serious error. I give it to you very, very, very severely here as a – as a great error to try to follow down a chain without running what you're finding on the chain, just out of your impatience or the pc's curiosity or something like that. You got fourteen automobile accidents, you better run him through fourteen automobile accidents until you get the first one. Now, maybe in the last two or three at the bottom he'll suddenly jump to the first one; you run that and the whole chain blows. But you can ball him up, man. Do you see?

The area has got too much unconfrontable stuff in it. But the more of these he goes through, why, the more he can confront and the deeper he can go and the more charge, see, the more material he has confronted, the more he is able to confront it, and you finally get him down to where he can confront basic on the chain.

Now sometimes a pc will fool you. And he himself will get so anxious that he skips five, six, seven incidents just in an anxiety to get to that bottom one, you see? And the next thing you know he's glug! He's gone into the glue. Now, a pc gets very confused if you do this.

The right way to do this is to erase the auditing. You don't go back and do what you should have done; you just erase the auditing. Treat the session as an incident. And erase it as a lock, and everything goes back together again rather neatly. And that is something we have almost forgotten how to do in Scientology. Guy has a rough session, right away we want to get him over to Review and get his ARC breaks off and fool about with it and do this and that.

No, you don't have to do that; run the session as an incident. "You remember the beginning of this session? All right, go to the beginning of this session. All right. Rapidly pass
through to the end of the session and tell me the incident and tell me what happened." Do that two or three times. *Pssth!* That's it.

You can erase anything if you're good. But, oddly enough, if you took him through the session two or three times it might gum him up because he's had some earlier, rougher sessions now that you should have gone back to on a chain, and you've got another chain on your hands. [laughter] So you might say you can always go through something once, but if it's a chain, watch it.

So the whole of Dianetic auditing is the tracing of experience. There are thousands of things I could tell you about this. There are tons of phenomena. We probably know more phenomena about Dianetic auditing than any other single activity. And the funny part of it is, all you really need to know — well, I'm giving you data in this lecture which is highly explicit and which is very useful to you, but it's all contained — pretty well contained in HCOB 3 April 1966. Now, if you had this lecture, too, of course.

Now, there's power in this stuff and you can become a drug addict on Dianetic auditing very easily because it is very, very, very interesting stuff. It's the root material of life. I probably from time to time will remember little bits and pieces and give you some more. I just thought of one just now, that's a handy thing to know.

If you get some lifetime in restimulation, run the engram of the death and it'll disappear; the life will desensitize. You get the guy stuck in a lifetime as a sewer cleaner in Paris or something like that, and it's such a degraded life when he at first was telling you he was Joan of Arc during that period. He isn't necessarily wrong about this, don't you see but he actually was jumping to an earlier life and getting it beautifully confused so that he wouldn't have to face the degradation of *that* life.

It's the lives that almost make it are the bad ones — you know, the lives that almost make it — or the lives which are just so degraded the guy can't imagine himself as that kind of a being, and that'll upset him. It isn't really the successful lives. People will run Julius Caesar with the greatest of ease. But they wouldn't like to run Cassius.

People who run Julius Caesar were probably something horrible during his lifetime. You see, they're just like the guy flying around in the incident, and he is the headsman, he's the headman's ax, he's the block, he's the executioner, he's himself, he's the executed person.

Now, you have a lot of fun running stuff like this. You can find out a lot about track, pcs have an awful lot of cognitions, and you may hit some lower levels of Release. But it'd be release by chain. You're not going to get release from the whole experiential track. That's not possible. But you might get a free needle on automobile accidents. And if you do, pull out, man. But then don't stop running engrams. Find some other type of engram.

There is — I can assure you that you're not going to get a total bank release, because those total releases are up there at 0, I, II, III, IV, V, you see, and they're all above this. You're going to get negative releases. Releases on the negative lines. The minus scale which you have on your first Gradation Chart and which should have been repeated on the next one and should — will be repeated again because they're quite vital. Do you know that you can assess —
apparently assess the minus levels and sometimes produce a Release just by assessing them – where the guy is stuck at – but don't keep on assessing after you see a free needle.

But here – here is practice auditing – practice auditing.

Now, somebody will tell you that it's very, very bad to fool about with the mind – very bad to fool about with the mind. But in actual fact any Dianetic auditing is better than no Dianetic auditing. You see, that remark was true about Dianetics. We've moved up into such powerhouse auditing today in Scientology and so forth, that you can perhaps knock a guy around with auditing, but not with Dianetic auditing. The guy will struggle out of a session and so forth.

Now, we used to tell people to come up to present time, and in view of the fact that'll also put him at the beginning of track, there's no particular reason to tell him that. So, the thing for you to do, if your pc is very groggy after a Dianetic session, why, just get him to look around the room. Get him to name two or three objects in the room, and it actually will orient him in PT.

Now, try for light secondaries when you first go into this sort of thing. Well, that's – far as that's concerned, try for what will really be light locks. Try for a little bit more in the way of secondaries. Actually, if you just kept auditing secondaries you'd eventually fall into engrams because it's very funny, the engram lying there and the secondary is visual.

I mean, he can – he can run the secondary, but the engram is too much for him to confront; so we can't run that. But the reason for the secondary is the engram. You say, why is the fellow sad at the departure of his wife? The fellow is sad at the departure of his wife. If he is way over exaggeratedly sad and she wasn't a very good cook, you can't see how this is going to ruin his next hundred years, don't you see? But he's all set to have this ruin his next hundred years. Why is that? Well, it's setting on an engram. It may be sitting on an engram and maybe he was a wife in that life before and got shot. See? Something like that. There's pain and unconsciousness associated with a similar contextual incident. Now he gets this terrible grief, heavy grief type incident and he doesn't know what to make out of this.

This has great value, by the way, auditing of secondaries. There's a lot of tricks associated with this. It takes a long time to audit these things sometimes, but there's a lot of gimmickry associated with Dianetic auditing that you don't really have to particularly know. You sort of fall into it. You start developing it; you start recognizing it, and so forth. Because it's very obvious. But I could take ten or fifteen years off the appearance of any widow by simply running her husband's death. It's fantastic! You wouldn't believe the change that would occur.

There are certain things that you can do that produce remarkable and fantastic changes in a being. There are certain things that you can alleviate. But I give you this warning: If you start using Dianetic auditing to cure up somebody's lumbosis – he's got lumbosis so you're going to run the engram that causes lumbosis, and that is now going to cure his lumbosis – forget it! Every so often you will cure his lumbosis. Every so often you'll have a win. That's the wrong way to go about it because you're validating a down statistic. You're giving him this attention because he's got lumbosis, and he tends to deteriorate as a being.
You want to use this just as you use any other kind of auditing. You should use it just to improve the being – just improve the being. You're auditing a thetan, you are not auditing lumbosis. Now, you're not medical doctors – thank God – not psychiatrists – heaven forbid! – you are people who can make beings totally recover. You have the technology of total recovery of a being, and that doesn't mean a body. And that is so fundamental a truth, that as long as you use any auditing just to make the being better, there you are. All you're trying to do is improve the guy's confront, that's all.

This guy wants to be audited because he's got medicosis – deadly illness! And he wants you to cure his medicosis. I don't think I'd take that on. I really don't think I'd audit him. I'd much rather audit his sister who wants to dance better. Because this guy is down the line in a sort of a cave-in, don't you see? He's going to be rough, he's going to be this, and the other thing. He just – mmmm – entirely different emotional frame. Now, he's going to be very anxious, and he's already told you he had a hidden standard. He's saying – when he says, "Cure my medicosis" – he's saying in essence that, "If you can have an effect upon my medicosis, why, then I will believe in Scientology".

And you say, "Isn't that sweet of you!"

There's an ant over there and you know, I just don't care whether he believes about Scientology or not. In fact, I don't think it'll change any part of human history whether that ant believes in Scientology or not.

Now, if you know somebody who thinks he can be better, I'll happily audit him. But I'm afraid I would be that nasty. I've had enough hidden standards, man! Because let me tell you, his medicosis probably won't alleviate until he's about a Grade V and he's asking me to do it with two seconds at Grade 0. But he's so stuck on a hidden standard that he wouldn't even care that his communication was better. He's just all wrapped up in problems like mad, and so on. Well, there's ways to handle this person. There's ways and means to handle this person, but not as a practice case in Dianetic auditing. This is fun. Why get serious about it?

Now, you yourself as an auditor should know how to run an engram; you should know how to run a secondary, because you yourself in your early career very often burn your finger, cut your hand and you can run it out – phhhh-phhhh-phhhh-phhh. It's very remarkable. You can make burns go down and you can do all sorts of magical things with yourself I wouldn't advise you to do it for some little kid just because he's burned. I'd give him a Touch Assist or something like that. But it's very interesting. Anybody ought to have this experience, but don't burn yourself just so that you can have the experience. To watch a blistered finger go down as you steadily, steadily, steadily on, run the incident out of having burned it. It's quite interesting.

Every once in a while in auditing somebody with these you'll get an awful win – and the last – last thing I want to question you about – one thing I want to warn you about very, very much – is please don't get stuck in those wins! There's value to this auditing; there is greater value to this auditing than man ever before had. This solves the problems that Sigmund Freud was trying to solve. It solves them with spectacularity, man! And compared to Scientology, it's nothing. Don't go getting stuck in a win. Have wins by all means, but don't get stuck in them and suddenly say, "You know, Ron's really got something there. You can
cure people with this. Hey! Woof! Look at that!" [laughter] "Guy had a withered arm. I ran three engrams. His arm grew the normal size. Good God! This is for me!" You go out and collect a whole bunch of withered arms and that's it. [laughter]

The danger of Dianetic auditing is it wins. The road out is the road you have up through the Grades. And it took all this knowledge of Dianetic auditing, it took all the material, it took all the odd observations, it took all those years of work to carve that very thin and now rather ordinary-looking path that works too fast, up through the Grades.

Dianetic auditing was very useful with which to learn the fundamentals about the mind, and that's what I want you to use it for. You will all of a sudden be rather interested to learn about these recorded incidents, and you will become very familiar with this thing called the human mind as you use this in auditing. And you yourself will get a very interesting insight into such things as history, customs and habits of bygone races. You have lots of fun; you get practice in handling pcs, and you might make some minus-grade Releases. You won't even make a Grade 0. Don't expect to. But this is – this is great training – great training. If you were to go out and hang up a shingle with this, you'd get enough wins. You'd get probably 50, 60 percent wins. So what? You're rewarding a down statistic. The guy got sick, so we're auditing him. That's probably what's wrong with him in the first place. He wants attention.

And if you go bog yourself down at this stage of development of Scientology with handling all the sick and the insane of this planet, you will never get anywhere. There are all kinds of people who aren't. Now, somewhere up the line in a century or a millennia or something like that, somewhere up the line the Registrars are going to run out of auditors and pcs. By that time everybody will either be very adept or very disinterested, but wait for such a time as when an organization, to function, must have such pcs. Then – then get into it. Then get into it. You're not strong enough, stable enough or anything else to suddenly take on all the woes of the world simultaneously. I can confront them, but that's no reason I have to audit them. You could just bog yourself down right there.

I've seen more auditors ruin their careers by making a career out of one psychotic. Think of all the able people that could have been made more able while one psychotic was giving an auditor a total failure. Because the reason he was totally psychotic was probably his environment and he wasn't even removed from his environment to audit him, and he gets up two feet and gets knocked back three.

I remember one girl in New York City that – they kept auditing her and auditing her, auditing her. And they'd get her up to anger and she'd blow the household or something like this, she'd get out of there, and they'd promptly blame the auditor because the girl was now angry, and go back and put her into apathy and get the auditor to audit her again. And he would audit her up – or she would audit her up to a point where this girl was in anger, and then the family would blow up because the person now couldn't be lived with and so they'd knock the person back into apathy again. And this went on and on and on and what an awful waste of time. Do you see?

So Dianetic auditing is not for the psychotic, the neurotic or the sick. In spite of the fact that it probably could handle the psychotic, the neurotic and the sick. It is done in this
wise for your practice. You'll have – you'll be able to ARC break people and have other people come along and help the ARC break out, and you will learn all the things you aren't supposed to do, and your comm cycle will get smooth. You'll become very familiar with the mind, and that is why it is being given to you at this particular time.

I have never seen anything really more interesting in the realm of human endeavor and activities than Dianetic auditing. It is the champion of all time; a tremendous amount of fun. It does fantastic things. So there it is, and I hope you'll have some fun with it.

Thank you.
THE CLASSIFICATION CHART
AND AUDITING

A lecture given on 26 July 1966

Thank you.

This is the 26th of July, AD 16.²

Auditing means to listen and compute. It also means to get a result on a pc. And it's done in a subject called Scientology. And one sits down, usually, except in one series of processes, known as the CCHs, and he has a preclear. That is somebody who isn't Clear.

Now, in view of the fact that this person isn't Clear, he has to be handled rather gently because he has aberrations and difficulties. And it requires auditing done in a technical and professional manner which has not departed from standard procedure. You see, they have always had offbeat processing of one kind or another. It has existed since the earliest days of wogdom. There is no reason to perpetuate it.

The psycho-anal-yst – [laughter] I beg your pardon; it's rather obvious pronunciation – he sits down and does something with a person, too. But there is no similarity between what he's doing and what a Scientologist is doing. Now, a Scientologist is trying to make the person better and that is a new idea in the whole field of the human mind. It is so new and novel they think we are terrible because we do not electric shock and execute people.

Our situation does not compare with earlier activities, laughingly called psychotherapy or pure duress, medieval torture, police action and other things which have passed for mental therapy down through the ages. We're not even in the field of mental therapy. We're trying to make somebody Clear. Clear of what? Clear of his reactive bank.

Now, Freud said that man had an unconscious or a reconscious or something of the sort which was subconscious under the underconscious. He thought there was something there and it was inhabited by a beast known as the censor, who kept the fellows from pulling a social faux pas. And when the censor was asleep or nulled or something of the sort by drugs, why, the fellow would do antisocial acts, and that was the whole explanation of the human mind, except it was all caused by sex. I hope you're following me closely.

² Editor's note: From the German transcript it is obvious that in this edition of the tape some part was deleted where LRH makes a humorous remark. Re-translated from German it must have been something like: “...and I am not late – the schedule of Saint Hill is wrong. I think the real reason for this lecture beginning late is that people already know what I am going to tell. It has to do with auditing.”
But anyhow, we are – we are actually indebted to Papa Freud, because he did say out loud that there was some kind of a mind that was kicking back on somebody. He didn't really discover the reactive mind; we did.

Now, clearing somebody is erasing his reactive mind. All that is horrible, bestial and antisocial about a person is actually contained in his reactive mind. But we are also not interested, in a man, whether he's horrible, antisocial or bestial. This again has nothing to do with auditing. Auditing is not a social criticism. If you'll notice, nearly all psychotherapies are involved in social criticism. The psychiatrist exists for the (quote) good of the society (unquote) and to hell with the patient. That is the way he operates.

Now, therefore, we're into a new field. And we know the answers to the way a preclear behaves – not human beings behave; we know the answers to those, too, but who cares. The difference between a good-behaving wog and a bad-behaving wog is so slight as to be undetectable. [laughter]

I've seen dear old ladies ruining their families and driving them straight to suicide and so forth, and being patted on the back on Mother's Day. I've seen some of the wildest social mishmashes. It's all by definition: if you kill a man, why, that isn't bad or good; it's by definition, bad or good. You kill him in war, or you kill him because he deserves it, or you kill him because he's a criminal or – and you're a judge – or something like that – why that, that's good, see? But if you kill him one inch of type outside the statute, and so forth, that's bad, see? So there are good things and bad things, but they both are the same thing. So if you want to get into this morass of social behavior, by all means do so, but don't mix it up with Scientology.

Now, you can tell why a person conducts himself as he does – why a person conducts himself as he does. Good, I'm glad we can. But we don't care, because there is a certain road out. Scientology is a way. It is the road out – away from reactivity, away from aberration, away from identification of A=A=A. And it increases a person's ability and it increases his general performance in existence to a very marked and fantastic degree. And that road out has certain little milestones that you have to pass to get out and we call these, for want of a better definition, we call these Grades.

But there are things called levels. And now, if we look at the Classification, Gradation and Awareness Chart of Levels and Certificates, first one issued, and the modern one which is about to be issued – since the interim issue of early 1966 dropped several points off this chart that were vital to it and made it relatively unworkable, and which won't be dropped again. I came back home in time. Now, the point here is that there are certain points on this that a person goes up toward Clear. And those points have certain definite abilities regained. But these Grades are not really composed of single points – something that you might not have noticed, even you working with Grades – they are not composed of single points.

Now, this is the rough, public rendition – public rendition – and this is not likely to change. This is the public rendition, is Level 0, Communications; Level I – or I should say Grade – Grade 0, Communications; Grade I, Problems; Grade II, Overts and Withholds; Grade III, ARC Breaks; Grade IV, Service Facsimiles. Grade V is in actual fact a whole track Grade, but it is the more innocent end of it. It gets a fellow up to where he can confront whole track. And then we've got Grade VI, which is unburdening the reactive mind, which really is
whole track – except you don't have to address it at either point, which is quite interesting and mysterious about it all.

It sort of drops between V and VI and gets ignored these days but every once in a while a piece of whole track bangs somebody right in the snoot and he doesn't quite know what hit him. And he says, "What was that? I seem to be sitting here in a space car and we seem to be shooting up toward some planet of some kind or another, and we seem to be delivering an atom bomb or something. I'm not sure what. And, ooh, oh yeah. Well, I get it now. It exploded. Yeah. Wonder what that's all about? I guess I've been reading too much science fiction." [laughter] And people should ask, "Why does science fiction have the command on its audience that it does?" They never looked at that side of it.

And then we get Level VII, which contains the materials necessary to totally erase the reactive mind. Now, I want to point out to you that it is really not possible – people will try this, and as we go up the line, the only wreckage we will find is people who have tried to enter this whole problem up in the upper grades, ignoring the lower grades. And that, you'll find, is the main part of the catastrophes. The other part of the catastrophe is simply not following standard technology.

What is standard technology? Standard technology is contained in HCOBs. It actually isn't contained in any of the books of Dianetics and Scientology. Did you ever realize that? Modern technology is not contained in any of the hardcover books, or any of the other books. It's contained in HCOBs, Hubbard Communications Office Bulletins, and there they just run off one after the other. And one of these fine days I suppose we will roll up our sleeves and publish them all in consecutive order, all corrected so that nothing ever corrects anything in the bulletins and make it very, very easy. But we will have to put them probably in about seven or eight or ten different volumes, because there are quite a few of them. But that's standard technology. They're on white paper printed with red ink. If I haven't signed it, it isn't true. And that's standard technology.

Now, because we developed something later, we didn't lose the standard technology of something earlier. The main bugbear of the person studying Scientology was that he – the bugbear was his, not mine – was that he conceived, every time he read something new, that that wiped out all the old. And this concept was brought about on just this one point: that he didn't understand the old that he had read, so he didn't realize that it integrated with the new which had just been issued. And at no time, really, in HCOBs, has the new wiped out the old. There are very, very few corrections.

I remember trying to correct a whole series of processes one time called the R2s – R2-12 (there was R2-10, R2-12). And I corrected all these because they seemed to be just producing havoc. They seemed to be terribly ruinous, and there was only one thing wrong with them: is they made a Release at their grade so fast that the auditor never noticed. He'd start his list, practically and he had a Release sitting in front of him. But of course, he wanted to earn his pay – and that was before we knew about overruns – so he would go on and run it and run it and run it. And for quite a while it'd produce quite phenomenal results, even being overrun. But suddenly, clank! The person would go straight into the bank with it and that was very upsetting.
So the idea of overrun, and how flat is a flat process, and so forth, does require correction in HCOBs. But there is nothing in an HCOB – nothing in any HCOB – that tells you you mustn't audit the pc. You look there in vain and you won't find anyplace in there...  

I've got the Saint Hill Course on running engrams as a practice action and I think you must be having a ball. I think possibly, much to your consternation, you've made a grade of release here or there that you didn't know existed in the lower bands, and that's probably very upsetting. And that was probably what upset Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health auditors. They were probably making lower levels of release which they would overrun.

But I assure you that you can have a release per chain, so don't go dashing off sideways and trying to get out of facing the engram by going release.

He is a "secondary about Mamas" release; that's the grade of release it is, or the level of release.

This fellow is a "light engram" release on the subject of cutting his finger. He's released on cutting a finger. I speak quite seriously. It's just by chains.

Now, I, in the first place, would be the last one to plow anybody in – unless he's a student. [laughter] Now, pcs are people and they're entitled to a break, and they're entitled to rapid gains, and they're entitled to soar and go right straight on up to Clear, and all that. This we know. But that doesn't apply to a student.

You know, in opera they always say that the individual, the opera singer, really never has tonal quality or feeling in her voice until she has suffered. And after some great suffering in life, why, she becomes a great artist. Have you ever heard that? Well, after you've had it a few times, you'll become a great auditor. [laughter]

I wouldn't give anything for an auditor who hadn't occasionally been wrapped around a telegraph pole – but good! Like a pretzel. I wouldn't give anything for an auditor who hadn't had an ARC break while being audited for the next ten or fifteen hours, and going into a sad effect. Then he'd know what it was, you know?

I know this is brutal and even sadistic, but it isn't. It isn't, in actual fact. It's a complete fact. The fellow who's never been overrun on anything – he certainly is never going to be shy of being overrun; it's out of sight of his zone of experience. "Well, I don't know what the pc's all upset about. Of course, I missed a free needle, but what's the pc upset about? Should appreciate it; I gave him an additional fifteen hours of auditing." [laughter]

An auditor isn't worth much unless sometime or another he's audited over the top of a PTP. You actually owe it to yourself professionally, and to wogs and what it's all about, to sit down someday as the pc and just don't announce the fact that you're worried as Punch about a PTP. And of course, you'll get no gains, you'll feel terrible, and so forth, being audited on that.

Now, I'm not advocating bad auditing for the sake of experience. But I am saying that if you do very much auditing, you can't help but get some bad auditing now and then, and it's not necessarily disastrous.

---

3 Editor's note: Another deletion. The missing part, retranslated, is: "It is really good that I came home again. You know, there was a big thing which had to be handled."
I have had some of the lousiest auditing anybody ever heard of. I've been audited by Dianetic auditors who were trained in an Academy which taught only the bubble theory. I used to get away with it by saying, well, I just would do exactly what the auditor said, and this got me through many, many years. But in 1958, I found an auditor who gave me four auditing commands simultaneously, didn't let me answer any one of them, and so forth, and then wouldn't tell me which one I was supposed to answer. It's quite a dogfight. So even that stable datum vanished on me.

I've had some very good auditing and I have had some championship bad auditing. And I'm moving right on up; be checked out here, in a few days, Clear.

Now, what's all this about? It is a command of the thing called the mind. Now, maybe after you're Clear and maybe after you go OT, and so forth, you won't then really care to understand anything about man and just regard him as a sort of an oddity that sometimes gets under your feet. But in actual fact, that's a rather dangerous attitude. You should rather savvy what this character is all about.

There isn't anything – now, believe me – there isn't anything going to help him. Education, psychotherapy with electrodes, brainectomies – that's the new psychiatric operation: they take out the whole brain. [laughter] There isn't anything going to help an aberrated being, I assure you. There is nothing going to help an aberrated being but processing. They can sweat it out educationally, and so forth. Now, I'm talking about his state of case, his behavior, and so forth. Really, you're not going to get anyplace, short of processing.

So you better know that processing is a very narrow, little track – a very, very narrow, little track – bounded on both sides and above and below by a complete mass of improper things that can be done. It would be impossible to list the number of wrong things that could be done in auditing. It would be an infinite list. Every time I'd think I had it all straightened out and nobody could possibly make any additional errors of any kind whatsoever, one would.

So this track called standard technology is a very, very narrow path and it's very easy to stray off of its edges. And one of the ways of straying off of its edges is to forget to handle pcs while auditing them. And I see what has happened here and why we have fallen into not handling pcs anymore. Because obviously, all the ways you handle pcs are contained in the grades of release, aren't they? "So, of course you can't handle a pc's overts if you're running a communication process. Naturally! It'd be beyond his grade. And of course you can't handle an ARC break while auditing a communication process, because ARC breaks, and so forth, are up here at III and IV." And I think that's how you've gotten into it, but you sure have gotten into it.

You can always run an advanced process on a pc, as a rudiment, as something to straighten the case out in a hurry. He isn't about to go release on it. But the day you sit down to audit a Grade 0 – to make and attain a Grade 0 – the day you sit down to audit that person and do not detect or note that he has a present time problem is a day you will have a lose, as a case! That guy isn't going anyplace! You're auditing over the top of a heavy PTP. That present time problem has got him parked right there – bang, bang!

You say, "Is there anything you'd be willing to talk to me about?"
"Well, I have some problems."

"Well, I'm sorry. Can't talk to you about the problems because problems are up here – the problems are up here at-at-at-at Grade I and you're only at Grade 0. So, you have to shut up about that!" [laughter]

Finally, you're running problems and you're grinding on and on and on about problems. And the pc is getting sadder and sadder and sadder and sadder, and he says, "But you're not answering my communications, and you're not acknowledging me, and – umpff – I've been feeling terrible for the last thirty-eight days."

And you say, "Well, yes, but we can't do anything about that because, you see, that's... Grade III and IV is where we handle ARC breaks, and so you'll just have to ha... keep your ARC break until we get up to the grade that it's supposed to be handled at." And of course, the answer to that silliness is the guy is not about to ever get up in grades.

Now, let me tell you something about this chart that maybe didn't come home too completely: is how'd I find this chart? There's one for you. How'd I find this chart? Why is this chart so dead on? This Gradation Chart, so forth – it's quite a trick. It's made up only of those things which you can't audit in the face of. And that is the genus of the chart, and that is the real reason I found the Grades, and why I found the Grades. And I isolated them just as crudely as that. I said, "All right. There are certain things that, if you don't pay attention to them, prevent all progress in auditing. So therefore, they must be the keys to aberration." And that's where we got the Gradation Chart. Clever of me, wasn't it?

Audience: Yes!

People think it's a Gradation Chart so people will take it by a gradient. Well, they're arranged crudely by gradient, but you'd be surprised how long I argued: Was O/W an upper grade from problems or a lower grade? And I finally found out that it must be an upper grade, because a fellow could confront having problems when he couldn't confront having overts, so therefore, that was an upper grade. This was the way the thing had to be rationalized.

But there it was. In all those years of experience – and believe me, there have been a lot of years of experience on this subject; a lot of them – in all these years, only these factors have presented themselves, factors that each one separately, much less in combination, can totally prevent case gain unless given attention, by definition. This is the superbarrier. These are the superbarriers to the track. These are the girders across the bridge that have fallen down sideways.

And what are these things? Well, it's elementary: the things that a person cannot possibly audit up against. If these things are out, the auditor has had it. He can't go any further. And these things are communication, problems, overts, ARC break and service facsimiles. When you've moved the fellow up that far, he can confront something of his own life and background, and so starts moving out onto whole track and moving into the reactive bank itself.

But the things that you cannot audit in the presence of, without handling, are the Grades on that Gradation Chart. Do you see this?
So, of course, if they are the things which absolutely stop any pc's progress, then they must be, themselves, things which desperately require releasing. And when then addressed, I didn't even have – when I finally figured this out and worked this down and split the process. And I knew already about overrun. We found overrun in doing Power Processes. But when those things were audited on a big basis with the pc – such a thing as his overts – when they were audited on a grand scale, I knew you'd get a Release.

So I knew you could have a Communications Release and I knew you could have a Problems Release and I knew you could have an Overt Release and I knew you could have an ARC Break Release, see? Dead easy. Nothing to it. Naturally. The thing had to be that way, because these things were the powerful points in the human mind that debarred all further progress on the part of a case. Well, all a fellow had to do was be worried about his wife. All he had to do was be worried about his wife not meeting him that afternoon, which gave him a problem of "What is my wife doing afternoons?" He comes into session, his tone arm fails to produce action – nothing is as-ising; he isn't coming out of anything – and even starts climbing a bit. He can't answer the auditing commands. He can concentrate on nothing. That's what a problem will do.

Now, this fellow who is in overts: Of course, the fellow can't talk to you – he can't talk. I wonder if you ever realized, though, that talk goes down to the fact that a patient in a hospital gives you trouble as an auditor if the patient is unconscious. An unconscious patient is out of communication; it's just a communication trouble. But also, I'd like to call to your attention that dogs and horses are out of communication. And I don't know how you're going to solve that, but that's your problem today. I'm not worried about it anymore.

But this fellow has committed an overt against the auditor, or against Scientology or the organization. Or he's trying to get away with something – he's got a withhold. You going to make progress with him? Nu-uh. Mm-mm, mm-mm. He's just going to get natterier and natterier, and choppier and choppier, and nastier and nastier, and meaner and meaner. He's not going to make any progress, not one scrap!

I'll tell you a joke. You might not think it's a joke. But do you know that one of the differences of technical accomplishment between Saint Hill and a Central Organization is that a Central Organization very often gets a pc who doesn't intend to completely pay for his service? That much withhold parks the case right there – just stops it!

Now, you take an ARC break – this is the most deadly thing that anybody ever had anything to do with. What essentially is it? It's affinity, reality and communication, break in. What is "break?" Bust. Snapped.

People get to thinking it's because they weren't acknowledged. Please. You see, there is no term in the English language or in Latin to describe this adequately. So the individual's affinity has been cut. And that's Desire – Enforce – Inhibit (the old CDEI Scale: Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit) couldn't be on A, and any one of those actions couldn't cause an ARC break. And – only it would be called an A break.

And R – it would be over- and under-reality. Somebody's busted his reality: "Where did you put the staircase, pal?"
"I haven't any staircase. I never saw the staircase."

"Oh, yes you did, pal. I saw you build it with your own little hatchet."

A reality break, again CDEI – Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit – on reality. Enforced reality, and so forth. What is laughingly called modern education is mostly enforced reality. Hoo-hoo-hoo. Because boy, that reality can be in quotes, too. Boy, can it be in quotes.

So if you want to really ARC break somebody with one of the natural sciences, turn him loose in a physics laboratory as a student with the equipment which is commonly furnished, and try to get him to get an experiment to come out. You know they seldom come out. You normally take the best student (who is the best student because he has an answer book) and then the rest of the students sort of copy it off and fudge it one way or the other, so the amount of paper burned, and the amount of – the weight of the paper equals the weight of the ash plus the weight of the smoke, you see, showing that nothing is ever destroyed, and so on. You get into corny equipment, and so forth, and you get a reality break.

Education quite customarily and routinely breaks somebody's reality and it breaks their reality sufficiently as to make them bad students, or they don't want to study, or something like that.

And then we get into communication break, and of course, that's the most visible. Guy talked too much or didn't talk at all. The guy would not answer the communication at all or the guy answered the communication perpetually so that it couldn't be communicated. Any of those things will cause an ARC break. All right?

Look at that: your first Level, 0, is communication. Level III is ARC breaks. How many pcs are you going to handle at Level 0 without ever colliding with an error at Level III? If C is one of the commonest sources of ARC breaks, you mean to tell me that you're going to handle the subject of communication without ever bringing about or finding an ARC break in the student that has to be handled, huh? Well, like cat, you're not. You never will in God's green earth, really.

There's always got to be somebody around in Review, or some senior student or something like that, to be alert on Level 0 students.

Of course, I know it goes like hot butter, and it – you don't run into trouble very much. But it's that very little trouble that you must also be interested in because it'll barrier your results.

Now, I know you could go on the basis, "Well, after all, there are getting to be three billion human beings, and that's an awful lot of human beings; that's an awful lot of wogs, and there's no reason why we shouldn't expend a few, you see, in the process of salvaging them."

Well now, I'm a conservationist.

Well now, as far as service facsimile is concerned, this fellow is – all this fellow is thinking about, at the problems level, is his lumbosis. Boy, this lumbosis; you can't ever get... Every time you turn around, he's got lumbosis on the brain. His lumbosis is causing him trouble, man. He is just getting lots of trouble from his lumbosis. And then we finally find at Level IV it's a service facsimile. It's what explains all of his failures. He keeps telling you he
wants to get rid of his lumbosis, but really he never said it in that many words; he merely complains about having lumbosis.

Now we begin to understand why we had such a hard time getting a Problems Release on this bird. We managed to achieve it, finally, and we did get a free needle, and so forth, but we were never very happy about it. Well, at Grade IV we find out that he has a service facsimile.

Well, I don't say there is any short method of finding anybody's service facsimile that could be used in general, because we're getting too high in the grades. But fortunately, we're passing above the levels of reality which are real to somebody at the lower grades. And it normally turns up in due course.

This merely turns out to be a pc we have always had trouble with. His rudiments were always out, or something like this. And then we finally get him up to Level IV and handle the service facsimile, and there we go.

Now, at Level V⁴, we're straightening him out on the subjects of reality and several other subjects which are taken up in a package, but what we're really doing is sort of getting the track straightened out. And we're looking for the points on the track where he is terribly stuck, where he's really mired in. And it takes very fancy processing to do that. Now we're getting into very artistic processing.

But I assure you that if this processing, again, neglects these various barriers that can lie across the track of the individual, the guy will be stymied. You say, "Well, yes, he's up to Grade IV – he's a complete Grade IV Release – so therefore, he should never again have any service facsimiles, ARC breaks, overtts, withholds, problems or communication trouble." Oh, you – man, you got the wrong definition of Release.

I wouldn't be a bit surprised – I just wouldn't be a bit surprised but what you couldn't find a whole new series of banks to unrelease a person into. You're dealing with a gross product here called a Release. This is just a gross product, and this is a hopeful product. This is the sort of a product that – solid gold is awfully nice, but all we've got is this gilt. And this gilt very often turns green. And sometimes we have good gilt and it lasts for weeks or months or even years – got some beryllium in it, you know; it's really goodshape gilt – and sometimes it turns green an hour later. And it's not gold at all. It gets verdigris. And I don't know how long a Release will stay stable because I have had rel… I've had Releases before this.

You see, the one thing that booby-trap the whole of research in the field of the mind is that one could produce a temporary state of Clear. Temporary! Just like nearly all of life is composed of lower-scale mockeries. Yeah, yeah, you look around at somebody's exaggerated abilities – exaggerated and fixated, and become just one thing that he can do, don't you see? He's insane. But actually, the thing he is doing is an ability.

Who was this old bird? Jung, I think it was. Jung. Now, thetans can move objects or bust up objects, I mean, when they're way upscale, see? All he had to do was sit down near
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one and it broke up. I think that was Jung. And this worried him so – this worried the guy so, that it was really what he wanted out of his studies and researches was not to have bookcases fall down, plaster crack wide open, armchairs go out splat, every time he came near them. And he never achieved that. Well, actually, that would be a thetan ability gone mad. Poltergeist, or some such thing.

So you get these upper-scale abilities that any thetan would have. They're out of control and unexplained to the individual, and when they occur, why, he thinks he's crazy.

So these lower-scale harmonics include the fact that one can make something that looks just like something but ain't. And that's the big booby trap.

Now listen, it wasn't just a booby trap in 1950 – it was also a booby trap in 523 B.C., on this same subject, in this same line of research. A thetan exterior produced all the symptoms of total sanity – great, whee, marvelous, and so forth. It'd last two minutes, two hours, two days, two years. But the one thing that was certain about it: it wouldn't go on. And the Buddhists called it a bodhi, and a bodhi has the same stability as any thetan exterior would have that you made today.

You can walk up to somebody, pop him out of his head with the magic words and he will be stable for two seconds, two minutes, two hours, two days – your guess is as good as anybody else's. But one thing is certain about it: He will key in again.

Now, release, the way we're doing it now – and you mustn't just downgrade the idea of release and say it's all that unstable, because it has this benefit: accompanied with it has been the experience of overcoming it. And that experience stands one in good stead because it has improved his ability to confront.

Now, that goes further than that: a bit of erasure occurs. Modern auditing is sufficiently good that a bit of erasure occurs along with it and the condition is desensitized. So he is more apt to be stable as a Release on this grade than he was stable, to make a (quote) Clear (unquote) 1950, book style. Do you see?

Now – I now know the difference between me and people that were being taught to audit in 1950. My auditing differed; it differed considerably. And the difference was that when the pc looked like he was finished, why, I quit. I wasn't trying to prove something. I was willing to give the pc a win (let me state it that way, although that's critical). I was so willing to give the pc a win that when the pc would say, "Whee, gee!" you know, and light up like Roman candles and so forth, I would say, "That's it. Good. Fine. Thanks. Goodbye." And they had a tendency to remain stable for some time. Some of those people from back in the late 40s were stable three years afterwards, I know of.

Now, what's interesting here is that we're approaching release on a gradient here and we know what grade of release we're making. And when we were (quote) "clearing" them in the 50s, we never knew what grade of release we were making a Clear at. Do you see?

But this is the thing which booby-trapped the line, was the – the facts of stability. Stability – how long would it last?
Well, being a very thorough fellow and being a very, very thorough research man, and having been at it for a very, very long time now, I got the idea finally that it must be a totality. If we were going to have something that was a near absolute in the way of Clear, then we were going to have to do a near totality of erasure. And for three years I worked very, very hard to find out what you totally erased and so today we get a Clear.

Now, we've known for a long time that a thetan made up his own bank, but telling him so didn't get him over it. And we've just found out again that telling him so didn't get him over it, too. Even when he's almost Clear. We say, "Hey, you're mocking it up," and he'd say, "Hey, am I mocking it up? Yeah, I am mocking it up." And he'll go Clear – pshew! – and he goes off that bottom step that isn't there, you know? And he's got to go back on and finish it up the way he should. It's got to be his cognition.

So once more the making of a Release and so on is very, very worthwhile – man, man, man – because it's on a plotted line, and the fellow has raised his confront, he's released – being released in a proper sequence, he's getting accustomed to things that have been ruining his life, and would ruin anybody's life. Because let me assure you – once more I repeat – anything that will stop auditing would ruin somebody's life, because auditing is pretty hard to stop. Our process drills and that sort of thing are themselves intensely valuable therapeutically. I know some people, every time they felt bad, they'd go out and do their TRs.

But this achievement was bringing it up to the top of a totality of erasure. And being a very thorough sort of chap, why, I said, "All right. Then the answer to it is a total erasure." And of course, you can make a total erasure of the reactive bank, only nobody had ever done it before, from the beginning of the universe on. So there are a few little tricks involved in it. It takes a little while.

But that's a head-on collision with the thing. That isn't just backing out of a desensitized area and being free of that desensitized area. Man, you could plunge into a nonexistent bank all you wanted to and you wouldn't find anything there to get stuck in. So that is a Clear. So a Clear is a stable state.

But Clears – Clears follow the rules of life until they themselves have changed their minds concerning the rules of life, and when they do that, of course, they're OTs. Probably very, very advanced to tell you a thing like this but I've been, of course, researching OT processes. And I find out, oddly enough, that the OT processes are the har… upper harmonics of just those processes – except they're not processes. That's another story.

Now, wherever an auditor is auditing, there are only certain things that are going to prevent his achievement of success. There aren't 8,965 of them. There's only this little handful – this very, very small handful. And you better not go multiplying the number of things that can get in your road, because then you're putting you in your road. And you know the hardest thing in the world for a thetan to get around is himself.

Now, the things that you cannot neglect or ignore in auditing, regardless of the grade of the individual, are communication factors, problems (particularly PTPs, notably), overts, ARC breaks, the fact the guy is getting paid, some fashion or another, for his aberration or service facsimiles. And those things will always get in your road. And he might have gone
somewhere else on the track than where he is supposed to be at. And the upper harmonic of that in OT is the guy is no longer in the room; he's gotten bored.

But here are elementary things, and of those, the first four are the most vital. That is, communication, problems, overts and ARC breaks. Now, you're going to neglect those? You're not going to audit.

What are the symptoms that a person with these things displays? Well, I'm not going to stand here and give you some long, authoritative list, because they are numerous. The indicators of these things are numerous. It's something like my explaining to you – and they're obvious – something like my explaining to you that that sign up there that is one mile long and a half-mile high, painted a glaring white and lit with the totality of atomic fission and power from half the world's searchlights, with the red letters on it c-a-t, spells *cat*. That's the way I feel after a while. You know, I feel like I'm just beating a dead horse, you know? It's wild.

If I say, "Look, you cannot process somebody unless you're in communication with him." An auditor, half an hour later, realizes the pc hasn't answered any of the auditing questions and goes and sees somebody, a Case Supervisor or somebody, and says, "I don't think the process is working." Process be damned! The auditor isn't.

The carrier wave of all processing is communication. So if your pc doesn't feel like talking to you, you're not going to get anywhere. I mean, how elementary can you get?

Now, let's say we're doing a service facsimile at Grade IV, and the pc isn't talking. Well, we say, "He can't possibly be not talking, because he is a Grade 0 Release." Well, let's just say he wasn't released on you. It just so happens he isn't talking that day, and until you get him talking, you're not going to get any auditing done.

Now, you see what I mean about the mile-long sign a half a mile high, with – painted white with the letters *cat* on it in red. I mean, that's so obvious. How could I possibly ever have to tell anybody that? And yet, time and time again, I go through and I see a bunch of sessions happening, and I see this pc isn't talking and that pc isn't, and that one and that one. And I find about a third of the pcs in the room aren't talking to their auditor.

It's not my hypersensitive, supertrained brain at work. My brain doesn't work, as a matter of fact; that's probably why we got someplace. You'll see the pc, and the pc – he should be sitting here, you see, talking to the auditor, you see? And you see the pc like this: ... [silence] And you hear the cheery voice of the auditor, you see, saying, "All right. Ah, let me have the next item."

And the pc: "...Cats."

He don't hear this auditor say a thing, you know? You never hear the auditor say, "What's up?" You know, "What's cookin', mate?"

Of course, the auditor would probably ask me, "What are the proper words to use in a state like that," see? [laughter] My answer, I'm afraid, would be "effective words." [laughter, applause] And similarly, we're trying to list something – find the – S&D or something like that – and the fellow says, "Well, I – I'll – I'll give you a few more items but I've got to meet Mazie, you know, and so forth. We're having a bit of domestic problems, you know? We've
got to go up and see the lawyer and so forth. I'll give you a few more items for this S&D, and so forth, but really you've got to warn me when it gets to be *whumph*-thirty."

And the auditor say, "All right," and take the next few items on it. *Whaw!* The pc has got a PTP of such magnitude that his attention isn't in on the bank. So of course, if his attention isn't in on the bank, how can his attention do anything, because it's the pc's attention, not the auditor, that does things through the bank. [laughs]

And this pc is saying, "Well, I don't want to be critical but I have had better auditors." [laughter]

What the auditor doesn't realize is that pcs don't object to auditors unless they have overt on them – no matter how – how lousy their auditing is. Do you know that? And if you sit and look at a critical or nattery pc and so forth, and don't find the overt, you've just got rocks in your head, that's all! Why sit there and beat yourself up? You're beating yourself up!

It had nothing to do with the state of his mind. It's the state of your technology. Critical pcs have overt. And the longer you audit them without pulling the overt, why, the more you're going to get chopped up; so why chop yourself up? That's the way you commit suicide! You just keep this up, the pc eventually will shoot you or something.

And as far as ARC breaks are concerned, those ARC breaks that are not handled, worsen. You cannot audit in the presence of an ARC break. You notice it's fairly well up the grades there and it's pretty rugged. Auditing somebody over the top of an ARC break: at first he'll protest, and then he's liable to scream, and then he raises a fuss, and then he does this, and he finally finds out that isn't getting him anyplace. And he – he gets sort of tired, and he begins to feel a little bit sad, and then he gets sadder and sadder and sadder. And you'll see him walking around after a session and he looks like Ophelia, or whatever his name was, in that comic section that was written up the Avon, some years ago. You know, she looked very sad – although she was singing.

I will say this, that these things have not been pointed out since the Gradation Chart came out but they are what they are and can occur. And a person who is released at one of these grades is normally much less apt to have this happen. But get that – it's much less apt to have this happen. You could key him back in so it'll happen. You can throw somebody out of communication. Kick him in the teeth a few times and he won't talk to you. I guarantee it. I don't care what grade of release he is. I'd hate to do it to a Clear and OT. Probably something horrible would happen to you. But the point is that these things occur – until somebody changes his agreements on life, clear up at the level of OT.

Now, I hope I've taught you something about a Gradation Chart. And I hope I've taught you something about the road out. You are very rich in having processes which on a broad, general basis handle these various conditions and make Grade Releases with some thoroughness. You're very rich in this. But that doesn't mean that you won't get ARC broke with yourself as the auditor doing Grade VII.

It's interesting that the bulk of, if not all, the Clears to date are good auditors. Aren't they all Saint Hill Course? There isn't one single fast-route Clear yet. Which is very interest-
ing. So if you want a good auditor at Grade VI and VII, why, become one. An interesting commentary on this.

But you are dealing with the primary things which barred living. And when I found out that if they were barring auditing, they were also barring living and therefore were the route for auditing, and then when plotted out did make rapid Releases, you've got the genus of this – this Gradation Chart. Possibly you hadn't realized that before. Quite a remarkable piece of stuff. There frankly isn't anything else that can happen to anybody that would bar the road out.

You say, "Well, he could get killed." Well, not necessarily; that wouldn't bar the road out, because he'd pick up another body and you'd get him sooner or later. But as far as auditing is concerned, those are the things that happen to people, and so therefore, they are the grades of release.

Now, there are interim release points on this chart that you probably are neglecting. And you're saying, because a person goes free needle at Grade 0, he has then gone a Grade 0 Release, see? Now we're getting into dicey and dangerous stuff – but he's run some Communication Processes at Grade 0 and has gone floppy needle and you say straight-away, "We're all finished. And now he's a Grade 0 and we don't have to do anything else with Grade 0." I want to call to your attention that there's a thing over here called Valence Processes. What the hell were they? Well, they're covered in HCOBs – very legitimate address. That'd make a very thorough Grade 0 Release. Right now you're skipping it.

These were the elementary Communication Processes. Well, there were some more complex Communication Processes for Grade I – much more complex Communication Processes, all of which have been noted down – followed by Locational Processes, to make a grade of release. Here was the original plot.

Now, when we did a II, we had the CCHs. How the devil? You could overrun the CCHs so easily that people are – tend to just pull off that one and just drop it right out of the lineup and not have any more to do with it, thank you! Because, of course, a person is off a meter while doing the CCHs, so therefore, you cannot tell when he goes free needle.

But here also were ARC Processes. And there were lots of those. And then there was case remedies fitted in there; that whole Book of Case Remedies fitted in there. You could go release on a lot of those, too.

Now, here was Auditing By List and Overt-Justifications, and so forth, at III. Here were solutions on physical problems and here was dating on a meter. That just dropped out of the lineup complete. I know it has.5

And then we had Cause and Effect Processes, which are quite remarkable, and R4H and Effort Processing and Rising Scale Processes. Now, here was where whole track engrams and secondaries and so forth fit, but those were the Power Processes – are the best and fastest way to get into that sort of a lineup. And then we had the R6 Processes Solo and we had the

---

5 Editor's note: Another deletion. The missing part, retranslated, is: "And I also know what some of you might think right now. No, it has not dropped out of the grade chart. I have seen it during the last few days. Since a few days I am back home."
Power – this is "processes used" – the Power Processes belong here. And then we had above that, Clear. And above that, the OT Processes, which I am now developing.

Now, that gave a whole list. Now, the processes which you are doing, and the last HCOBs which you have, these are perfectly all right for you to use. And a Clear is somebody at Grade 0 who has gone free needle on Communication Processes, and who at Grade I has gone free needle on Problems Processes, and at Grade II has gone free needle on overt and withholds, and at Level III has gone free needle on ARC breaks of one kind or another, and at Level IV has gone free needle while finding a service facsimile. And Level V and VA, of course, are going free needle, or the proper end phenomena, on the Power Processes. And Grade VI is the unburdening of the reactive mind by the processes prescribed at that level to a free needle – very easily overrun; a fellow is doing it himself. And they usually overrun and have to be brought back. And then at Grade VII is the total erasure of the reactive bank, and also the unreactive bank, and also any bank that had anything to do with it. And if you do those things, I will grant the fact that a person is released at all those grades.

I want to point out there is a whole bunch of other things that can be done at those grades to release people. Now, I don't say you have to do those but I am saying this in this lecture: If you think you're going to run one pc for as much as two or three days of auditing without having to use technology from another grade than that from which – on which you're auditing him, either done by a senior or done by yourself; you are very much mistaken. It'd be very hard to audit some pc without, sooner or later, running into a communication breakdown, problems, without running into an overt, without running into an ARC break. Be almost impossible! The smoothest auditor in the world could not fail but to run into one or more of those phenomena in the process of auditing.

And if you're going to neglect them, you're just going to booby-trap the whole road as far as the pc is concerned. He's not going to make it on up the line, that's all. He will drop out. And I dare say any failures you're having with cases is because you are ignoring the grade definitions used as rudiments – the definitions and names of those grades. For instance, problems, ARC breaks, and so forth. These are used.

Now, how long do you sit and run ARC breaks on a Level 0 pc – a Grade 0 pc? How long do you run ARC breaks? You run it until you have handled the ARC break which was barring your road to auditing. You don't now try to make him a – an ARC Break Release.

Do you get the idea?

You understand more about this Gradation Chart?

Audience: Yes. Mm-hm.

Well, I do hope, in spite of the catastrophic method in which this lecture began... I haven't mentioned any names. I haven't even looked pointedly at anybody. [laughter] And I haven't set up any examples that are actual examples – and this is true – I haven't set up any actual examples of anybody having goofed on this recently. I only discovered it on the basis of – just noticed that one auditor, in handling a case, neglected all of the points. And as he was an old-time auditor, I realized that he thought that was all yesterday's auditing and we didn't handle ARC breaks anymore, we just plowed through somehow.
But auditing is done in a highly standard way. It is a very narrow, narrow track. It is not a wide track on both sides of the road. It is highly beneficial. It has very definite goals, aims and gains. And when it is barriered, you'll find the only things barriering it are the things which I have talked about today.

Now, therefore, the things I've talked about today, and going non-standard, are the things which would bar people from becoming Clear. And that's all. That's all. Your own personality, added up to the technology and moving on through, does the rest of the job. You, a being, are also part of the lineup, and I count on that and count on your cooperation as a thetan in pushing it through on a standard line, straight on through to Clear for everybody.

Thank you.

Thank you.

Thank you.
Thank you.

Thank you.

Good, you made me smile now.

Now, this is the what of the which? I get these planets mixed up. It's 28 July AD 16, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and a lecture on Dianetic auditing.

Now, needless to say, had you listened carefully to the first lecture, you wouldn't need this lecture. [laughter] I hate to have to – have to point these things out but that's the truth.

Now, let me ask a question here. What are you handling when you are running Dianetic secondaries and engrams? What are you handling?

*Audience: [various answers]*

Well, boy, you should sure know this. You are handling the human mind. That is all there is to it. If we add to that then, as another picture, a valence, and as we add to that another thing called a machine, then you've got the lot. That's the human mind. You are actually getting your hands all dirty with the human mind. That is the human mind. It isn't anything else and there is nothing else in the human mind.

Now, that was a basic discovery in Dianetics. Now, what the mind was coating was the discovery of Scientology. It was coating, you know, paint coats, globs of *glupf* coat. It is coating a thetan. And a thetan is a life unit capable of many things as described in the Axioms, but most familiar to one and all as *you*. [laughs]

So you, a thetan – and if you don't believe you are a thetan, I'll give you a little exercise: Look around you; what do you see? You see the physical universe, correct? All right, and look at another person next to you; you see a body, correct? All right, very good. Now look at a picture of a cat. Make a picture of a cat. Those who are too black to do so, why, just skip that exercise. Make a picture of a cat. All right. Now, that picture, although it is synthetic and a creation at the moment you're making it up and so forth, that's the mind. And what's looking at the cat? [laughter] You are. And those of you, now, who couldn't get a picture of a cat, whatever you got, look at it. [laughter] Now, what's looking at it? You are.

Now, this is the entirety – the entirety of the human mind. Now you say, "Well, if we created a picture of a cat, oh well, that wasn't part of the mind, it was part of my crea…"
Who the hell do you think is mocking that thing up called the mind? You are. Now, that was the great discovery of Scientology. That was discovered after Dianetic days. What is the source of this thing? Engram originally meant "trace on a cell."

I know it's fashionable for the newspapers to say I never went to college and there are several colleges at this particular time that are wishing that I hadn't gone there. [laughter] But I can also assure you that you give them another decade or so, those colleges I haven't even done more than go to a prom at will have some plates on 'em. You know? Man is silly, you see?

Anyway, in college we were taking atomic and molecular phenomena, which is a very interesting subject. And they should have left it there as a toy subject and shouldn't have gone any further with it because out of that subject came the atomic bomb. Now, it's originally called atomic and molecular phenomena. Well, they narrowed the subject down and made it very compressed and highly specialized and called it nuclear physics. And today, why, people get degrees in nuclear physics and go out with aplomb to blow human beings all to pieces because politicians don't know how to handle governments.

Now, the whole subject of the human mind was so unknown, so bedazzled and mucked about – people hardly even knew there was a mind. You find Mary Baker Eddy saying, "All is mind, infinite mind." Well, we're into a problem in semantics, meaning the meaning of words. She was using mind in some other connotation and so on. She was – she thought the universe was a big think. Fortunately it's not. We're here. A lot of think but there's also us. Now, when – no criticism of her – she was trying like everybody else.

So, this thing called the engram came from a theory I developed while I was in George Washington University. And it was an interesting theory because man had no explanation for the storage of thought. But if you consider – now, hold your hat because this is – this is typical scientific think, see; some theory to embrace the phenomena. Now, if memory is contained in a molecule, there are ten to the twenty-first power binary digits of molecules in the brain – in the neuron system – yes, ten to the twenty-first power binary digits.

Now, what a binary digit is, I've forgotten. You know as well as I do. [laughter] I knew once, but I don't know anymore. Binaries to me – you see, I've been in navigation since – and they're the two suns that go around each other and make a dumbbell sort of star. You see, I don't know what it is.

Well anyhow, I know it's a long figure. And if there were a hundred holes in each molecule – see this figure is something you just go on writing for a day or two, you see, or weeks – and if there were a hundred holes in each one of these molecules and there was one memory in each hole, why, man – by calculation then, of the number of things observed and remembered and by actual inspection of man's memory – man had enough memory storage to last him three months. And although this may not be true of psychologists, psychiatrists or many professors, there are those who can remember further back than three months. [laughter]

So I wrote this up as proof that this wasn't how man remembered. In I think 19 – oh, I don't know when it was – 1936, some five, six years later, something like that, this was issued in Austria (from Vienna, where else?) as the way man remembered. So, man is so scarce on
Now, there's a mirror theory that is even more ridiculous than that one, whereby one perceives by having a mirror which reflects the perceptions and concentrates it. Now, don't ask the question – by the way that was in the 50s and so forth, that was the psychological school of thought explanation – now, don't ask what looks at the mirror, because they'll tell you another mirror. And we sort of get into an infinite – [laughter] one of these German periscopes, you know, where the submarine captain lays in his bunk and looks at – looks at Berlin's nightclubs or something. [laughter] I mean, they never followed the thought all the way through. Something had to look at the mirror.

It's the same idea they have about computers. They talk about the wonders of computers, you see? Marvelous computers! "Boy, can I – can I think!" You know. "Great, great! Can I think!" Every once in a while I'm standing around when I see some of my friends, and I – they're in there with the ENIACs and UNIWACs and mucklucks, or whatever these things are called these days, and they're doing this gorgeous stunt of praising the computer and saying how much better it is than a human being. And I shatter their comparisons by saying, "Who asks the computer questions?"

And they say, "Well, of course, we do because we're so stupid." [laughter]

And I say, "Who, then, does it answer questions for?"

Oh. They've sort of got the idea that a computer answers questions for other computers that asks questions for other computers, you see? But the truth of the matter is any time you go near one of these UNIWACs or ENIACs or mucklucks or something, you see some guy there feeding it – feeding it cards and feeding it questions. And there's – whatever slots they have on the things and so forth. You'll also see somebody come over and take out a long tape and then read it. [laughter] And it didn't mean a thing until somebody read it. Do you see?

So man's – all I'm trying to give you is man's approach to this was so childish as to be silly. The – his – what data he had about the mind, he couldn't even think about.

But now, it's very difficult to think about the mind and don't blame him too much, because the mind, essentially, if all there was, was a mind… The psychiatrist thinks the mind is the brain. He's got it moved over sideways. That's why he keeps sawing up brains and drilling holes in them and so forth. He thinks he's getting something. You can't drill a hole in a mind. It's not possible. He would, if he could! [laughs, laughter]

But this thing – this thing called the mind, you see, is being asked to think about something called the mind. An ENIAC or UNIWAC (names of the big electronic computers) are not able, actually, to think about computers, see? They're not able to design themselves. But fortunately – fortunately, why, the mind doesn't have to understand the mind because there's somebody there to understand it. And fortunately for us and unfortunately for a lot of other -isms and -ologies and so forth, I for one was there to understand it. Do you see?

So this thing called the mind is probably the least understood, the most mysterious object that anybody ever heard of. You would have to know that an individual was quite capable of making pictures, of creating mass, energy, space and time, before you could understand
what the mind was. That would require, then, that you understood there was such a thing as an individual. And an individual isn't something walking around in a frock coat or with pince-nez glasses or something like that. An individual is a static. And this static is that – well now, static is something that's motionless but actually a static by definition in Scientology is simply the ultimate in "What is it?"

Now, there is no reason to try to explain a thetan or say where it came from, because it didn't come from any place. It is! And we have to understand now the Scientology idea of what is reality. And this really baffles people because this is the biggest philosophic conundrum of the ages. What is reality? Now, people tell you to face reality and so forth. But you could say with a philosophic quip, "I'll be glad to face it if you will explain it." And that would of course stop them cold, because they can't explain reality.

Reality totally lacks philosophic definitions and we got into such weirdities – weird things as, "If the tree fell in the forest and there was nobody there to hear it fall, then would it have made a sound?" I think that's marvelous, you know? I mean, the jokers – and they couldn't have all been serious – Hume, Locke, the rest of these birds, and some of the French philosophers and so on – these fellows – these fellows really dreamed some up. You want to have a ball sometime, read some of these old timers of two, three, four, five hundred years ago and get their definitions for some of these commodities which you have to know about in order to be free. And reality is one of them.

Well, reality, in Scientology, is what is. And people who can't see very much, of course, don't have much reality. And you say, "Is the E-Meter real?" Well, the E-Meter is real because it is. And honest, you don't have to go beyond that as a definition. You don't have to go into "Why is it there, and who made it, and who put it there, and how come it's running along in time with us?" These are other questions. Well, for heaven's sakes, break them all down to their proper, tiny components. Not one of these questions, of course, is simply "What is reality?" Reality is what is. And you can experience reality so easily that I wonder a little bit at anybody having any trouble with it. You can stamp, and it is, so there it is; it's real.

"Yes," they say, "but a lot of people have an awful lot of delusions."

You say, "Okay, what's a delusion?" That would probably stop them. We could answer it easily. A delusion is what one person thinks is, but others don't necessarily. You might say that's a reality for one person out of agreement with others.

And I'd hate to have a mental practitioner – I'd hate to have a mental practitioner who himself had a very low level of reality, you see, because he'd be out of agreement with everybody else's. So that everything to him would be delusion. [laughter] Just the fact that somebody said it was real would be enough for him to then state that it was delusion.

Now, one of the ways to handle such a person – and I say this in all kindness because, don't cheer boys, the poor devils are dying, you know – is just get him to feel the table, you know? Don't be amazed if he experiences a fantastic case gain in just that instant. But just get him to feel the table. And you – and let him in on something: you feel the table and you say, "I can feel it, too." And it will be such a relief to him, because for a long time he thought only he could.
Now, out of these things of "What is reality? What is a being?" and "What is a mind?" and so on, we can walk, we can map a path with great security and find out what it is that has man trapped, why man acts as he does, why he reacts as he does. And all this is very elementary once you know the basic definitions.

But I don't think you would have very good luck in auditing Dianetic engrams. Engram definition today is just something that – an experience – a mental image picture of an experience which contained pain and unconsciousness. And of course, it still contains pain and unconsciousness. Secondary is – is an experience – a mental image picture of an experience which contains loss and is therefore misemotional. Now, that's all there is to that.

Now, in Dianetic processing, then, you have to know what the mind is. And in the process of being processed and in processing it you are running head-on into what this thing called the mind is. And it isn't anything more complicated than what I have told you.

Now, how it got made: Well, a thetan is a compulsive mocker-upper. By mock-up we mean a mental image creation, ordinarily. And he's able to create just like that. So a bullet hits him, so he makes a full picture of him being hit by the bullet. He is so overwhelmed by it that he thinks the obvious thing for him to do is to make a picture of it. He is stupid, man! And that is the flaw which makes him aberrated. And that is the one flaw in a thetan.

Now, if you can get him over doing this so that he can recover from this mad obsession to make a picture of everything that happens to him and then hide it from himself and then fix it up so it can impinge itself upon his existence, you can get him out of the cage. And the funny part with all this, you say, "Well, he didn't have enough experience, he didn't have enough pictures, so therefore…" You can rationalize all you want to; the case happens to be that the individual is trapped by his own creations.

Now, he dramatizes these pictures, or they enforce computations on him. He will go through being shot because he has an engram of being shot. Now, the way he does this is get dislocated in time. Now, each of these pictures – you want to know about precision, man. The precision with which a thetan mocks these things up as they happen and then puts them on the time track with the exact time on them is amazing! You talk about the inaccuracy of a human being. Boy, that is accuracy to end all accuracy. It is correct within seconds. It is an amazing feat! If it happened four years, two months, one day, and three hours, seven minutes and two seconds ago, that is the exact thing that will fall on the meter.

Now, he can also turn time around, you see, to how long ago it was. You can run it from the beginning, but you better not because there are some booby traps at the beginning. But you run it from PT back and you'll find that this amazing ability to spot in time these mental image pictures of the things which have happened to him are absolutely gorgeous. It is so great that sometimes all you have to do is date how long ago the incident occurred to have it blow. An individual has to be in pretty good shape, however, before you can do that.

Now, this then, in essence, is the mind: Is those pictures which have been made of experiences and plotted against time and preserved in energy and mass in the vicinity of the being and which, when restimulated, are re-created without his analytical awareness. That is the mind. That's the mind you're working with. That is the mind you're trying to get out of.
Now, you say this, "We're trying to get this individual out of a body." No. You won't get anybody out of a body worth a nickel so that he'll stay out of a body and so forth, because he is so weakened by his mind that he cannot control or handle himself in relationship to his body.

Now, the trick of all of this – the trick of all of this is that you cannot make a postulate or an intention through this mass called the mind. And whenever you do, the mind restimulates, so a thetan is not able to make or handle things by postulates. He says – he says, "You will be all right." You know, he has this impulse to say, "You will be all right." You talk about spot healing, you know, or something like miracle healing, you know? Saint Pete or somebody walks along and sees somebody and he wants to heal him up. So he says – the thought – the intention is there to make the fellow all right. His intention goes just so far, collides with whatever engrams are in restimulation and goes splat! So he says, "I guess that's not a good thing to do." Whereas his intention is actually terrifically powerful.

So a thetan's thought can't go through his own barricade of his mockups. So obviously the less experience – creations of experiences – the less creations of experiences an individual has around him and the less that he has to restimulate, why, the more he can think or project his thoughts or the bigger he gets. Do you follow? Now, you can delete these experiences and Dianetic auditing is that activity by which these experiences can be erased.

Now, if an individual is always going around like this – he's always going around like this, you're fairly sure – this is... I'm now talking from a Dianetic viewpoint. Of course, there may be dozens of reasons he's going around like this, all contained in the mind on the same thing. But I will give you a simplified action of it. He's going around like this, you can be absolutely sure he's got a mental image picture where something made him go like this. So much so that you could even... And you better not do this with any case that is having any trouble at all; but somebody who is pretty well uptime and is doing fine, you can actually ask him things like that. But the trouble is, if they're uptime they aren't obeying their engrams to that degree. But theoretically, you could see this fellow bent over like this, and you could say, "All right, the incident in which you are bent over like this will now appear." And he would get the incident.

If he didn't get it and it remained black, you could then get the duration of the incident – you could – the date of the incident. You date it – how many years and so forth, ago? And then you would date the duration of the incident – how long did it last? And he would get the picture of it. And there he is – there he is, dangling from a tree or something like that, with a rope under him, having been shot with fifty-four arrows, you see, after being flogged or some mild, minor experience of this character.

Now, the – there are various ramifications to all of this. There are various complications, you might say. This individual is all messed-up because he's trying not to dramatize the engram in which he is stuck, you see? He's trying not to dramatize it, because the tendency of the individual in a dramatization is to repeat in action what has happened to one in experience. That's a basic definition of it. But much more important, it's a replay now of something that happened then. It's just being replayed out of its time and period. So this individual who is dramatizing is actually either totally unrestrained and therefore totally dramatizing (at
which moment we consider he's mad), or he has the impulse to dramatize it but he knows he better not. And a fellow will tie himself down like Gulliver in Lilliputia, you know, with all those strings. Just tied down and tied down and tied down and he will hold himself back and so forth. He's trying to keep from dramatizing some incident.

So you get a double action here. You get the impulse to dramatize and the effect of the incident on the individual, and you get as well the individual's analytical awareness that it's not a bright thing to do to pick up rocks — whenever one sees a rock, to pick up the rock and hit somebody with it. He'll think he's rather odd. He doesn't know where this comes from, so he begins to lose confidence in himself. Every time he sees a rock, why, he has an impulse to go over and to pick up the rock and bash somebody's head in with it. And he knows that that is not a nice thing to do. It isn't because he's afraid of the police. It's because he's basically good; he doesn't want to do those things. But there's the rock and there's a head, and he'd sort of start holding things up so that he can't look at rocks. And then the next thing you know he walks around like this all the time, you see, so he won't see any rocks. You get it? And he's dramatizing an incident where somebody else picked up a rock and hit him over the head with it and then he went into their valence. Do you see? He became them because they were the winner.

So this — this is the way all of this stacks up. There's tremendous amount of interesting phenomena and bric-a-brac, and so forth. You're dealing with the basic mind, because what is the core of the reactive bank also has this same character. But it is so outrageous and so different and is so overwhelming that you're not about to touch that unless you've got the exact map. And even when you've got the exact map you occasionally knock your block off.

But you're going in this lightly, lightly — dealing with this lifetime, the last year or two probably, and some people have probably not penetrated any deeper than this morning's breakfast. But the existence is all mapped.

Now, in view of the fact that he didn't know what happened, occasionally he tells himself what happened and so he will sometimes have his actual experience overlaid with another experience. This is the way you get too many Juliu s Caesars. You can get an almost infinite supply of Julius Caesars.

The man was a mad heterosexual [homosexual] nut who had very nasty personal habits and whose ideas of conquest were so laughable as to be nonsense. He conquered such countries as England which were ready to welcome the Briton — the Romans at that time. They were all ready to practically bring them ashore and shake them by the hand and say, "Hey, what do you know. And we've been using your stuff for a long time, boys. Come on in and sell us some more," and so forth. So he lands with chariots and spears so he can conquer everybody. You know, loony. He cut off the right hand of fifty thousand Gauls — the act of a madman.

Now, this is a pretty suppressive punk, isn't it, huh? Well, this made him the winning valence. So, I'd say that a lot of people who served with him on his side and a lot of people on the other side, and so forth, would register loud and long as Julius Caesar.

Now, whenever you have a personality — whenever you have a personality that has been either terrifically successful (only that's less so), or a personality who has been terribly
overwhelming, vicious and oppressive, you get a lot of people in that time in that valence. Because there's a lot of mental image pictures of it, see?

So don't get too baffled about past lives. Every once in a while past lives get so invalidated to people that they don't want to have anything to do with them because they've seen too many Julius Caesars. And it tends to suppress one saying that, you know, I was Cassius, you know? And you – it's the invidious comparison.

Get the chap who's walking along and he's got a plan that is going to help the British Empire, you see? And he's a perfectly valid statesman. He's going along; he's doing all right. He's perfectly capable of doing so. Some bird walks up to him who is a complete, frothing idiot, see, and he tells him that he used to be Disraeli and he has a plan to save the British Empire. At that moment the fellow who is the sane boy has a tendency to feel that he must be crazy because he has a plan to save the British Empire. Do you follow? And by invidious comparison, you say to yourself "I couldn't have lived before because look at those nuts talking about – there are three Julius Caesars over there and two Napoleons," you know?

So sometime if a pc is being too doubtful about all this and he's had a hard time on it, just run invalidations – run your Suppress and Invalidate and so on, on the subject of "Have you lived before?" You'll get some very interesting results of it.

It is fashionable, simply because thetans – meshed in to the degree that they are, smashed down by mass and the mind and so forth – it is very hard to remember. It's very hard for a thetan to remember more than a few years when he has a totally smashed-in mind, complete. And one of the reasons is – is his effort to remember gets painful, so he'd rather not remember. Now, when you've just been blown to pieces with a cannonball – you're twenty-one years old and twenty-one years ago you were blown to pieces with a cannonball – trying to coax anybody to remember any earlier than twenty years ago or better still eighteen or more comfortably sixteen years ago, it becomes very hard unless a person knows what he's up against.

He tries to handle this. He has methods of handling this bank. And one of his favorite methods of handling the bank is almost as nutty as making it in the first place. His method of handling it is to forget about it. How crazy can you get?

Of course, you have to be up in the vicinity of Clear before it really starts to look hilariously funny. Because you take a Grade V – even as high as Grade V (certainly as high as Grade IV), you find people still trying to figure out how that bank – you know, how the – the bank, mind: interchangeable words – how this mind of his is valuable. Of course, this is an excuse not to confront it. You know, "I better not confront it and do anything about it because it's so valuable."

Well, of course, his effort to confront it is an effort to confront very, very painful experiences. And he doesn't want to confront those painful experiences and so he said, "There must be some virtue in it; I'd better leave it there." Another method he uses in fooling himself concerning it.

And there's a whole cult that follows this – a real cult; not what they call us, you see – called psychologists. And this cult actually follows and subscribes to the theory that you had
better be glad you're neurotic. But that is merely a school's expression of something that beings kind of want to think anyhow, see? If you can't cure neurosis and you don't know what the mind is all about anyhow, then you could excuse all that by simply saying, "Well, you really don't want anything done about your mind, because you see it's a good thing you're neurotic. You see, all great artists are nuts. You see, that's obvious. Look at them." I don't know, I also look at their artwork.

Now, therefore, the mind is a complex mechanism which influences the individual and which he's better off without. And you really won't believe, all the way, that you'd be better off without it until you finally get rid of it, and then you say, "I've sure had a lot of weird reasons while I was hanging on to all this coal tar." You say to yourself "I must have been nuts!" That's right.

Now, every now and then – every now and then, somebody's got a valence – some genius valence of some kind or another. And this genius valence is all rigged up to answer questions. And he's got a computer, see? So he says, "How big should I build this building?" And he gets "562½ feet high." So he puts it down on the drawing. He wouldn't know what to do without that thing. It never occurs to him that he himself has to go around here and to work out the answer and then come back here and hear it. And he will become sad about losing his mind. He will come very sad about losing his mind if he gets – if he gets one of these things half-desensitized. It's half-gone. It's still there but it doesn't work anymore, and he hasn't taken back the ability. See, he hasn't taken back and owned the ability to do it, and yet it is erased to a point where it doesn't work. And at this point he will be rather regretful of having done something about it because he says, "How big should the building be?" Dead silence.

And then he goes along a little further and he gets a little bit better and all of a sudden, "Of course," he says, "the building ought to be 819 feet and a half. Only – any fool could see that." He can see that now, you see? What he did was attribute the ability to a circuit, put it on an automatic-response basis. But he was in actual fact using a valence.

Now, every once in a while you'll see a child come along and they can play a piano or a violin – oh my God! They just sit down and brrroom bang, you see? And they're only six years old or something like this, and, wow, they're playing with symphony orchestras. And all of a sudden they get to be ten, twelve, and they one day look at a piano and they don't know what it is. That same mechanism occurred, except they've been working on a circuitry of some kind or another, and in the circuitry they have somehow or another erased part of the circuitry or done something about it. They never get up to a point of realization.

Now, in one lifetime you can almost erase your own skills if you've put them all on picture form, which is quite remarkable. So a fellow starts out – boy, he just starts out great guns, and the next thing you know, why, he's blah.

Well, the best way to do that is to stick yourself in college. Get a nice valence of you – of you the expert; nice valence, you know – nice circuit out here, valence, a beingness – which is the expert. And then always consult the expert; never think it out for yourself see? And then one day accidentally abandon this thing, mislay it or move on the time track so that
you're not near it anymore, and then be totally lost and not have the skill. But who has the skill in the first place? The individual himself. Do you follow?

Now, a thetan, once having started this idiocy of mocking things up and mocking up and holding on to all of his personal experiences, then began to find virtues for it. And he made little machines and he did all kinds of things. Now, when you start reversing this procedure, he goes slightly mad, because halfway through any action, why, he will have lost the benefit of it without having regained it himself. Do you follow?

This does not respond, however, on the IQ graphs. Any processing increases IQ. It's almost impossible to lower IQ. So the individual is getting brighter, and that's the final test of it.

A great many things have worked out, of course, about Dianetic auditing since we have begun to make Clears. And man is basically good, and the more mind you get rid of the brighter you get, until you get rid of all of it – you're very bright. All of this – all of these things, you see, have borne out and are perfectly true.

Now, when I talk to you about Dianetic auditing, when I talk to you about erasing the automobile accident you've been in or losing Aunt Mamie, your favorite ally when you were a little boy, or something like this, you realize I'm talking to you about play. As far as auditing is concerned, this is play. The amount of benefit to be regained from running half a dozen engrams exceeds anything that man has ever been able to do for anybody in the history of the human race. And compares to Scientology processing the straight way at about one one-millionth of the potential gain. Do you understand?

So, I'm talking to you about play today. But you as an auditor had better know about it and you better look at it and you better get familiar with it, because that is the mind. You are studying the cage. Them's the bars. That's what's got you under arrest; it's these tricks and vagaries. And the technology which it requires to vanquish this thing was actually in excess of the simple erasure of pictures. You had to know an awful lot. Now, that doesn't mean it wasn't still a simple problem and that the definitions of the mind didn't hold, but it meant that the mind was more complex and the experiences had been far more complex than anybody had ever imagined. You see? And it was much harder for somebody to confront.

Now, there's a question of time. If picture by picture, you undertook to erase the mind, you would get into one of these binary digits I was talking to you about before. One of the things that made me come off of Dianetics entirely is I could make a Release and very often the fellow would sail off and so on. We'd called them Clears in those days and quite validly; he had been temporarily cleared. But his reactions to the entirety of existence were really infinitely less than those of a Clear and of course infinitely, infinitely less from those for an OT. You see, after you're Clear then you have to study up and regain what you can do. Anybody who is clever enough to mock up a mind and keep it in place and not even know about it for that long, he's got a lot of abilities to en… he must be a very clever bunny, indeed; and so he is.

But an individual has as many engrams and secondaries as he has had experiences, as he is old. Now, I don't ask you to take my word for how old you are because it's very impolite particularly to ladies to hang any vast age upon them, but if you will put yourself on a meter
someday and start chalking it up as to how long you've had a mind or something like this, you would come up with something very interesting, indeed. You'll feel better, too. Unless you get too serious about it, and then you'll plummet yourself right down into the middle of the reactive bank, and then you'll have an awful time. So this – lightly, lightly, you know? A little goes a long ways sort of thing. But if you ask the question bluntly, "How old am I?" you would probably get a variety of answers because, of course, you are the ones who invented time. And you aren't old. You have been in a certain state for a certain period of time and you can measure those states; but you cannot measure a total – a total, total with any degree of accuracy. You're going to get variations all over the place.

Now, you start going back in time and you'll find out that there have been – there's been quite a long period. Now, in view of the fact that you've probably averaged a pain every – well, let's be reasonable about it; let's say you've averaged a pain out of every year. Every year you have done something. You've stubbed your toe or you've had something happen. Let's say, you've averaged a pain in a year and a major catastrophe one way or the other every five or ten years. Now, let's be very gross about the whole thing and say at least every lifetime you've had a catastrophe. I think that would be reasonable to suppose.

Now, therefore, divide twenty-five into the length of time you have had a mind which reads on the meter, and I'm afraid you will get too many trillion incidents for anybody in this lifetime to sit and erase. So although theoretically it could all be erased, incident by incident, chain by chain and so forth – theoretically – you haven't got that much auditing time and nobody has got that much patience. It would take something on the order of zaom, thousands of hours. Maybe binary digits of hours, you see? And this is impractical for a human being because, I point out, the average age of the body at the time it decays totally is something around seventy, seventy-five today. See, you haven't got enough time. Take more than seventy-five years to get in enough auditing to erase all of the engrams on the track.

So therefore, I had to short-circuit this. I had to bring this right to basics and I had to bring it to basics of what actually did a thetan consist of rather than what was he mocking up. And then we addressed this and we addressed the mechanics of the thing, we have our current Gradation Chart, and then it is possible to clear somebody. And it's very interesting now that anybody who came into Scientology untrained, unprocessed and so forth would, if he pressed right along with it – not too frantically, but just kept going more or less the rate at which you're traveling at the moment – he would be at least a minimum or a maximum (depending on how hard he pressed at it) of two years to Clear.

Now, you could do it much faster than that by becoming much more businesslike about it. But a reasonable assumption – a very reasonable assumption at the leisurely rate people move, and all that sort of thing, would be a couple of years to Clear. It's – I don't know what average time we have at the moment in the Clearing Course on the course itself. I can only make guesses, and so forth, and I knew when the technology was available – I don't know how many Clears we've got now, and from that sort of thing I would guess that it's somewhere between a ye… eight months' and a year's auditing. I would just guess that. That's very reasonable auditing, you know? That's getting tired and lazy and stupid and forgetting about it and patching it up and going to Review and then being very businesslike for two whole weeks and… You know, that kind of thing.
So that—the lower grades, however, these things are so perfected—and there is no shortcut for VI and VII. Anybody who comes along and tells you there's any shortcut for VI and VII, he's just trying to cut your throat. Remember that. There is no shortcut.

Somebody said to me, "I should have thought, Ron, that you would have blown the whole bank just by plotting it." Ho, ho, ho! Ha! Even me, no. And I was—get—I got, on engrams, eventually so I could take a fantastic engram, you know, where you were just blown all to pieces and betrayed at the same time and totally surprised and scattered all over the environment for a few minutes and that sort of thing, and blow those things just by inspection. Say, "Oh yes, there it is." Whoooch! And gone, see? I got up to a point where I could do that. Huh, confronting the basic reactive bank isn't like that. I'm not trying to scare you; I'm just trying to keep you from making mistakes.

Now, your engrams are erasable and in the process of erasing them you get into various phenomena which I have already told you about but some of those now auditing them obviously didn't listen. So, I will tell you again, nicely and politely and without—as Stan said the other day, he said, "What's marvelous about you," he says, "you don't scream and beat the desk, and so forth." I accepted the compliment, but actually some of your top executives will tell you I do scream and beat the desk every now and then, you know? Not really over stupidity—not over stupidity. That isn't why I scream and beat the desk. Just to get compliance. [laughs]

Now, what's interesting about this is that the moment that you run a late engram on a chain... Let's—you've probably got your nomenclature a bit tangled up and you probably should listen very carefully and you probably should get your misunderstood words out of this stuff and so on, because this is very, very important.

Here you have—let's—let's take a picture of a ladder and we're going down a ladder here. Now, the bottom rung of this ladder is the basic on the chain. It is more important, therefore I've made it blacker. Actually this, here we put another ladder here, and we put the top rung as very black and important—that's the way it looks. And this bottom rung, it—important at the time—was very slight. And you say, "Therefore, the toughest incident would be the earliest incident." No! No, the toughest incident to try to do anything about is the—the most recent one. And the easiest one to do something about is the earliest one.

Now, a chain simply means a series of incidents of similar content. There's the hit-by-a-car chain. Now, there may only be one engram on a chain but that would be very rare indeed. There may be 20 hit-by-cars chains, see, 20 on the hit-by-a-car chain. Now, if we're speaking of this lifetime, you may find 1 or 2 on the hit-by-a-car chain that won't erase on account of unfortunately for the reality of some people who don't like the truth and can't face... You know, people don't like past lives because you—you're pointing their attention back at a lot of agony. There's a good reason for it, see?

This guy is 41 years old—41 years ago he died. He probably didn't die pleasantly, either, being the kind of fellow he is. [laughter] So you tell him he's lived before this life, you're pointing his attention back at that horrible incident, and so forth, and he just bounces straight back to present time, shaking, actually. You think he's mad because he's talking about past
life. No! He's terrified! "Don't t-don't talk to me about-bout-bout-bout-bout p-p-p-past lives. Damn you Scientologists!" You see? "Oh, you dogs! Kill 'em!"

You say, "Sonny boy, why be so yellow?"

Now, the resolution of a problem requires that you handle the elements of the problem. The resolution of a problem requires that you handle the elements of a problem. You will never solve a problem by handling different elements than the problem has. Isn't that rrroah! This is one of man's favorite indoor sports: solving problems by using different elements than the problem contains.

So, therefore, if you insist on a person staying in this lifetime, you're going to run into the hit-by-a-car chain with 2 incidents in this lifetime which are the last of 520 incidents. And you're trying to erase the last 2 of 520 incidents. He was first hit by a car 1,765,000 years ago, 3 months, 1 day, 1 hour and 10 seconds ago. The mind! See? Back! And when you go through an incident once and it doesn't desensitize, and you start the fellow through again and the incident now appears a little bit heavier and massy, you better hit the silk, man. You're probably at 897 on that chain. And you start to put this fellow through it, you try to put this fellow through it too often, and it's just going to get heavier and heavier and thicker and thicker. And one of the symptoms of this is his bouncing out of it.

Now, we're not going to handle bouncers now and get guys repeated down into it and that sort of thing. There's no point in doing that. There are easier ways to handle it; just erase the earlier incident. Now, it's the – always requires the earliest incident that you can reach to totally desensitize a chain.

But here's one of the symptoms. You start through – start the pc through an engram, and when you bring him back through to go over it again, he says exactly what he says before without any change or variation. He is no longer in the time of that engram. He has bounced and he's now running out of the lock he put into PT. He's now busy running the present time lock. It was so heavy that it laid in a lock in present time, see? Do you follow? It hasn't done him any harm.

So, you were busy running an engram of ten or seven years ago, you see, and it's the hit-by-a-car, and it's bokety-bokety-bokety-bokety-bokety-bokety-bokety-bokety-bok. And then you start him through it the second time, and he goes bokety-bokety-bok, and there's no new material shows up of any kind whatsoever, he's not seven or ten years ago. He's not back where it was at all. He's erasing what he just laid in in PT. He's just going over it again.

Also, he's learned better. He's learned better than to go near it. And you have run into the same mechanism, exactly, of why a thetan keeps a mind – because he doesn't want to confront it. It would erase if he confronted it, but it is too painful for him to do so. So you've actually got a pc a bit in over his head. You have been a bit too persuasive, and you have been locating engrams on a meter. You naughty fellow. "Oh," you say, "of course. Well, you always locate engrams on a meter." No, you run them on a meter.

You introduce a meter into the location of incidents and you're going to run a pc over his head the whole time because the meter can see deeper than he can. Well, the funny part of
it is, if you run what he can erase, you've got a level of confront he can confront. "Did you ever lose anything?"

And he thinks for a little while and he said, "Yeah, I lost a ring."

All right. That's the incident. No meter. Now, as we run him through it with Dianetic auditing and so forth – it's a secondary, of course, because it contains loss – as we run him through this thing, you're going to get meter action. Great. And you better watch your meter, too, because it's liable to go free needle or something on you, see? If it does, forget that chain. Get onto something else. You understand now?

A man can remember what he can confront. And that's all he's going to remember. If he had a fight at breakfast, he's not going to want to remember breakfast. Well, if he got hit by a truck ten years ago, he don't want to remember hit by a truck ten years ago. Now, if he talks about it at all, it's because he's talking about a lock which he's moved up into PT which is comfortable. He'll tell you all about having been hit by a truck, but he won't give it to you in present time as though it's just now, this minute happening.

Now, you see, he can come to present time away from the incident and have a sort of a synthetic history of this incident, and he can go through that, and if you locate incidents on meters, that's the way he will run engrams. All sort of synthetic in PT and he doesn't want to go back down...

The guy – the guy who is the most shivery, the guy who is at fear on the Tone Scale will act like he's on a powerful spring which is shooting him straight up the track to PT. And boy, he's stuck right here, you know? He is not going to go back anyplace. No, no, no, no place. No.

"Ah, how about breakfast?"

"Oh, well, I don't know anything about b… how about breakfast?"

"Well, can you remember what you had for breakfast?"

"Oh, I don't know. Is that necessary?"

This is not the chap who wins medals for courage. See what I'm talking about? He acts like he's being ejected on hydraulic thrust straight up to present time, boy, and he's here hummmmm-hummmmm-hummmmm!

Now, you say – you say now, "In your…" Poor Freud. He was dealing with people of this type all the time, you see? They couldn't co… they're as crazy as they couldn't confront, you see, and they were pretty nutty. And he was asking them to go back and remember their childhood. Why, man, if he'd ever – it never occurred to him to ask, "Can you remember entering the office?" Because they would have said, probably, "I don't know. How did I get here?" It's a fact.

Amnesia – amnesia is simply – is not a very mysterious mechanism. It's just a guy who is so spooked that he doesn't dare remember ten seconds ago. Now, he's had some experience beyond which – earlier than which he is not going to remember, including the experience. So he's only willing to remember some moment after that experience. Now, we call this amnesia. He's just scared.
Now, you'll run into this all the time in varying degrees in pcs. And the worst ones off are those that are just rigid in present time. They're going along with each click of the clock and no further back than the last click. This person will tell you he has a bad memory. That is not the only source of bad memory. A bad memory is just accumulated occlusion of it all, but it's nevertheless nonconfront, see?

Trying to train somebody with beatings would be the last way in the world that you could train anybody because you've given him all of his education so that he can't confront it.

Now, here – here we have then a problem – this give – tells you why some instructors are very beloved by their students and turn out genius students, you know? For some reason or other everything he gave the student, the student finds that's the easiest thing in the world to confront, so that's what he knows.

Now, where do you find relief to this situation of the pc stuck in present time? Now, you're going to find some pc, you're going to find an incident, you will actually get him back into the first part of that incident, you'll get him to roll off that incident. Maybe he'll even go through it once. He'll all of a sudden hold back the pain that his hip – hrrh. That's it. He was already in it, so he said, "Mmmm, we don't want that; we want this." Pshmom! Like a diver coming out of the bottom of the sea, he comes up to the surface and he runs the next time straight along on present time where it's nice and safe. He doesn't want anything to do with that dirty old nasty pain that almost took his leg off. Do you see? Do you get it? So it's all a bounce. It isn't just a bouncer, a "get out," that pushes people up to present time or shoots them about.

Now, an individual actually will feel so imprisoned at some point of the track – he's liable to feel so imprisoned that he knows he cannot progress any further than that point forever. And you'll find somebody who's totally stuck on the track. But this is somebody who is terrified of the future. And people get in this frame of mind about when they're to be executed. If you can recall the last time you were about to be executed – [laughs] time must halt at that point. And you'll find out that a pc seems to go back earlier very easily. So, he shoots back to the beginning of the – of anything. You can't hold him in an incident.

You say, "Come, come, now, we're going to run the automobile accident when you had – when you were 5 years old, and so forth."

"Yeah, well I – Oh, by the way, I got one now. I got one now two thousand years ago. I got one now 15 thousand. I got one a trillion years ago; got one 2 trillion years ago."

And you say, "Well, whoa, whoa, whoa." Well, recognize what you're dealing with. This is the guy who doesn't dare move forward with the time track.

Now, you'd only get him misbehaving and a Dianetic audited pc only misbehaves when put beyond his ability to confront and then you run into all the problems of Dianetics. Now you have to know an infinite number of solutions. Now you have to be clever not 'arf. You have to be a screaming genius with answers. You have to sit there and sweat, man, as an auditor. You've got to be right on the ball! So much more on the ball than you can be that you'll flub. Why? You're running the pc over his head.
And one of the best ways in the world to run a pc over his head in early stages of auditing – later on you can start using a meter – but in the early days – I mean use a meter to locate. The way to really run a pc over his head is take him bright, brassy green, no familiarity with the mind, doesn't even know about mental image pictures, discover the source of his lumbosis, plunge him into it straightaway and try to force him to go through it. You will have a very unwilling Pc. You have to practically sit on his head; he bounces all over the place. The second time you bring him through it, he runs it in PT. He can find no other part of the chain. He can't erase it, you know? He's in trouble all the way. You have to therefore be very clever as an auditor. Do I make my point?

It's just you're running him beyond his ability to confront. That is all. His ability to confront is one-millionth of a – of an attention unit. And what he's confronting and you're asking him to confront requires one thousandth of an attention unit. And he's not about to stay there comfortably and do anything about it at all. Do you follow?

Therefore, if you will look in this bulletin of 3 April 1966, it carefully stresses gradient scales. Now, after you've been going a little while, yes, you can find it on a meter, but the guy's ability to confront is up. You're getting someplace. But the truth of the matter is if you want to make a Release this way, don't ever locate anything on a meter, and he will come out the right end of it. He will be able to confront more and more and more, and you've improved his ability to confront his past experience. Now, you could almost bring about the same result with a repetitive processes – "What can you confront?" See, you could almost bring about the same result.

But as a matter of fact, an individual can then build up, build up, build up, but he himself is not getting an insight into his mind. With a repetitive command of this character, you're going for broke. In other words, you're going for result.

But with Dianetic auditing, we're not going for result. We're trying to give you auditing practice, and we're trying to have some fun. If you get results, it's your own fault. [laughter] And if you do this right, why, you will get results. And the test of it is, is does your pc feel any better afterwards?

Now, if he doesn't feel any better, you've done one of two things: You've either let him go too light or you've let him go too strong. See, you've insisted that he run some tiny, light lock that he isn't even vaguely interested in and could confront a dozen like it, or you've insisted he go in over his head.

Now, the mind knows what it can tolerate, so the best test is the pc, not the meter. The guy knows what he can tolerate. So, you say, you want – going to run a secondary now. Well, you can ask him for, "Now, have you ever lost – have you ever lost anything?" And if you wanted to be very sure, you could say, "Recently, have you lost anything?" See? Asking sneakily on the line.

And he says, "Yes, as a matter of fact I lost a ring."

Run it. But now, when you're asking for moments of loss, remember that you're asking for the whole chain of all secondaries because that is the definition by – which it has. So you could soften your question up even further. "Do you recall a period of sadness?" Let's attach
the emotion to it. Now, we could ask for times when he was sad, times when he was afraid, times when he was this, times when he was that.

You talk about throwing people in over their head. In the early days of running, there were so many techniques developed for throwing people into engrams that it was practically a snap of the fingers and over Niagara Falls the guy went. He didn't have any choice. We were so skilled in those days of putting people into incidents, and so on, that the most remarkable dramatizations would occur – fantastic body convulsions; they'd practically fly all over the room.

And I remember one chap that I snapped into an incident – and I cured something with him; it's true that you can do something with it – of straight unadulterated terror. Terror so great, that as his body shook on the bed, he was lifting the legs of the bed off the floor and banging them down again in a chatter. [raps the desk] Sounds impossible! I wouldn't have believed it if I hadn't seen it with my own eyes! That bed was chattering against the floor! This guy was scared! [laughter] And there is a thing like an odor of fear, and that odor permeated the room to a point where I never thought I would smell anything like it in my life. It smelled like a terrified army in full rout.

And it was an incident. It was right there. He'd been sitting in it. It was in full restim. He just – an incident he kept resisting; he couldn't confront any part of it, and I just tripped him into it, with some skill. But it was an incident where he and a fellow scout had gone – as a couple of savages – to scout the enemy position and had been caught, and his companion had been boiled and eaten before him and then he, in an effort not to get eaten, had managed to get free and throw himself over a cliff. And it finally developed how – ever; that he couldn't really determine whether he'd been thrown over the cliff because he had gone mad or whether he had thrown himself over the cliff. And it finally resolved, and so forth, that he had thrown himself over the cliff. But he ran this out and the emotion discharged from it. I only had to go through it five or six times and it finished it. But he was not about to go anywhere else on the track. It completely changed his life, as a matter of fact.

But there we were auditing for result. And undoubtedly you could bring about a fast result. And the reason we wanted to bring about fast results is because there are so many engrams. There are just so fantastically many engrams that we were becoming choosy as to which ones we were supposed to run, and we were trying to speed up the process. Well, you're not trying to do that. You're just trying to learn about the mind.

The faster process was the first one I ever used, which is gradient scales. Find something the fellow can confront and run him through it. And, factually, I've made people a lot better by getting them to run the incident of walking into the room to keep their appointment with me. Managed to coax them back that far on the time track. And I had my best results with that type of an approach. So you say, "What would you consider your chronic emotion is?"

And the fellow says – you know, you can be tricky about this – "What would you say your chronic emotion would be?"

Well, the fellow says, "I – I – I don't know. I think I'm just bored most of the time."
"Well, that's good enough. And can you remember a time when you were bored?"

"Oh, yes, yes."

"Good. Now, let's start in at the beginning of that period." You'll find a secondary, and you'll find another secondary. And you'll find another secondary below this. And the next thing you know there was real stuff here in being bored. You find this guy in actual fact was made to be in a place of no interest but some danger for a period of time that was very upsetting. Now, if you went and ran engrams to parallel this – you don't have to call for engrams to parallel this – sooner or later you're going to come up with an incident where he was executed or something in exactly the same type of surrounding as he was waiting for while in danger. And that would be the engram which gave this other thing. Yes, it is a chronic emotion and you could ask for various types of emotions and this way you could sort the thing out. There are lots of tricky things you can do.

I'm not trying to put any slightest block on the tricky things that you can do. I don't care how many commands you give him while he's running it. "Oh, go on," you know, and so forth. "Keep it up." "Continue." Anything you want to say. I'm just saying get the guy through it. That's what you're supposed to do. That's really what you're supposed to do. Well, what does it take to do that? And I'm telling you that you'll get your best results by not throwing the fellow in over his head. Then you won't run into all of these things whereby you need 8,765 solutions, you see, to 50,000 problems. See, you're not going to run into any problems.

The guy will run what he almost can confront, and he'll get quite a – quite a bang out of running something he almost can confront. He'll get quite a relief out of this. But you would just be fascinated how little some people can confront. But also you could be fascinated at how much some people can confront.

This fellow, he'll run through it and somatics are tearing all over the place and so forth and, "So, the lion took another mouthful out of my left leg." You know? Great.

It's what the pc can do, not what you decide the pc can do. But the individual who just doesn't run well and doesn't seem to get anyplace and that sort of thing is of two varieties. He has two things wrong: He is either being asked to confront far, far too much, or far, far too little. And the number of them that will be confronting far, far too little are very few and far between.

So, it boils down to the most commonest – the commonest thing that you'll run into is asking them to confront too much. How much is too much? Well, it is too much for the guy you are auditing. That same "too much" won't be too much for the next guy you audit. Do you understand? It varies from being to being because experience varies. Not only does experience vary but different parts of the track are in restimulation. Some people are in a very tough basic incident of some kind or another which makes all other incidents – the lightest of locks – the most painful things imaginable.

Now, you want to start running down a chain. Now, of course, if you call for a loss then that – you're ask... making a bid now to run out every single engram on the whole track. So, if you want to get a little more practice, why, extend it a little bit further and call for–
what's the guy's chronic emotion, now? Well, solve that chronic emotion. Work on it as a project. And you'll do a lot of secondaries. Secondaries will go right straight down the line.

Now, some people have an idea that there is an engram and then a secondary occurs and then the secondary accumulates locks. Now, it isn't that simple. The mind is – I've – just because I have given you simple answers is no reason the mind is simply built. You have all the jerry-rigged messes you ever wanted to run into.

Now, listen. There will be a chain; that is to say, the original and then the repeated incidents, plotted in time thereafter of the same type of incident. There will be a chain of engrams, which is to say, incidents containing pain and unconsciousness. You know, the off-with-the-head chain. The off-with-the-head chain, see? And here are 150 engrams, each one of which consists of having one's head cut off. Now oddly enough, there will also be, in parallel to that, the off-with-the-head motivator series. And there'll be 49, or something like that, incidents whereby the individual cut somebody else's head off. Now, in addition to all of that, each one of those will have accumulated locks which are conscious-level experiences which sort of stick and the individual doesn't quite know why. A shiny piece of metal would be enough to make a lock, see?

So, each one of the 150 engrams has many locks. When I say many, I would say, oh, 2 or 3 hundred thousand. Each one of the 150.

Now, what's the secondaries? Well, the secondaries, if you had a rung of a ladder, as you were looking at a ladder, and the bottom side of that rung were natural wood color and there was a stripe of black painted across the top of the rung, you would have the secondary. It's actually lying right straight there with the engram. Now, each one of those 150 engrams has its own secondary. There's a secondary probably for every single one of the 150 engrams. And each of those secondaries has a lock, and not only has a lock but has maybe 2 or 3 thousand locks.

Now, worse than that, this chain cross-references and interconnects with public gatherings, injuries during. Now, that's not a series of locks, that will be independent – an independent series of engrams containing pain and unconsciousness, each one of the incidents, you know? Why, there was the fellow in the crowd, and he was a little boy, and the crowd surged, and they squashed him and he died, you see? I mean this type of incident.

Now, those will – those engrams – the off-with-the-head chain will be the smashed-in-the-crowd chain, you see? The public gatherings, incidents in, they will be cross-referenced and their locks will intermingle. So, that the locks of one of these chains will also cross over and become the locks of the off-with-the-head chain, also. Isn't that great!

Now, let me show you where you would really get foxed if you tried to trace something like this down and you would really have trouble. We want to know... And this is a typical – a typical Freudian problem – fetishism: The fellow has a fixation on hairbrushes. I can assure you the mind has enough incident in it. They just underestimated the amount of incident, you see, by about – one ten-trillionth is about all the incident they thought was there, see?
A hairbrush would be absolutely impossible to trace back to all of its engramic and secondary influences or associators. Be impossible. It would be impossible to take any single article and trace it back to why the individual is afraid of it. That would be impossible! You could desensitize it. You could find some reasons for it. But to get the basic reason for it? Oh, no! Oh, huh! It occurs in engram chain one, engram chain two, engram chain three, secondary chain four, and 8 billion locks. And it turns out not to be a hairbrush, anyhow. It turns out to be a small black animal. [laughter] Hairbrush itself just restimulated.

But to set anybody a job of tracing something like that back would be pure idiocy. There would be no point in it of any kind whatsoever. Wrong way to go about it. Wrong end to. Those are the cognitions that the guy gets out of it. "Hey! A bridle."

"Yes, yes," you say, coaxing him, making him aware of your presence. [laughter]

"I always wondered. I always wondered why. I always wondered why. Yes, it's the disk on the bridle. That's what it is."

You say, "Well, what was that?"

"Well, Mother always used to wear a cameo, and it matches the disk on this bridle. And it's when I was killed – heh – at the tournament, the fellow had a disk on the side of the bridle and that hit me. And that was the last thing I saw. And I used to wonder why I got colic all the time, you see? And my mother wore this. Yeah, that's great. I'm sure glad to get that straightened out."

Well, you be glad to get it straightened out, too. And you be glad when he moves off of it, because he's going to find 8 thousand more reasons before he's through. [laughs] Do you follow?

Men have experienced things. Women have experienced things. There's hardly anything an individual has not been or done at one time or another of his career. And to say, "This is a specialized thetan; he has always been a magistrate" – don't make me laugh. At what period in his career did he get tired of being a criminal and become a magistrate? [laughter] After having been a ditch digger, a coal heaver, a counsel, an artisan, a pilot, a space opera ranger, a writer, you know?

But the individual's experiential track is very important with regard to what he can do when he finally comes out, because we're producing a new thing in a Clear. We're producing a being without a bank who has experience. Never had anything like that before, see?

Now, one has had main points of experience on the track which have been more emphasized than other points, and he will tend to be better at these things than things he has not had so much experience with. But it's a case of emphasis, not difference.

Now, where your individual is being run on engrams, he can easily get in too deep, but only if you push him in. And if he's not running up new material, if he's not running them properly, why, you figure out why, in view of what I've been telling you. Now, it's either over- or underconfront, and my bet is on that it's overconfront. And you asked too generalized a question and you took too vague an answer on something. You didn't get the thing estab-
lished. You didn't decide what you were going to run. You didn't get it all mapped out before you began it.

You're going to run some times when the guy was scared. All right, great. We're going to run some times when the guy was scared. What was the last time he was scared? All right. And the individual all of a sudden trips into this new mechanism of "mustn't have any future." Back down the track he goes, starts winding up in bad incidents, and so forth.

Well, it's simply because you sort of lost control of the whole situation. You didn't steady him on and make him run what you started to run. You got him all involved in whether he should go earlier and he's trying to go totally Clear on engram running.

Well, if he wants to go totally Clear on engram running he undoubtedly could do so. Undoubtedly do so. It'd only take him three or four lifetimes. And I want to point out that the body goes to pieces in a fairly regular lineup at once every seventy years, or something like that, and so he hasn't got time to do that. You understand any more about engrams?

Audience: Yeah.

Well, I'm talking to you about the woof and the warp and the exact thing which you're auditing all the way to Clear. Now, I think that it's a good time that people not only got some practice auditing but also made some bowing acquaintance with that thing which has got them in the cage.

And it's always a very good thing when you find yourself in a trap to find out what the trap consists of. I often say that to myself when I find myself in traps.

But don't despair if you have not yet been able to run an engram on anybody. You haven't been able to run an engram because you've disdained to run some faint lock. If all goes to pieces, and you are no longer able to make any progress – and you haven't been able to make any progress – not no longer able – if you haven't been able to make any progress with your pc and you haven't been able to get him into anything, you haven't been able to run anything and so forth, run breakfast. You'll find that usually works. If you can't run breakfast and so forth, run the time he came to the session as an incident.

Do you know that people – not just that, but people can be so bad off that present time and the march of time past him in this universe is itself a continuous running engram. He is living in a moment of pain and unconsciousness. And the tick, tick of the clock is an engram in itself.

Now, a person is pretty batty when they're in that shape. They're very batty indeed. As a matter of fact, you won't find them around here. But that's how bad it can get. And you've run into some vestige of that when you're not able to run incidents on your pc. He just is not about to go anywhere. It's nice and safe where he is.

And so, you can always run an incident on somebody. Don't listen to orders that "I must run an engram." No, run the incident your pc can confront and run, and you will win all the way. Don't take incidents that you fish off the meter because you'll throw him in over his head, and I think you'll have a lot of fun.
This is a great sport. This is a great sport. I don't regard it any more than that but it's a very worthwhile sport and it's one that you should indulge in because it's going to make an awful good auditor out of you that knows a great deal about the mind.

Thank you.

Thank you.
SUPPRESSIVES AND GAEs

A lecture given on 2 August 1966

Thank you.
Thank you.
Thank you!

[part missing]

What's the date?

Audience voice: August the 2nd, AD 16.

Well, Suzie knows it but the rest of you don't seem to know the date. [laughter]

What's the date?

Audience: 2nd of August 1966, AD 16.

That's correct! 2 August, AD 16.

Now, we have lots of subjects we can always talk about. We have lots of tapes on them. But we obviously never have enough. For some peculiar reason—for some peculiar reason—why, the Tech Sec and the Qual Sec and so forth have trouble with a scarcity of materials on some of these subjects. That's quite obvious, because they keep getting committed or omitted.

Now, there's two types of crime—two types of crime. There's the crimes of commission and the crimes of omission. And in modern society they pay very little attention to the crimes of omission.

The penalty is usually awarded to a person, really, for two reasons: one is for being there and the other is for communicating. Now, that is the normal penalty in this society. If you want to reduce any crime down, why, it was basically composed of those two elements: being there and communicating.

But there are crimes of not being there and not communicating, too; the society doesn't pay much attention to these. But the auditor not being there and the auditor not carrying out his communications is a crime of the highest order, because he's now barring the road.

Now, it used to be that people were— you know, they expected me to prove Dianetics and Scientology to them and, you know, sort of carry along the full responsibility for its
workability, and when it didn't work it was my fault; and I should have done it better, and so on.

Well, you probably expect changes in Level 0, I, II, III, IV and V and all that sort of thing. Now, I got an awful surprise for you, you know: I'm not changing one comma in nothin'.

Now, we've gone from a total change, you see, to a total no-change, you see, just to make a proper dichotomy. [laughter, laughs] So the materials now are just right there.

But today, today, I really speak from considerable strength, because we have such a thing as a Clear and when you clip a Clear on the ear he rings for an hour without stopping. They're that clear. [laughs] And everything that was predicted up to the level of Clear has more than been made good.

Now, what's very peculiar is the road to Clear, in its stages from wog to Grade IV – pardon me, raw meat to Grade IV (a wog is somebody who isn't even trying) – the total jump there is very fast. That is a very fast jump. And that is one of the troubles of the lower grades and the thing that you as an auditor will have the most trouble with. It happens too quick.

Now, there are some processes which are not in the lineup which would be so quick, well, I don't dare put them in the lineup, you see? The auditor is busy adjusting his meter, you know, and he doesn't notice the guy went Release. So we've omitted those.

And 2-12 is one of them. Marvelous process – the most fascinating process to overrun that anybody ever heard of. I mean, it wraps a person around more telegraph poles in less times. When I got that I said, "This is really it, man." People said, "Well, if that's really it, let's really audit it." [laughter, laughs]

But we have – we have today such a fast route, that it's only by additives, goofing it up and particularly the gross GAES – the GAES – the gross auditing errors – that can stop somebody from going.

So, in actual fact, it becomes a real crime now to audit badly, because you're barring the road for this fellow for eternity. That's quite a long time.

Now, any thetan wants out. Even the SP himself; personally, wants out, only he unfortunately is sure that you are simply trying to put him in. You see, he knows he belongs in. And he is very easily described as somebody who is totally surrounded by Martians, regardless of who you are. You see, he's stuck in an incident which has personnel that have nothing to do with present time. But all that personnel is in present time, and you are that personnel, so that of course, you have to be held down. Because if you got big and strong and powerful, you-being a Martian or being an FBI agent or being something else – would of course do him in. So therefore, he commits almost continuous crimes in an effort to hold people down.

Now, there is a tendency on the part of Ethics that every time somebody commits a lot of GAES, and so forth, to declare them suppressive. Now, I should make it rather clear that a suppressive is a special breed of cat. He is not hard to identify, in actual fact. He is somebody with no case gain.
Well, you say, that's very hard. You – if somebody is – does not get better with Dianetics or Scientology auditing, then you immediately say that he is no good. Well, interpret it that way if you like. It's okay with me. I'm impervious to criticism. [laughs]

But anyway, a suppressive, being a very particular breed of cat, will of course commit nothing but – and do nothing but – GAEs and cannot be pressed into auditing at all. They won't audit at all.

Now, because somebody makes a few GAEs, that doesn't make him a suppressive. Do you follow? But it does happen to be true that a suppressive would never audit, he would only commit GAEs. All you would have to do would be describe to him how to make the gross auditing error so as to keep it from working, and you instantly and immediately would have on your hands nothing but GAEs. Because he then would be able to mask himself by saying, "You see? I am trying my best to audit these people, and they still don't get any better. So therefore, I am right and Hubbard is wrong, and the rest of you guys are for the birds." Do you see? "And therefore it doesn't work, and there isn't any way to make them any stronger. And if we can just get rid of this, then I'm safe." That's his whole philosophy: If he can get rid of any method of making anybody stronger or more powerful, then he's got it made. So he of course rewards only down statistics. You see, only a down statistic gets rewarded. Never reward an up statistic. And goof up or vilify any effort to help anybody. And particularly knife with violence anything calculated to make human beings more powerful or more intelligent.

Now, a suppressive automatically and immediately will curve, then, any betterment activity into something evil or bad. If you let him have auditing, he would then use the-a pattern like the GAEs to audit. You see?

But once more I tell you that not everybody who makes GAEs is suppressive.

Now, a GAE – special breed of cat, no case gain. I mean no case gain. Now, I would coax Registrars into being alert to this, and they'd save us fantastic amounts of trouble. Because something on the order of two-and-a-half persons out of every hundred who walk in the streets are screaming, museum-piece, institution-bait suppressives. They're the people who put the people in institutions. People in institutions are really PTS – potential trouble sources – which are, they say, the effect of suppressives. Suppressives are very seldom picked up. They know better than to get obvious.

Now, a suppressive makes no case gain, and will sit there and brag about it, and he can't resist bragging about it. And any Registrar who had somebody come in and say, "Well, I've had three-and-a-half thousand hours of processing" or "one thousand hours of processing" or "every auditor in Seattle, and they haven't had any results on me so far, and I've still got this terrible lumbiosis. And I've come here to find out if you could do anything for me. And I want a sort of a guarantee that you can."

At that moment if I were the Registrar, knowing my technology, I would say, "You bet! Now, you've had a lot of trouble with auditors. Now, before we sign you up, you had better go and see the Ethics Officer." [laughter]
Let him trot over to the Ethics Officer. And then an Ethics Officer should be very fully aware of what this is all about. He's not complaining – anybody has a right to complain about one auditor. But this guy will complain about them all, man.

He has other characteristics which are quite marked, and it's really an interesting breed of cat. If you ever got him auditing, he will only be happy or satisfied if his preclear gets worse. And he's only sad when the pc gets better. And that characteristic was what spotted us suppressives, years and years and years ago.

This is very peculiar. We'd notice here and there – once in a blue moon – we would have somebody exhibiting these characteristics. And the rest of the characteristics was that he himself got no case gain of any kind whatsoever, and he committed nothing but GAEs and could be educated into nothing else but committing errors. And we eventually traced these people as to what they did and how they behaved, and the monitoring fact was no case gain.

Now, there are a bunch of ramifications to this but these do not make a suppressive. The suppressive is in active attack on Scientology. He commits overts twenty-four hours a day. You almost never find out about them. "Every auditor in Seattle has audited me. Ahh, didn't make any case gain. Yeah, they took my money and they did me in." Ah, come off of it. You couldn't have that many Scientologists working on one person without a case gain. It's impossible. No, he would have had some gain at some time or another.

You know now that that person also privately commits overts: secret overts in the society around him. It isn't usually a nasty habit like strangling babies or something like that, but it could be. Spitting in other people's beer – you know, something. [laughter, laughs]

Just another characteristic, another characteristic is, attacks wrong targets. If the fridge is making a great deal of noise – to you Americans, refridge is English for icebox or – fridge. [laughter] Anyway, if the fridge is making a lot of noise and it's annoying him, he'll go over and kick the lamp. If the car has a flat tire, he will fix the motor.

In addition to that, he will not complete a cycle of action, but if he occasionally does complete a cycle of action and finds out about it, he will then reverse it. You get the idea? He's found out that he accidentally completed a cycle of action (see, he delivered the goods or something); he will immediately reverse it.

Now, those continuous overts, wrong target, non-completions of cycles of action, are primary manifestations, and when accompanied with no case gain, you pretty well got the boy tagged.

Now, at no time during this lecture have I said that all existing governments on the planet today reward down statistics, choose wrong targets, fail to complete cycles of action, or commit continuous overts. I have not said that. And your inference on that subject is your own responsibility. [laughter]

Well now, if you, in auditing, find yourself up against somebody who can't make any case gain (and you are doing your best), now, don't be a fool as an auditor. You take this thing on an ethics basis. Tech is out, because it isn't working. So your other tool that comes before tech is ethics.
Now, you as an auditor can actually be an Ethics Officer – which I think is quite interesting, but you have to be every now and then – and you should know some of the technology of ethics. It isn't just routing somebody to the Ethics Officer. You yourself; every now and then, are going to find yourself sitting there as a cop. Well, much more superior to a cop – an Ethics Officer.

You're going to have to know how to locate overts, how to locate overts that are so unreal they don't even show on a normal meter. You're going to have to be able to locate all kinds of things, on a meter, or in life, concerning your pc.

Now, where you run up against a total blank, you obviously can't get tech in, huh? You see? I mean, no gain, no gain, so therefore your other weapon is ethics. And that becomes [comes] before tech.

Now, what's the matter with the planet at this particular time is ethics is out. And that is proven by the fact that you are having a hard time getting tech in. With the technology which you know at this particular moment and the results which you are delivering even at lower levels, you have a total monopoly of all mental activities, all religious activities and all social activities on this planet. That is what you are entitled to at this moment. Do you have them? Well, therefore, tech is out. Obvious.

So, the only thing that puts tech out, is if ethics is out. The only thing that can get tech in is ethics.

Now, ethics is based on the mechanics of the SP – the suppressive person – the mechanics of the SP. Now, if you were to audit one of these heads of governments who's always choosing wrong targets and not completing cycles of action and committing these little overts – like brush wars or something – if you were to put him in the auditing chair, you would find that he would not respond to processing. No matter what you called it, no matter what reason you had to do it, nothing, he wouldn't respond to processing. He's a suppressive!

Now, he isn't going to do what you say as an auditor, because you of course are a Martian like everybody else. You're his favorite – you're his favorite bugbear, a representative of; sitting there. You're not trying to help him; you're trying to trick him. You're trying to trick him into letting down his protective mechanisms long enough so that you can stab him in the back! That's his whole opinion of life. And that is what you would find in the driver's seat. That is what you would find.

Now, as long as that sort of bloke is in the driver's seat – now, nothing in this lecture invites anyone to war, civil commotion or rebellion, assassination or other political activities. But if you were to get ethics in, you would just have to get ethics in. Now, ethics isn't gotten in on a wide police-state basis. It's gotten in on a very narrow basis. It's just a very occasional individual here and there who is in power.

Now, the other part of the ethics picture is called a PTS, who is a potential trouble source. And if you don't think that a potential trouble source doesn't cause trouble, you should look along the line, because the trouble is great, numerous, and so on. Causes much more apparent trouble than the SP. So, you very often think that you are looking at an SP who is simply causing trouble, to find yourself looking in actual fact at a potential trouble source.
Now, the person is a potential trouble source because he's connected to the SP. He has not handled or disconnected from the SP, and as long as he does not either handle or disconnect, he will continue to be a potential trouble source, no matter how thoroughly he explains it otherwise.

Now, a potential trouble source is interesting to us, as far as technology is concerned, in that he rolls coasters. Now, a roller coaster is something they have on Coney Island and other places, and down in Long Beach they used to have one called the Rabbit Eight, and so on. It's these little railways that go up in the sky and have terrific dips, in amusement parks, you see? And the little cars go up and the little cars go down, and that's a roller coaster. And the pc who goes up and the pc who goes down is roller-coastering.

And please don't think he's doing anything else. He hasn't done anything else at all but rolls coaster when he comes back in after the session and says, "I felt fine yesterday afternoon, but this morning I have a terrible stomachache." He's rolls coastered.

Now, during that period of time when that pc was out of sight, an SP was either directly contacted or restimulated. Now, the person didn't have to see the SP but only had to see something that reminded him of the SP. SP is a postman; he sees a letter box. That's enough. He goes PTS – potential trouble source – so he rolls coasters.

Now, this person is going to endlessly cause you, as an auditor, trouble. You're going to get them up three inches in the session and they will fall back four in life. And it is terrible to audit them. We're not being extreme. Actually, we're auditing over the dead body of some SP valence or person. We're auditing across something which is going to kill this fellow if he gets any better!

If, for instance, your pc – who is PTS – were to demonstrate an intelligence graph which went from 90 to 131, there's every possibility that he'd wake up the next morning very dead from arsenic. I mean, you're actually putting his life at risk. That's why you mustn't audit them, not because they're trouble to you. You're going to kill them. They're going to get sicker and sicker. More and more extraordinary effort is going to be applied to making this person ill. Sad but true.

Now, therefore, you are very interested in this thing called a potential trouble source, because a potential trouble source will give you trouble, will rolls coaster, won't get better, and it's a terrible liability to audit them – a liability to yourself personally, and a liability to them. If all of a sudden they made a sweeping gain, they're liable to be met with a .45-caliber pistol. I'm not joking.

Now, as fast as auditing is today, it really isn't fast enough to make the total grade against the SP, because there's that better part of a year to Clear.

Now, you could make the lower grades. You got the person for a week. You can make all the lower grades in a week, see? You work real hard, and you do a real good job, and the person is responding okay, and they're out of a restimulative environment. And that's why you

---

6 Editor's note: At that time, each Grade was only run to one F/N. This was considered to be the full EP and the achievement of the Grade Release.
see so many Grade Vs and VI cave in. You're not making it fast enough to keep them away from the suppressive environment.

So they get up to V and they're going to have a long time to go before they're VI, and whewww! So you see Vs collapse. Do you see? They're PTS. And that was because an undetected suppressive is in this person's environment, and the person is moved out of his common environment, and you audited this person, and in the process of auditing this person you got them – whssst – Grade IV Release! Great day! Fine!

Oh yes, they're not going to have this much trouble. Yes, during that period of release, they might even get wise to their environment. All kinds of things might be okay, but they walk out of that – and remember this person is only a Release. This person is still very mortal. Terrific shape, better than any activity was ever – actually Grade 0 is better than any activity in the past ever got to. They can still be hit head-on by the truck, and don't think they aren't if they have a real, live SP in their vicinity. Boy, that guy gets right into the General Sherman tank and throws all con… all fuel on the fire – bam!

And so you get more Grade V trouble – see, Grade IV, they went away, got restimulated. Now you come back; they're all set. Now you've got to rehabilitate them and so forth, and it takes a while to get through Grade V, and you start to run into your trouble if there's an SP in this person's vicinity.

Grade VI, you'll run into more trouble. And possibly anybody who's lagging on the Clearing Course is simply very PTS and so forth. But actually, the Clearing Course, if a person is – follows procedure and does grit his teeth and try to handle or disconnect his environment, he can make it through. I have; I'm making it through right – very nicely.

Well, I'm connected with some SPs known as governments and so on. They have long since made up their minds that we should be shot and pilloried and that sort of thing. I'm just – see, wrong target. So I'm just hoping that they will get very mad at somebody else.

But the point I'm making is that it's at about Grade VI which is the make-break point. You could somehow or other start persevering through, if you were a very superior thetan, at about Grade VI. You know, "So there's SPs; so I'm PTS – rrrr, rrrr; rrrr; rrrr. I'll make it somehow!" But I don't think it would be possible at Grade V.

Now, the answer to that is what we call an S&D, Search and Discovery. And when you're running an S&D, you're doing an ethics job. And you know assessment isn't auditing, and an S&D is an assessment.

This fellow who says – this fellow who says, "He doesn't do assessments well because he has GAEs during assessment and so forth." How could you have a GAE during an assessment? It's a gross auditing error. You can't have GAEs during assessment, unless you were auditing, which is against the law! You see, assessing comes much closer to being an ethics action than a technical action, because it's finding the suppressives, finding the PTS; it's patching up the ARC breaks caused by life and the environment. You see? Actually, those people have impinged on the individual.

So therefore, the auditor had better realize that these techniques – there are some techniques, such as the Search and Discovery (S&D) – Search and Discovery for the suppressive
and ARC break are not auditing actions at all but ethics actions. So therefore, you have to be a bit of an Ethics Officer, don't you?

Well, let's continue it out just a little bit further. And let's let you recognize when you are not getting any case gains while doing your best, and don't keep cutting your throat. Start taking an ethics action.

Now, the ethics action that'd be taken against a potential trouble source or a PTS – somebody connected with a suppressive – the ethics action that can be taken with regard to that person is to do a Search and Discovery. You sometimes will have trouble with your Search and Discovery because you haven't handled the ARC break before you did it. You say the guy looks like he has a suppressive around. Well, suppressives also ARC break people. And you mustn't even do an assessment on an ARC broken person; you must get the ARC break first.

Anybody who looks a little bit sad has had an ARC break for a long time. He's going into the sad effect.

Now, where your auditing will break down in the lower grades is on a rock known as the SP. And what can you do about him? He's got no case gain. He has no potential of case gain. You are sitting there, a Martian. You audit him. He tells you that you have made his finger better. He runs immediately next door and says that you're a gyp and a fraud and ought to be killed! He spreads wild tales about you around the neighborhood. He's perfectly nice to your face, chops you up behind your back. Do you get the idea? That is not a characteristic of an SP. It's because you've tried to help him that has made him mad at you. Other people also talk behind other people's back, because we're not all brave.

But, what can you do for this fellow? What can you do for this fellow?

Well, now, the only known action – and there is one – that can be taken with an SP is the last Power Process. And that will handle an SP if you can get him to sit still and answer the auditing questions. But you mustn't run it until some other processes have been seen to fail. Do you follow?

Now, where can you get that done? Well, you can get that done in an organization which is qualified to run Power Processing; and where, I trust, they have an auditor who can do it very well; and where, I also trust, they have a Registrar who, as soon as the person sits down and says, "Everybody in Seattle has audited me, and they've gotten no results at all," will promptly call for the Ethics Officer and chuck the fellow out onto the street.

Well, you say, "That's – hey, wait a minute. You just said – you just said that this Power Process would handle the guy, and you're saying that he really couldn't get in to register." Well, until such time as you run the mental hospitals, throw him out in the street, because he's the maddest hatter of them all. He's the real psycho.

You actually have to put him in something like a padded cell. You'd say, "Well, you answer the next auditing command and you can have your dinner." Three days later, you give him his dinner. [laughter]
But you're not equipped to handle this guy. But I'm saying that a person who gets no case gain could, in a well-handled HGC, whose auditors know their business on Power Processing, could in actual fact be audited up the line and out and squared around.

Now, when you've audited them on that, remember, you haven't made a Grade V Release. This condition, by the way, is often mistaken. You audit Grade V processes, but the person hasn't been bridged up to those processes; and when you've audited the Grade V processes, you've got somebody who is prepared to do a lower-grade release. You haven't got a Grade V Release; you've got somebody who can now be audited to Grade 0.

So therefore, don't be so surprised sometime when you run into somebody who has been audited on Grade V processes and who doesn't seem to be able to talk. Do you see? Do you see that? Power Processes are circular.

But until such time as you've got a very legal control of your environment, and until such time as you've got available padded cells and you can handle everything that goes wrong, and so forth, you'd be terribly wise to have a Registrar who, the second somebody says, "Well, I've been out in California, and I've been audited by everybody in California, and the organization out there charged me eighteen thousand dollars and I got no place, and I've never had any case gains, and that sort of thing" – If you had a smart Registrar, the smart Registrar would instantly say, "Well, you just go over and tell Ethics about it, because I'm very sure they would like to hear all these complaints about these auditors."

And then if you've got a clever Ethics Officer, the Ethics Officer listens to all this and sorts it out, and finds out whether or not this is an actual complaint, if there aren't just one or two auditors that made a goof; or whether this guy really hasn't been – has been audited well and didn't make any case gains. That's what the Ethics Officer has got to decide. And if the Ethics Officer decides that this is an SP, you're taking your life in your hands to put that person into the HGC.

But now, you say, "Well, that's a pretty cruel line to take, and we are very helpful persons."

Well, someday, when you haven't anything better to do, go down in the jungle and find a wounded water buffalo who is stuck in a hole, and go over barehandedly to help him out. And if you go through that elementary exercise, you will, I think, understand what I am talking about. Because that's what's going to happen: You're going to get gored.

Now, these people can be broken up pretty quickly. The only mistake they ever make in an HGC is running the preliminary Power Processes. You don't; you just saw right in – blambo!

Now, all of this preamble is to give you a taste of what ethics is all about. Ethics is not our effort to make ourselves right and the rest of the world wrong. That is not that activity. It's not our service facsimile. It's how we're getting – it's how we're getting in tech.

Now we do, organizationally, we have a tendency to be snappy and choppy with ethics and do this and that, but the reason for that is, is we're slightly introverted because we're a bit PTS against the environment around us. We cannot depend on the governments or societies in which we exist to have any caliber or quality of justice or anything like that. On the one
hand the Ethics Officer is trying to protect the organization from the consequences of SPs and PTSes, and on the other hand is trying also to bring about the justice which we so liberally pay for with income tax and nobody gives us.

There isn't any legal protection out there. If it's a jungle, it's because ethics are out, not because man is bad.

It might interest you how an SP comes about:

He's already got enough overts to deserve more motivators than you can shake a stick at, see? He has done something to dish one and all in. He's been a bad boy.

Now, the reason he got to be a bad boy was by switching valences. He had a bad boy over there, and he then in some peculiar way got into that bad boy's valence. Now, he knows what he is, he's a bad boy. See? Man is basically good, but he mocks up evil valences and then gets into them. You see, he says, "The other fellow is bad. The other fellow is bad. The other fellow is bad," see? And eventually he's got this pasted up other fellow, and one day he becomes the other fellow, see, in a valence shift or a personality – whole complete package of personality; and there he is. And so he's now an evil fellow. He knows how he's supposed to act: He's supposed to act like the other fellow. That's the switcheroo. That's how evil comes into being.

The religionists have been very – having a hard time trying to solve what evil was, and that is what evil is: It's the declaration or postulate that evil can exist. In the absence of postulates and the declaration of such, man is good. Isn't that interesting?

When you take all of the furniture polish off; and all the cast iron and old garbage and so forth, out, you find a good person. That's very lucky, because we're making very powerful persons, and it's very fortunate that they're good persons. Quite interesting as a mechanism. It would not be safe to embark upon such an activity as Scientology at all, you'd wreck the whole universe, if that truth wasn't a truth – and it is a truth.

It is the false, mocked-up valence which is the evil valence. Do you follow?

All right. Well, this fellow has been assigning great evilness to another personality or type of personality. And then one day he got into it. And then when he was in this basically evil personality, he started doing other people in. And then other people got very tired of him, or something of the sort, and he got himself into an incident, after which time never advanced.

Now, this is not the type of incident of which the R6 bank is composed. This is another type of incident. This is a battle incident or some kind of an incident. He is being attacked. He's being actively attacked by other beings, and he is stuck on the track. Now, that portion of the time track, or that point in time, is more real than present time.

Now, every once in a while you will be sliding around in Dianetic auditing and once in a blue moon you will suddenly have the incident – well, you – all the time running one, with just your interest on it, the incident is more real than the environment in which you are, and so on. But you once in a while will run into an incident which is far, far, far, more real than any reality you ever experienced! Thuhh! There it is, boy!
Now, anybody's got a few of these. He isn't permanently stuck in them. I remember the first time it ever happened to me, there was a line of redcoats, and the guns had never gone off. It was a very light little incident and it went flick and that was the end of that. But just for that instant, that line of redcoats was about the realest line of people I ever saw in my life. There they were, you see, all ready for volley fire with their flintlocks, you know? It was an action back in the days, you know, when you tipped your hat and you said, "Your first shot, gentlemen." [laughter]

And for some reason or other, due to various complications, why, the volley had never arrived. In fact the flintlock hammers were just about halfway down on the priming pan. You know? There they were. They had to go the rest of that way and the guns had to fire. And – that's many, many years ago. And I said, "That's an interesting mechanism," because I just saw it as a mechanism, since it wasn't very affecting to me; I wasn't worried about redcoats.

And I looked afterwards; I looked for it to see if I couldn't find – find it. Many, many, many years later I found it, man. I found it, man. And it is – you see, anybody has got one or two or three of these things, you see, when they start in from scratch, you know, before they get up in the Grades. They'll have a point there, and they're flicking around and all of a sudden, why, there is a fighter plane, or there is the ground, you know, or there they are on the edge of the cliff and the arrow hasn't quite arrived. And for just a split instant as you see the thing, boy, that arrow is really real, man! That has made an impression. Well, to that degree time has been stopped, and when you run back into it, you'll find a stopped picture. But remember, you and I are running back into it.

Do you get the difference?

The SP never went on from there. He never advanced from that moment! He's there in totally absorbed attention! And these walls, to the SP, are phony and thin. He knows where the real walls are. The real walls are in that incident, and that incident is more real to him than present time with every tick of the clock. And that incident contains something. It contains other personalities, other vengeances. But you, moving around outside of this person – you, moving around outside of this person – are part of the dramatis personae of his incident, and you are a threat, because all life is this incident.

There he is, driven against the cliff and being butchered by man-monsters. He's next in the line of captives. And in the trillions which followed, he's always been next in the line of captives. This person is living a nightmare that was once very real. (It isn't, as the psychiatrist said, something which didn't exist. I would never take the opinion of a suppressive person on what the track was all about anyway.) [laughter] He's always been the next one to be killed, see?

Maybe the other personnel out there are Roman legionnaires or some past-track Rome. But whatever it is, his bank got stacked-stacked-stacked-stacked-stacked till he no longer had fluidity, he no longer could move on this track, and then he got the business! Well, you could only get the business that solidly if you yourself had enough overts to stretch from here to Halifax and back.

But there he is, and he's never been anyplace else – not from that moment on. You are the Roman legionnaire; you are part of the game.
Now, that is all there is to an SP. There aren't warped brain cells, or numerous other things. There aren't thousands of answers to this. It is that answer.

And you, in practicing Dianetic auditing, run into a mental image picture. All right. Now, a person has a lot of these mental image pictures. Now, don't blame me if a person's mental image pictures, perfectly accurate, go back further than man likes to think he has lived. Don't blame me for it, because anybody you audit in Dianetics will run into just that! You audit them long enough and there they go. Man is an immortal being, and he did not get born in sin at the beginning of this lifetime.

By the way, if you want to argue with that, get somebody to run you on some engrams so you fall through and see for yourself! Anyway…

The point is here that this is something that has happened to the fellow; like he's being beat up by a bunch of cops, and there he is, and he has never been out of being beat up by a bunch of cops. He's just stuck in time being beat up by the cops, you see? Now, that makes everyone he runs into a cop – male or female, peculiarly enough. His power of differentiation is zero. Everything equals everything in the incident. And that is the boy. And it makes him choose wrong targets. He can't complete a cycle of action because he's stuck in time. It makes him perform little overts because he's defending himself continuously – defending himself against the police.

Now, this is the character; this is the character called an SP, and he isn't anyplace else. Now, of course, with Power Processing, he could be blasted loose. And being blasted loose, he is able to function again on the track, and now he will respond to processing. It's as simple as that.

But how can a cop or a Roman legionnaire audit him? Do you get the difference? That's the only problem to be solved in handling an SP. It isn't an auditing problem; it's a problem of the identity of the auditor

Now, you would just be amazed how many cases resolve in an institution. I know, I've put my collar on backwards many a day and audited psychos in institutions, in many a yesterday. It's amazing, absolutely amazing. Some of the results I've had with this make me sometimes a little bit ashamed of myself that I don't push in that direction harder. Because institutions contain very few SPs. They're PTSES. The SPs are those in charge.

I've seen a girl actually getting better and had a psychiatrist run up to me absolutely screaming, "You must get the family – you must get the family of this person, to consent to electric shock!"

"What's the matter?"
"Well, we've got to electric shock her!"
"What's the matter with the patient?"
"We've got to do it!"
"No, no, no – is the patient getting worse?"
"You don't understand! We'll throw her out of here!"
Talking to a nut. Complete nut. Person was getting better, so they had to electric shock them.

The same person told me that I didn't keep good records. I should keep records that had the time and place connected with every single action as the predominant action, and so forth, and they kept good records.

And I said – it's sort of like shooting at tame dogs to talk to these fellows. I mean, it's cruel. They miss all the obvious things like, you know, "Yes, but what do you learn from your records?" You know? Question like that never occurs to them, see? "What do you learn from your records?"

"Well, what do we learn?" Then complete non sequitur – you know, ding-ding-ding-ding, here comes the wagon. [laughter] Complete non sequitur: "Oh, we learned if we didn't electric shock them, they would get out of here six weeks earlier in each case." Yet he has to electric shock everybody, see? He even knows it doesn't help anybody. He's gotten that brave. See, he's gotten that blatant.

Now, my only quarrel with psychiatry, in actual sober fact, is that it's not cleaned up its profession. It's got dirty hands. It's not cleaned up its profession, because if it cleaned up its profession, it would be able to view the fact that some of the things they do get results, and 90 percent of the things they do don't. And that the cruelty and brutality which they levy against the insane, or wage against the insane, is not getting results. If they knew about the mind, they would know how to handle their own people.

So my only quarrel with psychiatry is their ethics are out. Do you follow me?

Now, Frieda Fromm-Reichmann – this is not my own opinion. Frieda Fromm-Reichmann wrote a book on it. Someday you'll want to look it up. It's Frieda Fromm-Reichmann, and she was one of the greatest of great – I think she's still alive – and she wrote a book in which she begged throughout the book for the psychiatrist and his profession to get in his own ethics on his own practitioners. That book is available – Library of Congress and other places. And she is probably the dean of all American psychiatry. She was making a feeble effort to get it in. But that's the trouble.

Now, my only complaint against government is, being bodies charged with the responsibility of getting in law and order, never having isolated what puts lawlessness and disorder into the society, never having made any effort to understand it, but just shoots everybody. So my quarrel with them is, their ethics are out.

My only quarrel with politics and political theories and political practices just sum up to the same thing: They do not produce an orderly society. Any system of politics which lets a madman rise to supreme power is an evil system.

Now, you as an auditor are only able to push ethics in or blame SP or PTS for your lack of results if you yourself have clean hands with your GAEs. If you yourself do not commit gross auditing errors, then you are perfectly at liberty to handle ethics. But as long as you yourself have any question, then you will never quite know. And this is the difference between a confident auditor and an unconfident auditor, and is the primary difference.
"Is it my auditing or is it the case I'm auditing?" That is the unresolved question. "Is it my auditing which is getting no gain, or is it not possible to get gain on this case?"

And that is why I started this lecture by telling you I don't have to make any apologies now. We're taking them all the way to Clear, and there's nothing going to be changed of any kind whatsoever in the lower-grade processing, because the only time we're flumping and flubbing is when ethics go out or technology is not followed. It is omitted or added to. You omit pieces of technology or you add to technology, it will cease to work.

Right now they've got one going; they've got one going now which I'm sure is ended as of this afternoon. They've had one going about "below 2." "If the tone arm goes below 2, then horrible things will happen, because a person who is a low-tone-arm case will never experience any gain except on Power Processing." That is the wildest misinterpretation. I just wish they'd just forget about it. I don't care anything about it anymore. I don't want to hear about it anymore. If the tone arm goes to 1.0 and stays there, I don't want – even want an Instructor to say "That is a peculiar and particular and interesting phenomenon." I don't want nobody to do nothing, because apparently this is a very dangerous cat, and it will suddenly run and get all over and scratch everybody up like mad.
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Throw your trim knob, and you'll throw him back on the dial. Then don't forget to compensate your meter before you say the next guy is released. [laughs]

So there's an additive. There's an additive. I don't know how many people this additive has shot down in flames up to this moment. It's several, several. You know? There are some fat folders around, and so forth. And fortunately it isn't I finding all this, and so forth. It is I that found this "below 2" thing, but it was already been stated to me by somebody in the Qual Division that – this… There was a common denominator in those folders: they each one had a "below 2" trouble. And so I'm getting a shakedown of the relationship of a fat folder to a "below 2" phenomena, just as a peculiarity that's going on at the moment. That's an additive. That's an additive.

Now, you get an omission, and an omission can be very, very deadly. We cease to have sessions that start and end. You know? We don't start any sessions anymore and we don't end any sessions anymore; we just sit down and start auditing, you know? Pretty wild, because it never completes a cycle of action for the pc and has a tendency to make him obsessively go on. That's how bad an omission could be.

But your little omissions can cause you equal amounts of trouble – your little omissions, you see?

How about the omission of acknowledging? Supposing you never acknowledged anything; you just omitted that totally: You'd destroy the entire technology. Do you see? It could be very serious.

But your problem, to get right back down to it again, is how can you be sure – you see, it used to be that we had three problems here: Ron could be wrong, you see; and it could be the auditor; and it could be the pc, see? Well now, because of all the Clears, we have to drop the first one out. [laughter] Now – so therefore, it leaves an auditor with this problem. And I don't give it to you as a light thing; I give it to you as something that's probably worried quite a few of you from time to time: Is it the way you're applying the technology? Or is it the pc you are auditing?

And I have seen that auditors – bless them – always err on the side that it's their own auditing. I have tried to reason with an auditor who was trying desperately to audit a PTS, who just kept on blaming her own auditing – couldn't even hear the technology of PTS because she was blaming her own auditing so hard. Yet her own auditing wasn't that bad; she was auditing a PTS. And it was very, very hard to convince this auditor that a PTS was the only reason somebody roller-coastered unless the auditing was very omitted or committed along various lines. Do you follow? Very hard to convince this person there could be something wrong with the pc, because this person was too fixated on the idea that she really didn't know quite how to audit. Do you see that?

Now, therefore, you've got to be satisfied that you don't commit GAEs, and after that your judgment on an ethics problem will be sound. But until you are able to know completely, yourself, that your auditing is smooth and your technology is correct, you will not, with any certainty, be able to spot an ethics problem! Makes sense, huh?

_Audience voices: Yes._
Now, that's the primary bugaboo of the auditor. You're trying to help people. Now, is it something wrong with the person you're trying to help, or is it something wrong with the way you're helping?

And there's a very easy way to decide this — very, very, very easy way to decide this — and that is to know what are the five GAEs.

Now, we say GAE, and we mean gross auditing error. There it is: a gross auditing error. And there are only five of them! You can't commit 105 because there aren't 105. You can only commit five. That's a good thing, because they can be spotted and isolated. And they are very, very elementary. Anybody could spot them.

You could make a tape of yourself auditing some pc and then listen to the tape back and knew — know whether or not you committed GAEs. It's that elementary. First GAE, particularly, would surrender to that test: auditing cycle out.

Do you give an auditing command, have the pc answer it, and then acknowledge it? Elementary. Do you do that? Or do you give an auditing command, not let the pc answer it, and acknowledge? Do you let the pc talk for half an hour before you finally wake up that you should acknowledge? Do you see? Or do you have this smoothly down? Can you do this thing?

Boy, it's an elementary thing there, isn't it? Well, not to do it is a gross auditing error. It's one of the reasons Scientology works, is because of its communication drill. Communication is a basic — so fundamental that when you use the communication cycle of action known in Scientology (man didn't know it) — you can just use a cycle of action and cure things up. It's the most remarkable thing.

You can sit down with the training drills, which just handle a cycle of action, and with a bunch of people that have just dropped into the org, or something of the sort, and two or three of them will get rid of some somatics and upsets and feel better. What's doing that? It's just the exercise of the drill itself.

So, woven through auditing are all kinds of little side benefits. But this is not a little side benefit. When you omit this one, man, you've had it! So, do you handle your comm cycle well? Or do you give an auditing command, not let it be answered or make it be answered exhaustively before you finally acknowledge.

Or do you hit it on the button? Do you err over or under? Because if you err in not acknowledging, your pc will go into an obsessive outflow.

Wherever I see a PC who's just talking on and on and on and on and on and on, the auditor giving no commands — only four commands issued in a two-and-a-half-hour session, see. When I see this I know what's wrong:

It's a GAE; the auditing cycle is out. The pc is trying to find that last step. Can't find that last step, and he's gotten so accustomed to this.

Now, some pcs are this way obsessively in life, but you, oddly enough, by a precise auditing cycle, snap them right out of it. A proper auditing command cycle, and so forth, will straighten them right up.
Now, you'll notice people out in the society – you should listen to their auditing cycles just for a gag. Does your auditing cycle sound anything like that? You should listen to a few of them, you know? Lean up against a lamppost with your back to the two that are discussing it all, or sit in the lobby of a hotel for a while. Just listen to those auditing cycles. (They're not auditing cycles; listen to comm cycles.) You'll be fascinated, man. You've got a treat in store if you've never done this. You say, how could anybody call that communication?

Now, that's the first GAE.

Now, the second GAE is: the repetitive auditing cycle is out. Now, the repetitive auditing cycle is quite something else than the auditing cycle. It's being able to do it again. [laughter] And people who aren't able to do it again cannot give a repetitive auditing command on and on. They can't do it. So, they do what we call Q and A; they change. The PC makes a remark so they change the process. Every time the PC gives something offbeat, then the auditor changes the process. Do you see? They Q-and-A.

Here's an example of Q and A: or – well, just the inability to "Do birds fly? Do birds fly? Do birds fly?" and acknowledge it each time and so forth. It's "Do birds fly? Are the jolly little sparrows a-wing? Are birds flopping about? Are birds? Have you ever been an ornithologist? Do you swim?" Where'd he go? See?

The Q and A is simply the – the shift with the PC. It leaves the PC in control of the session. The auditor starts out, "Do birds fly?"

And the pc says, "Yes. Yes, I had a canary once."

And the auditor says, "Where was that?"

Pc says, "In Des Moines."

And the auditor says, "Were you there when you were a child?"

And the PC says, "In se...," about... If you ever listen to this as a gag going on – I mean, it'll – really happens. And when you listen to this going on you will begin to detect a note of exasperation in the pc's voice. A bit of asperity will enter at this point. "Well, yes, I lived there, when I was four." Q-and-A, Q-and-A, Q-and-A. Drift.

You ask an auditor – an auditor who does this – you ask this auditor and you say to him, "Now, get the overt." And he comes back with the life story of the fellow's brother. Well, that'll be compounded of Q and A, but also this – this – another one: He just wouldn't do what you said, you see? He wouldn't audit it at all. He didn't even come near it.

Now, the next GAE is just bad meter reading. And you would just be amazed – you would just be amazed – until you have stood around teaching people to meter read, you'd just be amazed how, in that group, two or three of them won't even vaguely come near reading that meter.

If you ever want to find out what's wrong with some auditing session sometime, and you've got an HGC auditor, and you're D of P, or something like that, and you're tearing your hair out about this PC, remember these GAEs, man.
You get suspicious about things, like "How about the meter?" Well, the auditor has been auditing the pc with his meter uncharged. Well, that would be a understandable error. But how about the fellow auditing the pc without the meter turned on? Could happen. How about the auditor auditing the PC without the cans plugged in? Now, that's what we mean when we say GAE. And you, in trying to examine auditing, will always err in the favor of being too reasonable about the thing.

You argue and argue, and you argue and argue; you talk and talk and talk with this auditor about the PC, and then you find out that the auditor doesn't believe in meters and so doesn't use them in his session, or something like this, see? I mean it's gross. And that's why we have "gross," you see – it's a gross error. It's always something big, you see?

You're blowing your brains out trying to find this little thing: "Do you have the trim knob set exactly right?" and all that sort of thing. Trim knob set right? Why, the meter's been out of repair for the last two months – hasn't been functioning at all. Auditor rocks the meter to get his reads. [laughter]

Now, an old, experienced Director of Processing like Mary Sue could tell you some wild ones. She's tried to run down, and tried to run down, and – you know, the mysterious non-recovery of somebody, you see? And she's finally run it down to something like, well, they never turned on their meter. You know? I mean, it's incredible. Here she's beating her brains out trying to help the PC, you see, but – gross auditing error sitting right there.

Now, the fourth one impinges a bit on the second one. You told him to run one process and he ran something else. It goes worse than that. He's not able to read, understand and follow procedure. That's a simple test. That's a simple test. Can you read and understand an HCOB? See, that is a simple test.

You would just be surprised. When that gets to be a gross auditing error, the person didn't even read the HCOBs related to the processes they were supposed to be auditing. And to our shame it once happened here at Saint Hill. There was no checkouts required for a short period of time, many, many months ago. There were no checkouts required. Nobody in Tech or Qual is there now – not because of that totally. But before they audited the hottest processes in the world, nobody was requiring a checkout on them. Boy, that's a gross auditing error, man.

Now, one of the reasons Tech was having a hard time in 1965 in organizations is there apparently wasn't a D of P anywhere in any organization in the world outside of Saint Hill that was requiring star-rated checkouts on the lower-grade processes his auditors were supposed to be running on the pcs. Tsk! Interesting, huh?

Oh, I get on to these things, and I follow them up, and don't think we're all bad. But that accounted for lack of Releases. Of course they weren't making any Releases; they weren't running any of the processes that released anybody. See, that's a gross auditing error, is not being able to read and comprehend what they're supposed to do.

Or, not reading it at all! See how gross this is? You say, "You don't – you just seem to be an awful long time, Mr. Jones, on the subject of making your – that pc – you just making
that PC a Grade 0. This is – seems to have been on – this is going on to the third month. Seems to be just a little bit long – long... So what's wrong? What are you doing?"

Well, actually, the way you'd find out what he's doing: Is his auditing cycle out? His repetitive auditing cycle out? Is he reading the meter badly?

And what you're liable to find is something like number four: He has never run, to date, any of the processes that make a Grade 0 Release. He's never run any of them. It's that – it's that which you normally find at the bottom of no results in auditing. Or it's an ethics problem.

And the fifth one is, unable to handle and keep a pc in-session.

Well, you'd say, well that automatically is covered in one, two, three, four. Oh, no, it is not! Who does that? Well, Ron does it, of course; he does everything else! No, that's something that you do; that is up to the auditor.

It is sometimes necessary to be quite forceful; it's sometimes necessary to be quite persuasive; it's sometimes necessary to do most extraordinary things to handle and keep a pc in-session.

For instance, you've got somebody who's very blowy. You're trying to pull some overt of one kind or another. It's – this session is going rough, man, and you finally have to back up your back to the door, turn the lock, put the key in your pocket. The guy finally gives you the overt. See?

Now, this pc doesn't seem to be running well, and you just never take out a moment to find out why or examine the pc or talk about anything or have any two-way comm. You see that the pc is disinterested; you don't make it your business to find out "Why is the pc disinterested?" Pc can't seem to answer the question, for the last four hours of auditing, doesn't seem to have had any answer to the auditing question, is sitting in the chair crying. Why, four hours ago, didn't you wonder why this pc was unhappy? Do you see?

Now, that's actually a matter of quick perception. I used to say that it used to take me about an hour – I could find from forty-five minutes to an hour and a half before the auditors in the org would notice that an ARC break was coming or a blow was going to occur. It was forty-five minutes to an hour and a half I used to do this with a squawk box, you know, patrol. We used to listen in on the sessions, and so forth. I could find it on an average of forty-five minutes to an hour and a half before the auditor noticed it. "That Pc is going to blow. That pc is ARC broken. It's coming right over the hill" – just from tone of voice.

Well, the auditor in this particular instance had the advantage of sitting across from the PC, having a meter in his hands, actually being able to observe what the PC was doing, do you see, and didn't notice it for another forty-five minutes or an hour and a half; until it became terribly obvious.

So you want to pick up your perception. And that is a place where nearly all auditors fall down a bit. Pick up the perception of what's going on with the PC. Be a little bit interested in what's going on with the PC, and do something about it. And don't do so much that you completely destroy all effects of processing, but do enough to keep the pc in-session.
Now, what is "in-session"? Well, he's willing to sit there and answer the auditing question; he's fairly cheerful, and so on. It has some precision definitions but, crudely, a PC ought to be fairly happy about being audited, even when he is running through sadness. So that would be ability to look at the pc and see what was going on with the Pc. And that comes under the heading of willingness to confront a PC, doesn't it?

Well, those are the gross auditing errors: auditing cycle out; repetitive auditing cycle out; bad meter reading; not able to read, understand and follow procedures or bulletins or auditing directions; and five, unable to handle and keep a pc in session. And those are the five gross auditing errors.

You can verify, then, your own auditing. And if you look over the whole thing – and you look over the thing and you say to yourself; "Well, I do those things pretty well," now you know whether the pc is or is not an ethics case. Because if you do those things well, and the pc doesn't run well, that pc is an ethics case every time. Do you see?

Now, there's how you disentangle the "myskery."

The whole problem of ethics is a universal problem. It is a problem in mental troubles. Ethics would never get in on discipline alone. Never! It would only get worse.

Justice can never occur in the absence of an understanding of the human mind. Never! You get nothing but goofs.

Now, that doesn't necessarily make somebody who is an expert on the human mind, such as a Scientologist, the only person who should have anything to do with justice on the planet. Or does it? But I would not for a moment guide you over into a realm of high specialization in the field of justice, because ethics simply exists to get tech in. Once you've got tech in you no longer need justice.

We are the only road which leaves artificial measures of law and order behind us. And it's only the fact that we are handling aberration itself that makes it necessary for us to be in the zone of ethics now. The amount of ethics action necessary in actual OTs would be practically zero. Big difference.

And we notice that we're not having any trouble with Clears. I noticed earlier that the divisional statistics exactly matched the case state of each Divisional Secretary – how far he had gone – or he or she had gone, toward Clear. It was very interesting.

So therefore, the problem of justice and the problem of ethics is involved with the problem of human – human aberration. Unless you've solved the latter, the former can never be solved. Not all the gunpowder in the world could blow people into being good, because they're good naturally, and they resent gunpowder.

So, there also is how you can solve the problem of whether or not you're a good auditor or not, and why you should solve the problem. And I hope this has been of some assistance to you.

Thank you.
Thank you.

Thank you very much. What is the date?

_Audience: Four August AD 16._

Four August – 4 August AD 16. Very good. I'm glad you know what day it is. Now, that's an advance. [laughs] Now, I'm real proud of you. The – what else do you know? [laughter, laughs] Come on, what else?

_Audience: You are here._

You know me?

_Audience: Yes._

Hey, good! That's all right. All right. Good enough. What else? Huh?

_Female voice: Scientology works._

All right. Very good. Scientology works. That's fine. That's fine.

_Male voice: Dianetics works, too. [laughter]_ What was that one?

_Male voice: Dianetics works, too._

Now, now, you're not supposed to say Dianetics works. [laughter] The next thing you know you'll have everybody doing Dianetics and getting – getting well, and so forth.

You know, there was one psychotherapist in New York completely packed up his practice in 1950 because he'd been looking for cheap psychotherapy and he had found it in Dianetics. He said, "That's it." He was – has been researching for it and he said, "Well, you've got it. And that's it." It was quite interesting. He had seen the various results of it.

It's also interesting to me that the medical world has not picked up the fact that psychosomatic medicine has been wrapped up now for some sixteen years. Oh, well, they're a bit slow, you know. A bit slow.

Well, all right. I haven't the least idea of what I'm going to talk to you about today. Not the least. I didn't bring any notes, no papers, nothing. I listened – I listened to Mary Sue
on what she'd been getting on the lines, and she hadn't been getting very many errors through on her lines, and I was around looking at everybody today, though. They all looked rather sad. They were saying, [in a sad tone of voice:] "Hello, Ron." [laughter]

But you don't look sad now so I can't even undertake to merely pep you up, you see. Well, it could be worse. I could give a – you know, it could be worse. You could be on some other planet. Of course, the real laugh is somebody who came to me the other day – "You know, I just feel just like a prisoner on this planet, you know." It was a wog. I said, "Boy, I – what do you know. Perceptive!" [laughs]

Well, Dianetics – Dianetics is what I'll talk to you about. I could talk to you about a lot of interesting history. Dianetics has probably got more history per square inch connected with it than any other activity that's ever occurred on this planet. It hit something on the order of a battering ram and it completely disorganized all lines in all directions but the planet has really never recovered from the impact. That's the truth of the matter. Something did happen, and then because along about '51 or something like that I stopped shoving Dianetics as such, you see, why it sort of left the missing step at the bottom of the steps, you know, sort of feeling. But, of course, that's a sneaker because there is no intention of leaving it abandoned forever. Because it is this field and sphere which does disclose the anatomy of the mind; it is the entrance point to what the mind is all about. It gives very definite, if somewhat superficial, clues to human behavior.

I say somewhat superficially – it's hilarious, you know, sometimes – somebody trying to find his aberrations in this lifetime. This poor bloke that just got – went on a mad jihad or amok – that's the word. The Malays go amok.

And we had an American university boy go amok the other day and got up in the tower of the University of Texas and slaughtered a lot of people with rifles and that sort of thing. It was interesting to me that he'd been to see a psychiatrist – just been to see a psychiatrist. Told the psychiatrist all about it, that he had impulses to do it and so forth. And the psychiatrist said, "Good boy." And the fellow didn't turn up for his next appointment. The psychiatrist never much bothered about it and then he went out and killed about 39 people or – I don't know what the figure was, 14 or something like that.

But it was interesting to me – it was interesting to me just as a little side comment, that if you read carefully into such cases – movie star commits suicide – just been to see a psychiatrist. Another movie star commits suicide, you know, Marilyn Monroe-type thing – just been to see a psychiatrist. What were those two guys that committed enough overt to blow – Burgess and who?

Audience: MacLean.

Oh, Burgess and MacLean, that's right. They had just been to see a psychiatrist. At the – just before they departed they went to see a psychiatrist.

---

7 Editor's note: Burgess, Guy and Maclean, Donald, two high-ranking officers working in the Foreign Office of the British Government and being secret agents for the Soviet Union. They fled England in 1951 after being warned that they were about to be discovered.
Now, this bloke, he had just been to see a psychiatrist, you see. I don't like these statistics that go 100 percent.

Now, if a guy wants to sit around and be something called a psychiatrist, that's perfectly all right with me. Perfectly all right with me for him to draw pay with it, you know. Sit around back of the desk and look important and all that sort of thing. But I'm novel; I'm peculiar. I think somebody who's being paid to do something should do it. Of course, I know that's a new strange idea.

Now, if the world of mental healing and that sort of thing was all wrapped up in Dianetics – and with the refinement and smooth-out which you have in Dianetics right this minute, that does wrap it up. You're just using it for practice because let me tell you something – Dianetics is small game. That's like shooting rabbits when you're after water buffalo.

Now, that's the difference. It's not even that order of magnitude. It's like oh, I don't know, it's like digging a ditch by going out and counting the grains of sand that lie on top of where it should be. You see, it's very – it's very junior because when it was vivid and obvious that you were engaged in the resolution of the human spirit, the address of the surface manifestations of the mind became quite secondary. Do you follow that?

Now, heh, you don't head for a few hours relief from lumbosis when you can give somebody eternity. Do you follow? The order of magnitude, you see, between Dianetics and Scientology is hardly comparable but at this moment man is playing about, pretending he knows something about the mind, and he is playing about with shooting people in their gluteus maximus, hoping that they will suddenly cease to be schizo-paranoid or something. They haven't even got classifications that mean anything.

One day – one day – I've told this story before – but one day I was in an institution asking some of the psychiatrists some questions. And I walked around, and I'm always quite welcome in these institutions by the way, they never look at me with a sneer, they always talk to me very respectfully – it throws them – throws them for a complete loop, you know. They go, huuh! You know, like that. But then they re very nice and feed me tea, which I'm very careful to not drink and they talk to me about it and they show me all their records and they look at me sort of oddly out of the corner of their eye, and so forth. But you see, the secret is, is they know what we do works, you see. It is not a mystery to them.

Their backflash, where it exists, against Dianetics or Scientology is because it is a rival. They think of it as a rival and they think if it got ahead, everybody would get well and where would they be? We've had psychoanalysts, and so forth, quit being auditors because it wrapped up their practice, and it was too much work for them to get more and more patients. And they couldn't make enough money out of the patients. Fact. Fact.

One very prominent one up here in London. He almost went broke on the subject because his procurement lines were too bad and he'd been living off thirty-five patients, and then he started into practice and he cleaned up thirty-five patients and that was that and all of a sudden he found he was broke and he had to go out – and where they procure people is in social engagements. They go out and – parties and things like this, you see. And he – the social strain then had to be stepped up and this was very tiring and he complained to me about it very, very bitterly.
And what we miss in these chaps is they don't have any goal of helping the human race, and the psychiatrist who is seen merely just before the accident or the catastrophe is not there to help anybody or even prevent a disaster. You would be very interested to have a discussion with such a bloke because he wouldn't make any sense to you. You know why you're processing people, you see. Well, he doesn't give you the same answers.

And these boys, however, are not all bad boys. They are wrapped up into some kind of a routine which they can't get out of. In many states and areas it's against the law not to electric shock people. Now they've got a new one on experimental surgery that one has to weigh the value of the individual, I think it is, or the individual against the good that the research will do whether – before you butcher one up. And they call this equitable practice, you see, now that it – now ethical – it's now ethical to butcher somebody up if you can resolve it in your own mind that this will benefit a lot of other people and then there's sort of shifty think here. Well, a lot of these boys are SPs and those that aren't soon become very PTS, and operating in an atmosphere of that particular character is quite – not to make any pun but is in actual fact quite maddening. It is.

Now, when I've walked in the front door of an institution – the early days, I used to be very covert about it – put a collar on backwards and so forth. But nowadays, if it entered my head to go up and call on one of the local spinbins and so forth, I would simply drive – drive up and walk in and hand them my card.

These boys, well, they don't understand what we're doing because they don't have the same goals. Now, if you want to help somebody, why, then you do something effective. But supposing you didn't want to help anybody. And supposing also, you had no mission of bringing law and order, and supposing you didn't want to help the society either. You'd say, well, why is he in business? Well, I don't know. Someday I'll assign one of you a project to go around and visit them all and find out why they are in business. But it's basically goals. There is no doubt in their mind but that Dianetics worked and that was what made it so fearsome.

From one year to the next there are all sorts of philosophies come out. They must come out at the rate of a thousand or two a year, you know, at least, that even get into print and so forth. Well, where do they go? They don't go anyplace. There must be new schools of psychology and so forth invented every couple or three months. It's quite rapid, undoubtedly. And yet one never hears anything of them. And here, sixteen years later, we are still going forward and growing and that sort of thing, well, that's what's frightening about us. We're making headway.

Now, if we stopped helping people, why, maybe they'd be satisfied. If we started to adopt a goal line similar to the goal line of the current representative state or a goal line that was representative of medicine or psychiatry or something like that, and we fitted ourselves into their goal lines, you see, and perverted the technology so that it would act in that direction, we would be very acceptable. Well, I think it's too high a price. It's not even thinkable.

So, I have a philosophy about all of them and it's very quickly stated – to hell with them! [laughs] I rarely go around zoos wondering if I'm acceptable to the monkeys in the cage.
So Dianetics – Dianetics, if we went straight forward with it as it exists in its present version, would undoubtedly cut a fantastic swath in the healing professions, in the mental professions and that would be fine. And one of the things that restrains us to some degree is it's more or less owned territory. But you're rewarding a down statistic.

Now, you want to know – ask this question – how did medicine spin in? Because it's pretty spiny. How did psychiatry spin in? How did the old alienist go by the boards? You see, the field of mental healing is one field where every decade or so you get a change of title. You realize that? There's a change of title. Now, in an unsuccessful activity, you get these title changes as you come along. So that, well, in the 20s they were known as alienists, not as psychiatrists. Now, you go back down the line, you'll find out that they were known as different things. We've forgotten the earlier ones, but one day I was amusing myself and I thought, isn't this interesting? Since about 1850 on forward, they've been known as about a dozen different things. And currently they're known as psychiatrists, and I imagine that will fade out and one of these days they will be known as mentalists or some other title. Now, it isn't that the schools are going down, it's that the whole profession goes down, and that's because that profession is giving all of its time and effort to an existing down statistic and it becomes very enturbulated.

Now, were we to engage upon such an activity, we would have to be ourselves based so strongly, our feet would have to be so solidly on the ground, our economic framework would have to be so fantastically good and our success in other lines would have – in the – in what we are doing, you see, would have to be so great, that we could afford at that time to take an offbeat or even distractive activity and carry on.

Now that's a very odd frame of reference to look at this sort of thing in. But I wonder if you can envision standing on a rather slippery log across a roaring little brook with leather shoes on and trying to reach over, while standing on that log, and pick up a big heavy stone out of that running water. What do you think would happen to you? Now, if you are firmly planted on the bank and you had rubber boots, if you did step in the water and you were of a stature and strength that if you were hit with a 16-inch shell it would dent itself – yes, you could pick up that great big stone with the greatest of ease, do you see?

Well now, an organization or activity which is going along in a somewhat barbaric environment – you know the West is a scientific barbarism. It is really not a civilization, not yet, but it is very scientific and so on. But its usages according to many societies – what passes for politeness, for instance, in the West is so outrageously discourteous in more civilized societies that their hair stands on ends when they see people saying hello to each other the way they do in the Western societies.

I'm not saying that is anything very important, but a man has to be pretty civilized and he has to be pretty understanding and he has to know his business pretty shocking well to be trusted with very much power. Actually the society is unbalanced at this time to the degree that it possesses scientific power, without the gentler graces. It has power without humanity and that, to that extent, is not a civilization. Any group of cops can whistle up, or any army in the West can whistle up an unlimited number of machine guns, tear gas bombs, all sorts of materials with which to injure, wreck and ruin people, you see. But you know that they
couldn't at this time whip up a single technology to make somebody who was crying, laugh or somebody who was laughing, cry.

They are attempting to alter human behavior with forte main. "If you don't change and act better I'm going to hit you on the head with a sledgehammer." You see, that is the approach of this civilization.

Now, into a scene or a view like that, it is very dicey to put technology broadly in the road of those who are already accustomed to the abuse of technology. You could only do it successfully if the technology itself advanced the state of case with such rapidity that it completely overcame the basic or any impulse to abuse it. I've had the maddest conversations with psychiatrists. Very mad conversations, very weird. I've taught them how to run an engram – taught them how to find and run an engram – I've taught a psychiatrist this. And the guy comes back to me absolutely bubbling over with enthusiasm, "Oh, Ron," he said, "this is marvelous. This is marvelous. You really have something in Dianetics. I've been trying for years and years and years with one of my paranoid schizophrenics to find the incident that was responsible for his insanity," and he said, "you just handed it to me on a silver platter".

And I said, "Well, what was the incident?"

"Well, his father hadn't changed his diapers."

"Well," I said, "very good. After you found this, what did you do?"

"Well," he said, "it was quite remarkable. He all of a sudden conceived that he was lying there in the crib with dirty diapers and he was starting to tell me something about being angry with his father at that point and that was just what I'd been looking for so I was able to tell him at that moment that that explained all of his symptoms and I explained it all to him and so forth."

And I said, "Well, is the guy sane?"

He said, "What's that got to do with it?"

And I think that was the first time I ever reeled on the subject. What's that got to do with it? This person was a sort of a guinea pig that he kept in a padded cell and he was able to find a point in this guinea pig that he'd been looking for for some time because he knew it was there and he used Dianetics, found the point in the guinea pig, reverted to psychoanalytic evaluation techniques and so on, and it put him right back in the padded cell again.

Well, I've had enough experiences this way that although I every now and then get an impulse – well, I ought to whistle up a whole bunch of psychiatrists and give them a course – huhhh, I remember these things, you know. God!

For instance, I had an argument the other day with a medical doctor on the subject of the E-Meter. He thought it worked because the auditor had a strong personality. He did! He explained the whole thing to me on that particular basis and what is shocking is electrogalvanometer in the detection of emotional responses have been known for 100 years. He should have known this in his own technology. But he had selected out the whole subject of the electrogalvanometer and had blamed it over on Scientology and then he had said, "Well actually, it's what the auditor wants it to say that it says."
Well, it gave you immediately his level of technical development. Now, that was as much technical insight as he was capable of. And he happens to be the most advanced physician in a very large district and is the most liberal one there.

So when I see these things, I say, well, we won't push in that direction – we won't push in that direction, not yet. We won't stand on this slippery log, halfway across this stream and try to pull up any great big boulders, like the totality of the health level of the human race, the totality of the insane population of the West and so on. I don't know how many heads of government there are in the West but…

Anyway, it's just a little bit – a little bit something. But now you, of course, you've got your hands on a refined, smoothed-out, highly experienced Dianetics. This is a sleeked-up Alfa Romeo compared to a Model T Ford of 1912, you see. And the Dianetics which you got your hands on, if you listen to the couple of lectures I have given you on it and studied the bulletin real hard, read *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health* for interest and background, but follow the directions in those tapes and bulletin, and you've got a very, very, very smooth-running proposition. You have your paws on an E-Meter which tells you whether or not the fellow is running or not. We didn't have those things in 1950. You've got all kinds of things to assist you in this direction. You have technical materials of the composition of the mind which are in actual fact senior to those we had in 1950. Great many unexplained things still existed 16 years ago. Well, they've all been solved in Scientology.

See, you're taking off from the tremendous technical background of Scientology and going back to its immediate entrance background. Of course, this is – this is – this is very, very easy to clarify and it's very easy to do and I am very sure that more than one is going to get a terrific urge to get ahold of Mama and cure her lumbosis. Well, go ahead.

But don't, please, hang out a shingle. It's true, the world will beat a path to your door, but we have to modify that on the basis that it will be a very sick world that beats a path to your door.

Now, you say, this is a good entrance point. You can do this and you can do that. No, the best way to handle this is bring them into Scientology and then teach them Dianetics so that they can get a grip on the subject and tell them it's just a training procedure. Go ahead and let them get well. We're looking here at something – that something is going to happen. There's something going to come out of this that is different – that is peculiar.

We are advancing the most powerful psychosomatic technology on the planet out as a training technique, into a planetary area which never dreamed of anything that advanced. Now please, as it advances, don't lose sight of the fact that there is such a thing as Scientology, and that the salvage of a body is secondary to the salvage of a being. Now, true enough, it is great to be able to salvage a body so that you can salvage the being. And there you will find a use for Dianetics.

Fellow's just got through having an automobile accident and so you want to straighten him out so he can get back to his auditing – well, run the engram, you see. Some girl has just lost her husband or something, run the moment of loss as a secondary and spill it and you can get on with more serious auditing. It has a use. It has a use.
But the main thing – the main thing is, remember that you're in the field of the salvage of the actual being, not the salvage of his peculiarities. Now, if you wanted to trace the particular peculiarities of Joe Jinx or Bill Slats, you undoubtedly could find a chain of engrams which would match those characteristics, which when run would change his behavior to some degree. Do you know why? Because it's more fundamental – life has been dedicated to going wrong in that direction, so of course he's accumulated a tremendous number of incidents which demonstrate going wrong in that direction, do you follow?

This fellow – this fellow, he just loves to crack up airplanes. It seems like every time he turns around, he's cracking up an airplane. So you decide that those three crackups that he had in World War II which have got him all messed up – that these, if run, would of course solve his cracking up airplanes. Well, you're in for a big lose. You turn him loose and he doesn't crack one up for quite a while, but then he cracks one up. And this tends to give you a lose. Well, you didn't go fundamental enough. Actually, he's been cracking up airplanes for a very long time. He's probably been cracking up airplanes for an awful long time. And therefore if you don't accept the spiritual nature of man, you can't make Dianetics work, because it goes back too far. He was cracking up airplanes on Marcab and he was cracking up airplanes in the Galactic Federation and he has just been having a ball cracking up airplanes.

Now, there is a Scientology technique which gets him over cracking up airplanes and that's have him go out and do a Reach and Withdraw on airplanes until you get a free needle. Just bring him up to present time on the subject and bring him out of the masses which are making him crack up airplanes without bothering to inquire what mass is making him crack up airplanes. You get the different approach?

Now, the probability for cracking up airplanes probably be very slight – be very slight. He might go for several lifetimes before he gets stuck in it again and the possibility is that he would have – he chipped off enough of it that it ceases to be a game. But Scientology technology is just that much stronger.

Now, it is perfectly true that in one lifetime several experiences can absolutely ruin somebody. It is absolutely true that as long as the – use a Freudian expression – traumatic shock is contained in a broken leg, that is to say, the mental reaction to having gotten the broken leg, of the experience itself – as long as that remains intact, healing of the leg will be normal. You'll get a normal healing or you will get a long drawn-out healing. But if it takes six weeks for a broken leg's break to heal, if you ran the incident of breaking the leg, and if it didn't run, trace it back down just in this lifetime to the first time he hurt that leg, you would reduce the time of healing from six weeks to two weeks. And this is one of the wildest bafflers that medical doctors have ever run into with Dianetics.

You see, auditors for a very long time have been using Dianetics. It's one of the tools of the auditor. Now today, with faster techniques and so on, why, we have auditors who have sort of dropped this to a marked degree out of the kit. But most of your old-timers will still think in terms of running an engram. "Ah well, the guy busted his head on the walk and so let's run the engram." You know.

"I burned my finger," and he will either do a Scientology Touch Assist on it, but if that isn't working too well, he'll get more fundamental and run an engram. They still were using
engram running as a patch-up mechanism. All of this is very amusing to look at healing technology as merely an assistive and somewhat unimportant activity, but that's what it is. But it comes into the auditor's kit at a time when injury or illness prevents auditing. And that's its use in a practice. If actual advance for the being is being seriously—seriously—hindered, why, you've still got the running of secondaries and engrams to help you out.

In other words, you have a use for it. You can patch him up so that you can audit him on Scientology techniques. Well, this is possible—this is possible.

Somebody is so arthritic that they can hardly sit still—well, one of the things that running of engrams does and secondaries and so forth, is tends to cure arthritis. But it keys it out and a lot of people have recovered this way. There's a lot of these things, you see. You won't say it's a cure for arthritis; it isn't because the time would go on and the basic reasons the person had arthritis might key back in on it again and he'd get arthritis again. But it would give you enough time to come out of it.

For instance, I know of an instance relatively short time ago, where too much overwhelm on a case had resulted in an illness which had to be addressed by running out some of the efforts to cure the illness. You know, efforts had been made to cure the illness and then they had to be run out. But this was on high level auditing and it was rather disheartening to find, in a very short space of time, that it blew anyway on the auditing which it had. But there was just this moment when it seemed to be too overwhelming to permit actual auditing and so a process of running some engrams was utilized in order to take the edge off and let the person go on with it. That was actual physical illness occurring. So it has some use. And it's certainly something that a fellow ought to know how to do.

I've seen some very spectacular things happen. I've seen a goiter about the size of a very large baseball visibly shrink and disappear in the space of one half of an hour right after an engram was run, and I will say this—the engram was not well run either. I have seen several bad conditions of the body, and so on, disappear. I've also seen mental conditions alter. I have also seen the insane turn sane and that's one of the easier tricks. You'd be surprised how many insane can run engrams. Person is considered to be totally hopeless, you know, and yet they were just PTS—just potential trouble source, that was all. And you run a few incidents and you would be very interested how well they do run the incidents. It was up to a point where I concluded that being sane or insane had nothing whatsoever to do with the state of case. I know that sounds absolutely outrageous but it would just be a manifestation or a behavior pattern. It wasn't whether the person could be audited easily or with difficulty that determined whether he was sane or insane.

A person could be audited with great ease, a person was audited with great difficulty—it had nothing to do whatsoever with his state of case. I know that it sounds so funny, but the insane very often audit like a baby buggy and they'll run incidents. The funny part of it is they're usually try—they usually want to run the incident the psychiatrist has kept telling them it isn't true. They've run this incident and they tried to tell the psychiatrist about this, and psychiatrist just says, "Delusions, hallucination," won't even listen. So they ARC break him on it and about the first thing they do is present you with—it is something and they'll run it off and of course, it possibly is by this state of the game a bit delusory and that sort of thing. The basic
incident's gotten all messed up, you see, with so much suppression, but they kind of want to run that. Then they sometimes will be very, very, very thoughtful about telling you anything about it and you eventually can get it rolling.

But the alarming thing – the alarming thing in institutions and so on – I found in institutions, a very large population in the institution has been put there for different reasons than sanity. They've been put there by the family for this reason or that reason or the other reason and finally you get to a conclusion that families tend to be a bit suppressive in some cases, and they get suppressive to the point of where even where a person isn't insane, they will get the person put away. That is the main danger of having an institution and of having civil rights suspended because of a condemnation of insanity. You mustn't suspend civil rights simply because somebody's declared insane. He hasn't ceased to be a member of the human race.

When you – when you look outside – the behavior outside institutions and behavior inside institutions and so on, you begin to wonder if the psychiatrist does know his job. You wonder about it.

The rising statistic of the number of insane in Western countries is so fantastic – it'd only be a very suppressive society or government that would ever give it another penny appropriation. They'd say, "Hey, you guys have failed, man! You failed in a big way!"

But going up against an activity that is already being rewarded, if it has a down statistic, tends to bring you into the picture as being rewarded because you make down statistics and the next thing you know, why, everything you're trying to do is corroded. So my solution for the whole thing is to leave it alone. Let them – let them go – let them go spin. Let them go spin, practitioner and practiced-on alike and so on and do what you can. Because you see, we are on a winning line, you see, making the able more able may not be as profitable financially as it could be made but it is much sounder on a basis of personal and organizational repute and growth. What do you wind up with? You wind up with a bunch of able people. Well, how able can somebody get? Ah well, this is not a lecture on that subject.

But the main – the main thing to keep in mind about this, and there is something here to know, is that if you, for instance, set up someplace to cure lumbosis on all corners, you yourself are standing on a slippery log across a roaring stream, because trying to pick up one of those guys – aa-aa-aaaaah, man – it's picking up the black rock out of the middle of the roaring brook. It's very slippery. You find yourself being caved in on from all quarters. Not the law. You find yourself being caved in on by the family and the friends and by the guy himself and so on. You are in immediately in an enturbulated area. Your own case tends to park up.

I have seen – I've seen an auditor, attempting to handle an insane person – auditor, despite one's remonstrances not to and so forth just went out and tried to handle this insane person, and either out of the goodness of his heart or because of the size of; in one case, of his brother's fortune – auditor was being paid a fortune to do something for this insane brother – and in every case I have seen the auditor solely and totally tied up completely, utterly and so forth for months on end doing nothing else but holding somebody's hot hand and trying to carry through and do something about it. Wow! You talk about the investment of effort! Ter-
sific! And at the end of that time, I've never seen it otherwise happen that the auditor that did it, even when he's got the guy slightly out of the woods or has brought him out of the woods, I've never seen him otherwise than get a kick in the teeth.

My case histories on this sort of thing is that it doesn't pay to award the down statistic. So here are five guys walking down the street and one of them is as mad as the hatter. Now, if that bird, who is quite mad, had a brother who had 80 million pounds who was willing to pay an auditor 10,000 dollars or 10,000 pounds an hour to cure him, and the other four fellows didn't have any money at all, I can assure you, you would be much further ahead to audit any other of the four. You'd be much further ahead to audit any others of the four. It's just experience. Pure, unadulterated experience.

Now, institutionally, I've gone into jails and gone into institutions and looked at people. I've had lots of discussions with doctors on their patients and so on. I'm not quite as ill-informed on this subject as psychiatrists.

If you or I went out and shot somebody dead, they'd throw us into the electric chair or the gas chamber or something like that and we would be dispensed with, with great rapidity. No, but not an insane person. Not an insane person. No, he can go out and he can take a pistol and shoot 15 people and if he doesn't get killed in the process, why, he comes into court and his friend the psychiatrist comes in and says, "The man's insane."

"Oh, he's insane, is he! Well, we'll put him in a nice institution and he can sit there for the rest of his life or as long as it takes the doctors to do something for him. Well, we'll put him over there. We take all care of him and get all the social workers working on him an appropriation of about 18,000 bucks and so forth and there he is and good."

And do you know that in some of those cases nobody ever bothers to follow them through. Do you know that in as little as three days, the guy is right back on the street having been sent to the institution as insane, for murder. Just give him an electric shock and put him out in the street and sometimes not even electric shock. The psychiatrists look him over and say, "Well, the man isn't dangerous," and let him out in the street again. It happens at Saint Elizabeth all the time, Washington. It's got the Washington police absolutely groggy. Guy beats up about three cops and busts up a whole bar, they send him in and some psychiatrist drooling and buhrgling and blibbling comes in and says, "Oh, he's insane, Your Honor!"

So, this guy is just shipped across the river to Saint Elizabeth's and walks around there for two or three days and then the doctors let him out and he's back on the street again.

And it's gotten so the cops won't arrest them anymore. They say, why bother! Why bother? How can we keep law and order because if a guy's good and insane, he can get away with anything.

That's a pretty steep reward for a down statistic, isn't it? Pretty steep reward, for total lawlessness, and so on. Yeah, man, you start doing that very long; you get all kinds of wild things happening. Very unpleasant things start happening in a society.

I notice now that every time the US police try to stop a riot, somebody in Congress or somewhere in Washington will be very critical of the police handling of the situation but won't say very much about the ringleaders. They're working up to a point now, where the
creditable action is to riot. This is the rewarded action. If you riot, you get a prize. They pass a bill in Congress to reward you. Well, that's rewarding the down statistic. The fellow is not supporting the country, not keeping law and order, busting things up, looting stores, tearing everything to pieces.

So, what do we do with this? Well, let's give him more, let's give him more social workers, let's give him more dole, let's give him more votes; let's give him more rights. You get the idea? Rewarding that down statistic. Hey, how about all of the citizens around who weren't in riots and who weren't looting stores, you see. Well, they have to pay the tax that rewards the guy who did. So, the penalty of an up statistic.

Now, a suppressive society always penalizes the up statistic and it rewards the down statistic. So, in a society such as this one, you could make yourself very agreeable by awarding the down statistic of illness and insanity, and penalizing the up statistic, saying — going around saying, "Well, we don't know that young — that boy in school seems to be awfully bright. He's probably very abnormal. We probably ought to put him in an institution, he got through his classes twice as fast; there's a great liability to genius, you see, they always go to pieces — uh..." you know. I mean, if we went along with a total agreement like this society would love us. Well, I don't care to be loved in that framework. We're swimming against the stream, but we have to ask the question: Is it any kind of a stream you want to swim with?

Because by swimming with the stream you'd go over Niagara Falls with no barrel.

Now, therefore, in some peculiar way we are able to hold a constant, and we are holding a constant of ethical conduct; we are holding a constant on the subject of doing the best we can and helping other people. We — our impulses in this direction are very good. They are not neither getting better nor worse. They're very good, they've been constant for about sixteen years. Always tried to help our fellow man, keep our own nose clean and so forth.

And while we have been doing that — if we were just doing that we would get somewhere, you see. The rest of the society has been kind of going by the boards. You didn't see riots like this ten years ago in the United States. Twenty years ago they weren't quite handling psychiatry the way they're handling it today. You didn't see millions of dollars being appropriated to the reward and housing and feed and care of a bunch of nuts. If we were merely holding a constant we would win.

I remember Fred Allen, the old American comedian, and he said one time that the quality of humor and humorists had sunk to such a low ebb as to leave him on a pinnacle. [laughter, laughs] And we would sort of be like that, you see. I mean if it was just constant and we kept on true to our own ideals and so on, we'd still be holding the fort. As the society decayed, we would remain pretty well where we were, and it would leave us on a pinnacle and we would then be turned to eventually. Now however, that is not what we're doing. Although our motives and so forth are quite constant, our state of case or size of the movement is not. That's growing! That's with exclamation points.

Now, everyone connected with it is getting more able individually, and we have at this moment 22 Clears. Well, they're just now being enrolled in Part I of the OT Course. [applause]
And I don't know if it'll ever cost anything or not, but I have said just as a start so that we can get the enrollment done, that the first 30 Clears got Part I for nothing. We reward up statistics. Early up statistics, we reward. But, actually the curriculum on it is all mapped for Part I, and so on. It's very precise, very sensible. We do things in a very straightforward sort of way.

Now, this of course, doesn't present a picture of us remaining on a constant plateau with the society sinking away. It presents us on a rising plateau while the society sinks. Now, where do you think that's going to leave us as far as control and influence in the society is concerned.

If right now, my whereabouts and activities are a source of worry to governments, and they are; and if a government which recently said I shouldn't stay, then refused to make any statement on the subject time after time and even in their Parliament refused to all the parliamentary members to give any reason why Hubbard was not permitted to stay. It's rather interesting, isn't it? Compounded with the fact that a communication has just been received sort of around the back door that if I would request a permanent residency now, it would be granted. Second thoughts are occurring here. This is proving embarrassing.

I got a letter the other day – "If they reject you, then I don't want anything to do with them." Some chap there, you see. And I found out that it has caused a split in political parties and a new party is being formed. Yes. And somebody sent me through a document the other day and asked me to rewrite it for this new political party. Weird things are happening.

Now, what is the importance of this? The importance of this is we are of a concern. Not me, we. And what I do and so forth, is well is – well, is two, three years ago, when that FDA thing was on – probably nobody has ever told you what happened to the FDA thing. I don't think the thing was ever finalized because the government doesn't dare finalize it because we've got a suit against them for a million or a million and a half if we want to place it. And I don't know what the final outcome of that is or if any more recent news than this is – exists on it, but we're no longer being obstructed and there were two Senate hearings, pardon me, two Congressional hearings, one Senate and one House in which the government came off second best. The courts all found in our favor and so on. And I keep hearing that our lawyers are supposed to have a conference with the government lawyers so that they can find some resolution to the problem of how do they give us our materials back without themselves getting sued. And I keep hearing about that.

I wish somebody would do something about it because I don't think the government should be permitted to stand around like that – I think it should be brave enough to say, "All right, you can sue us." Or, maybe we could make a deal with them, and so forth – they give us the Pentagon or something, and… [laughter]

But that was a fiasco to end all fiascoes. And when it was at its height, why, they said you have to be awful careful about this fellow Hubbard because he's liable to appear almost anywhere. There's no telling where he will pop up. And this was evidently of considerable importance. Although Australia was willing to knock us all over the place and say all sorts of things and so forth, the one thing they wouldn't permit was my appearance. No-uh. They
knew they were safe as long as they didn't do that. They knew somebody – it could all be made look silly, see, unless somebody started talking sensibly, see.

So their whole strategy was to keep me out while it did it. Well, actually libel and slander in Great Britain in the Commonwealth is to – exists if a fair trial has not occurred. Of course, I wasn't on trial anyhow, but Scientology was. But a fair trial. If a fair trial occurred, it can then be reported in newspapers. But, if it was not a fair trial, it's libel and slander. So, the poor old Daily Mail and the rest of those papers, heh-heh-heh, there they go. They're right over Niagara Falls. And they're very worried.

Naturally, because they reported something where the principal was not permitted to appear. And you can't get a less fair trial than that. On the principal's request to appear to the Attorney General, the head of the Inquiry, the like, said, "No, no, couldn't appear" And even went so far as, "I couldn't – we couldn't guarantee his personal safety if he did appear." And then wrote letters and signed them to this effect. So, of course, the second that this is presented in the court in Great Britain obviously everything has been written since that time is libel and slander, and the judge cannot help but find in that direction for the excellent reason that, by definition, if it was not a fair trial, it mustn't be reported.

So, the only contest is not whether Scientology is good or bad but whether or not that Australian Inquiry was a fair hearing. In view of the fact that it's very easy to demonstrate that it was not – they – perjury – the QC was sitting there scratching himself under the armpit saying, "Well, yes, we know you lied and so forth, and it's all right, yes, go ahead." He did, it's right in – it's right in the transcript. He knew that it was perjury and he knew the fellow had been lying throughout the whole thing and said, "Good, good." Didn't strike it from the record – nothing.

Intimidated witnesses. One psychiatrist started to testify in our favor. The QC instantly called a recess, got ahold of the guy, took him out in the lobby, talked to him. And the guy went and sat back on the stand and became a hostile witness. We don't know whether money or threat changed hands. But it's in the transcript. And this sort of thing. Their irregularities were as great as you would expect from a bunch of criminals.

And so therefore, that's very easy to win. But you look this over, you'll find out that as we go along the line and so on, we win these things. But it looks like we're not doing too well because nobody ever announces in the newspapers that we win.

Now, East Grinstead up here, on their planning, heh, or whatever they call it – its planning… [laughter] They always played this gag in the Courier: "Doctor Hubbard Refused Planning." That's headlines, see. And several years ago the society and the little community here had gotten into the opinion that we just were turned down all over the place and all of a sudden the manager of the Fellbridge Hotel said – took a look down here and he said, "How do you people get all these planning permissions?" Because the truth of the matter was that every time we got a planning permission it was buried in the last paragraph along with a bunch of others in minutes of the local committee, see. But every time we were refused one, we were given headlines.
The fact is that we get more planning permissions than anybody else in this entire area. They frankly just shovel them out to us. This is very peculiar, you see, but the attitude of mind is that we fail along this line all the time. That's very funny.

So, you get this on an international basis. It must, at length, appear very surprising and very peculiar that these Scientologists who are always being knocked around—everybody says how bad they are—in the press and that sort of thing—how they keep on being there and keep on growing.

Now, the end result of all this, regardless of whether we do anything or not, will be for people to realize that that's been nothing but a pack of lies the whole way that's been said about us. The truth will eventually out, don't you see.

But we, of course, are a source of terror to suppressive type activities and I was told by the Rhodesian Herald's chief reporter that the only thing their government, some of the SPs in the government were worried about—he didn't use that terminology, but he said the only thing they're worried about is I might teach Scientology to the Africans. And they considered this would be something they would not like. And we just had a visitor from there yesterday came up, had a lot of interesting news. Nothing we didn't know really.

But it doesn't make any sense in the final analysis that if you're so bad, how come you keep on getting better? See, that won't make any sense. So, you could probably—we could probably go on up the track and live that out and everybody'd forget about the rest of it anyway, regardless of what we did about it.

In the last result, entheta can normally be dropped. You can normally drop entheta, enturbulated theta. You can just normally drop it. It looks bad for a while and it might have some lousy consequences to drop it that way, but if you use this rule, why just remember that the only person who would find this a hard and fast rule—the neglect of entheta—would be an OT. He can always neglect entheta. He couldn't possibly be hurt by it, you see. But if you're way down the line and somebody is doing this, that, and the other thing and so on, why if you sometimes—if you don't take some action, why, you find yourself very much in the soup.

And sometimes you have to act rather rapidly. But, the higher you get, the more you can ignore it. Now, I go too far. I've always—have gone too far, in this, because I don't think—I don't think that—I am known for what the newspapers say about me, nor will I be known for what the newspapers say about me, and I don't think a fool talking requires any attention.

Now, this of course, sometimes makes it rather hard on other people occasionally that I don't get up and make a thorough steamroller campaign out of something or other. I made a campaign out of that FDA thing. I backed it right straight up and they did a great job backing me up in Washington and we settled it. The only reason the Australian Inquiry went so far is that was really being shoved over and badly handled by the persons who were handling it for us there on the ground at the time. They wouldn't obey any of our instructions. That was what made that a rough one.

Now, the problem of what you do with what you know is determined by the framework of the society in which you are working, and it is not—it's not always the same solution.
You don't always get the same answer because you get a different society. You get different environments, different surroundings into which you can use what you know.

Now, you can imagine a violinist from the philharmonic orchestra going out to a lumber camp and playing for the lumberjacks. Now, I'm sure he would amuse the lumberjacks, but if he did not monitor his action or exhibition of skill against the environment in which he was performing he would probably be quite unpopular and might even become damaged.

So, although it is very well to have a constant of action and we can really congratulate anyone who is sufficiently powerful to always act constantly and apply the same solution to all situations – this is quite admirable – when you still got one foot in the human race and human yourself, you won't find that this is too easy to do. You're not strong enough yet. So, you monitor your use of technology against the environment in which you find yourself – your application and use of it.

Now, I've just had a sort of a roundabout invitation from another African country. We get invitations every once in a while. We've had an invitation from a communist country within the last year to train some auditors for them. We didn't care to reward the down statistic and we didn't do it. But another country has just been heard from. It's very nebulous; there's nothing concrete about this.

But you speak of different environments. If I were operating in that country which is a – the African has taken over there, the operating atmosphere would be entirely different, I can assure you of that. But what I'd probably have to teach them would be Dianetics. Very fast, very easy to grab, very few misunderstood words could occur, because you could teach them solidly. You could bring about the results with definitely that, and the possibility of there being any obstruction to your activities or necessity to take counter-legal action I mean, ethical action, to safeguard what you were doing, is practically zero because the proposal comes from the Minister of Health.

Now, this sort of thing tells you that you won't always act or operate in the same way in every society or group in which you find yourself. Now, I'll give you a good example. Don't go in amongst a group of people dedicated to the fact that there is no God and no eternity and man is meat, and try to pull a gradient that they can easily reject, because they can reject an abrupt approach that man is a spiritual being, etc., etc., etc., see. Once more you would find yourself way ahead by using Dianetics. That'll give you a very good entrance point.

But I seriously doubt amongst Moslems that Dianetics would be much of an entrance point. And I can tell you from experience that amongst Asians, it would be hardly any entrance point at all. The head-on entrance point amongst Asians would be, is, "Well, actually, you can achieve bodhi now in about 30 seconds." And they'd say, "Hey wait – wait, hold it, hold it, hold it. Where's the red carpet? Where is…" And then your main problem would be trying not to choke to death in the midst of joss fumes, because they got the early technology on this 2,500 years ago very choked up with the subject of burning incense and casting brass idols. See, they'd be different approaches.

Now, a medical doctor will in actual fact listen to Dianetics and so will a psychiatrist, where he can't even begin to grasp or handle any part of Scientology which treats man as a
spiritual being. It's so slight that you couldn't even teach him really a Touch Assist so that he would be convinced that it was working, see. Touch Assist belongs to Scientology. Scientology are the broad shotgun techniques that got things done, you see. Dianetics is running it out bit by bit.

Now, when you try to disseminate Scientology, you're really up against a problem today of not how do you stand up and suffer all the slings and arrows, but how do you tailor-make what you know to fit the group to whom you speak to. Because listen, it isn't false to do that. You have the whole vast panorama of existence, the mind, the spirit, religion. You've got the entirety of life as a bin out of which you can pull fragments out of the subject to offer people, and it is simply in actual fact our dullness that prevents us from disseminating. We just don't select the pieces which would come near enough the case and social framework of the person we're talking to in order to bring a reality.

You see, you're trying to sell him what he already knows. See. Down deep, he knows this. But this is all covered by a tremendous amount of false information. But somewhere there is an entrance point. In every case really there is an entrance point, and there being an entrance point, all you have to find is that point of a gradient of what you know about existence which he does not have to protest and which he does not have to argue with, in order to preserve (quote) his own integrity (unquote).

That's it. So, at what point or what point can we enter, see, the problem? I talk by the hour to medical doctors about Dianetics and Scientology. I don't have to talk to them very long but they're sitting there with their mouth dropped, very appreciative of the whole thing. "Is that so?", "Oh, yes." You know. And they fit it into their framework and run with the ball and you're all set. You know, if you can't get the other guy to contribute somewhat to the conversation, it's ceased to be an agreement.

So, in actual fact, if you wanted, with malice aforethought, to disseminate broadly, madly, in all directions, and so on, you would simply estimate the persons or groups to whom you were seeking to speak and having estimated, would then give them something with which they could agree without violating their own mores, without violating their own fixed ideas. And also, never give them something which is false, just to agree because your force and impact consists of the fact that you speak truth.

Well now, truth is such a fast arrow that it can go through without the fellow ever finding out he'd been shot. He merely experiences a tiny little shock. It's below his level of reality and inspection. He merely feels uncomfortable. And any resistance that you get in any conversation and so forth is you're just machine-gunning the guy down, and some of the bullets are going through and they're making him very uncomfortable and so on. He's not quite sure what's happening to him. He recognizes – he begins to feel that he's under attack. He doesn't recognize he is. He doesn't think he's being helped; he thinks he's being attacked.

I remember a person that was properly approached by a Scientologist. It was actually, the Scientologist sold it to her mother – sold Scientology to her mother. That's almost impossible in most cases, you know. That's very hard to do. And I remember now, she gave her mother, sighting the problem that her mother was having, gave her the Scientology datum that resolved the problem that her mother was having and persuaded her mother to use it, and her
mother used it, and from that time thereon actually can't be made to advance or anything else because that was too good and then the girl since that time has not found – never flattened the process, see – never found another problem mother was having to give her the Scientology datum that solved that problem.

But of all things, you see, Scientology is useful and unless you give people things they can use, you know, that you can use data, you don't have to use processing all the time – unless you can give somebody something that he can use, why he's not likely to have much use for it. He's not likely to be terribly interested in it.

But you have to estimate your audience, very, very accurately and if you do that right, your proper response is – short of you're having confronted an SP – your response, of course, is "Gee, where's this been all my life!" It hasn't really anything to do with their religious fixations or convictions. It hasn't anything to do with their social mores or anything else.

Now, there is something about the road to truth. It can never be traveled partially. So, if you do not provide some way in which to let them go on travelling on the road, you can also get into trouble. If there is not – no matter how tiny the crack in the door is left open, there must be some way for them to go further. Don't just leave them totally parked. That's tantamount to a sin, to introduce somebody to the fact, "Hey, here's the broad highway by which you go to glory, eternity, you become eternal life, and you know yourself that you are immortal and there you are, and there are certain technology is known about this and there are certain books and courses that are taught. I don't have the address just now of where this is taught. But, anyway it exists and good-bye." Phew! You just sentenced somebody to no auditing, you see.

But an estimation of to whom you are trying to speak, and an estimation of where they sit on the Tone Scale, and an estimation of what problems they have, and what use they can have for the data and so on – all of these things come into the whole field of dissemination.

Now, Dianetics – Dianetics definitely has a dissemination role. And when I tell you not to practice Dianetics on people, I'm being very, very factual but I'm not telling you the whole statement. Let them practice Dianetics. You digging it now? The greater truth lies in the field of Scientology, but the experience lies in Dianetics.

So, for a Scientology auditor to go and run Dianetic engrams on somebody or hang up a shingle on this, in fact would be silly. But to get together a group of people, teach them all about the fundamentals of the mind and get them to run secondaries and engrams – that wouldn't be silly. Just tell them you're getting them in practice so that they can go on and practice, so that they would know something eventually about the mind.

Now, we have a use for Dianetics right now and it's a very positive use for Dianetics. We're trying to get auditors so they can have some auditing time and get some practice auditing, because in Scientology you don't get any practice auditing and that's its positive and direct reason. But looking this over a little bit further, you're also absorbing a lot of very valuable technology, and that valuable technology comes into the field of dissemination. And so, that if you get very slippery and very smart with this technology, it's just about the most interesting sales technology or dissemination technology you ever had anything to do with. And you can say, "Well, what do I do with a group of people that I gather together?"
Well, you actually had passed out of the field where that you could give them an auditing technology, because you couldn't give them Scientology auditing technology, they overran it and abused it and that sort of thing. But you can give them Dianetic technology. And you might find that it would be very, very difficult for you to stand up and have many people stay around if you simply talk to them about their souls. Whereas you might find they got very, very enthusiastic indeed, if you taught them how to run engrams and secondaries. Do you follow?

So, it's a dissemination technology. Now, you'll find there's many points fit in this. I've done a lot of drills with this myself. I've even sold Scientology to newspaper reporters with Dianetic techniques. Take a meter – take a meter, tune it in, put the guy on it, say, "Here, I'll show you how this thing works. Yes, that's good. Fine. All right, good. Now, I don't want you to say anything. You're not to say a word. Don't answer any of my questions, and I'm going to tell you about your last accident. And have you ever been in the news – in an automobile accident? Yes, all right. You've been in an automobile accident. And, let's see, how many years ago was that? Was that more than five years, less than five years. It's less than five years. Is it one year, two years, three years? It's three years. All right. Now, let's see, three years ago. Okay, that's fine. Now, were you driving? Were you not driving?"

The fellow, all of a sudden, he can't be – he can't be prevented [laughter] from speaking any longer and he simply tells you all about it. He gets the somatics turned on and so forth. And he suddenly realizes that he had never known before that he went into the dashboard with his knee, you see. Guy walks out of there sold. There's a lot you can do with this sort of thing.

Well now, I didn't tell him he had lived before; I didn't tell him he was a spiritual being; I didn't tell him anything. I just found a piece of his experience. Almost as featherweight as being a fortune teller. I was mean enough in that instant not to run it out. I just left the somatic on. [laughter]

Dissemination and what you're learning right now in Dianetics is your finest dissemination technology. Now, it has the liability that if you tell everybody they can cure up everything on each other with it, you're in trouble. The odd part of it is, I never wrote that foreword to Book One, and I never made that statement about any two people. It's very interesting, isn't it? They were both publisher promotions. It was a medical doctor who wrote that – "Any two people can cure up 70 percent of man's illness." Actually, went into their first literature without my permission. Medical profession is saying that is what is wrong with it. Well, it was one of their honored members who invented it. He invented that statement. I never agreed with it particularly.

Now, you have a terrific dissemination tool. When you talk to people about Scientology, why, go on talking about Scientology. Don't tell them this is Dianetics. Don't try and get technical and deny everything, and explain it all sideways and so forth. Say, "Well, Scientology has a great deal to do with the mind. I want to show you something about the mind and so forth. Have you ever been worried about anything?" You know, as though this would be rare, you know. Don't solve it for him with Scientology technology of overt act-motivator sequences. People can't accept that much responsibility. Solve it for them quite otherwise. Say,
"Did you ever have a member of your family that was worried like that?" The old Straight-wire technique.

"Aunt Agatha." "Do you ever remember Aunt Agatha being worried like that?"

"Yes, as a matter of fact, I do."

"Good, how are you now?"

"Gosh, for God's sakes, I ceased to worry about it."

Well, what have you done? You've just – you've just attracted his attention to a picture and keyed it out. There are some tricks of this particular character – very interesting tricks. There's also the tricks of incidents. You've explained to somebody, to me – you should hear me explaining how an engram prevents blood circulation in the area of an injured limb to a medical doctor. They buy it every time. I say, "Well, it cuts down communication, so of course, that cuts down the blood circulation, too, doesn't it?"

"Oh, yes, I see. Oh, that's how it speeds up healing."

I say, "Yeah, that's the way it speeds up healing. Of course, there are a few other things in connection with it, but we won't go into those just now." [laughs]

Now, I want you to think along this line while you're talking to people and trying to explain it to them and so forth. You have the raw materials that are very close to the surface in any human being. If he could see his first picture, he would make a terrific case gain.

You're handling, then, not just an auditing practice drill and so forth, you are in actual fact handling the most powerful dissemination tool there is. Your knowledge of the anatomy of the engrams and secondaries of the mind, and so on, put into your hands terrific absorbing interest on the part of any human being you talk to.

Now, I want you to get a little practice using them that way and stop telling people that they're immortal thetans who will be OTs tomorrow and have lived before.

Okay?

Thank you very much.
Well, this is – what's the date?

_Audience:_ It's the sixteenth August AD 16.

So everything is moving up. You know, I think they told me there were about 240 students on the Clearing Course? There are 240 Clears moving right straight on up the line. And I'm – I have a bit of a problem. I have a bit of a problem with my own clearing. [laughter] I had 24 Clears who were screaming for their OT course and I had to put together the first part of the OT course and I slipped. And at the middle of a session and so forth, why, my TA went to 3 and the needle went loose and then of course I started moving up to check up the bank to find out if anything was there so that I could get started on the OT course and what you did with the bank and there it went. But I will try and get this condition remedied so that I can go out to Qual and go backwards and get checked out. [laughter, laughs – applause]

Thank you.

I lead a terrible life, actually. [laughter, laughs] I was an umpteenth stage Release with a completely floating needle one night, two or three years ago – about a Grade VI or something like that, and I had time – just time to drink a Coca-Cola before Mary Sue came back and started the overrun. [laughs, laughter] I was a VI Stage Release for one Coca-Cola. [laughs, laughter] What a terrible life. [laughs] But people get to walking on your heels, you know, and you push along.

Well anyway, I'm going to give you a lecture today about Releases and Clears. Because the probability is, is maybe nobody's heard it yet. You see? Because we found out that there were some people in the HGC that didn't know that. So if there were some people in the HGC that didn't know it, Lord forbid, why I imagine there's a person or two on the Saint Hill course that doesn't know it. I think that has a probability. And in view of the fact that this data is highly modern data, very, very modernized as data, it probably is to some slight degree new data.

We have a very bad problem, as you know, with the subject of releasing. And it is a problem of overrun. And it has gone on for many, many, many years. It's gone on for so long that it practically obliterated all the results of Dianetics and Scientology. And is the direct course of people walking around and saying Dianetics and Scientology doesn't work. Do you follow? It's that serious an error. So it just held us up endlessly. And there were certain phenomena which existed that one was not totally familiar with. Now I wasn't totally familiar with it because I wasn't familiar with the entire extent of the bank, how much this bank was,
how big this bank is, and so forth. And I know that the Queen's Counselor down in Melbourne, where they've just had a bad fire – don't imagine that will be their last bad fire – the Queen's Counselor down there said he couldn't accept the idea of past lives because it meant he wouldn't go to heaven. I got news for anything – any man that dishonest, just thinking about heaven is making a mistake. [laughs, laughter]

So you run into such phenomena – we knew about those – but how far back did it go? What was the total extent of it? In the early days we knew nothing about things like implantation. There was tremendous quantities of data that was unknown and it was very easy to make this mistake.

Now we're not in bad company in making this mistake because about 2500 years ago exactly on this same line of research, the identical mistake was made. The identical mistake was made by Gautama Siddhartha Buddha, no less. And he did not appreciate the existence of a bank at all. And that work does not take into account that there is such a thing as the mind or the bank. That's what's missing out of that larry of work.

Now there was another blunder made 10,000 years ago along the line of philosophic research. And there was a chap called Dharma and he was a monk, legendary and so forth. And oddly enough his name today means "fate." In the more esoteric Eastern philosophies and so on, they speak of somebody's dharma. And it gets perverted into karma and so forth. But he is so legendary that his name now means something else. But I think you can still find it recorded. And the mistake there was believing that you had to – you want to know how I know so much about this, well, I'll tell you some day. The mistake there was believing that you didn't have to do anything but become wise. All you had to do was become wise and you would instantly become nine feet tall. Do you see?

Now it's from Dharma that you get the tradition which most philosophers follow which is that, if you became wise you would become free. Now, there's almost – anybody there is around is grooved in to that basic philosophy. That is part of the woof and warp (rug terms, that's how you fix up a rug, don't want to give you any misunderstood words) – the – it's in the woof and warp of the entire culture, that you become wise, you become free. And that's been going on for 10,000 years on this planet. Started by Dharma.

Now that work has been totally assimilated. Now that one can exteriorize and that exteriorization brings about freedom, is the premise of Gautama Siddhartha Buddha and that's only 2500 years ago. They've got 7500 years yet to go before they assimilate that into the culture the way the philosophy of Dharma was.

Which means, you poor bloke, that you've got about 10,000 less sixteen years to go before Scientology is totally assimilated as the basic thing called philosophy or culture, see. So don't feel that you're going to catch up to this very rapidly if it took Dharma 10,000 years to get the point across that if you become wise you became free. And if people still don't know about exteriorization 2500 years after the most popular and most numerous religion on the planet, Buddhism. You've got 7500 years to go, so sit it out, you know? [laughter, laughs] We're slightly ahead of our time.

In other zones of the universe the existence of the mind was known. And in the – I hate to have to bring these data out because lawyers, when they listen to these tapes, in order
to condemn us you see, say, of course this is terrible to say things like this, but I just hate to be on a withhold all the time.

Anyway, in other parts of the universe in the Galactic Confederation they have a psychotherapy which consists of a recognition of the fact that at a moment of fatal accident to a thetan a picture was made. They know that that is, but they don't really think it is a picture. They think it is a location. And they take a picture of the location where he was injured and communicate to him in his unconscious state by snapping together a thing that looks like a movie clapboard. You see, they take this picture of the location and then they slap this movie clapboard in front of it, and the thetan is supposed to do something to – by shock or something – to his concept of that location as an injurious location, and so, in some way, blow the consequences of his injury.

That is a – that is a therapy, by the way, that is administered to the releases in that society which go as OTs, OT releases. And now that is their psychotherapy. And that comes as close to anything we're doing as anything else I know of in the universe. Of course there are many things could go on in the universe that I don't know anything about. There's lots of things that could happen that one wouldn't have any trace of; naturally.

But knowledge has a tendency to get around and you'll find out that if one being in one quarter of the universe is advancing along some certain premise, why, you will find out that it tends to advance in other parts of the universe. I don't know – but I don't think Scientology will be contained very long on this planet. I don't think it will be contained on this planet even this decade, see? It'll be that – that swift.

So anyway, these were new thoughts particularly for this very backward and barbaric planet. They – if you don't think things were barbarous you should have had something to do (and maybe you did) with India of 10,000 years ago. There was no slightest vestige of civilization. It was really wild and howling amongst the wogs as they leaped up and down, you know. And to get a point across that if you became wise you somehow became a bit superior – that was a hard one to do. So that was a terrific advance. It's almost like trying to teach animals or something, you know? You can't even talk their language.

So that was a big jump. And eventually, practically everybody on the planet agrees with that. We have now some fantastic percentage of the taxation of this planet (well, that's what's left over from military appropriations) is devoted to education. The scarcity of universities here in England now is represented by the fact that one university which can accept 850 students this next term has 10,000 applications. And it is a college of which I have never heard. So you can imagine what some of the more popular ones have in terms of numbers.

Well, there's this terrific demand for education or self-improvement. Now that – you might not look at it first, you see, because it seems so banal, so commonplace to you. But the fact that man at this time is actually willing to invest time, effort and money in the subject of making people wiser so as to make them freer is a great testimony to this fellow Dharma. Took him 10,000 years to get one point across.

All right. That was almost the totality of it. There were other ramifications such as one could get free enough to ascend to a very superior station, you know, like heaven or something, you know? There was connotation with regard to that, but that wasn't directly attribut-
able to Dharma but by fellows who interpreted him afterwards. He knew – you knew that you could become a free individual. In other words, there was a freedom, which was attainable. But no technology at all.

Now 7500 years after that Gautama Siddhartha Buddha discovered exteriorization, and of course the term "Buddha" comes from the bodhi tree since it was under a bodhi tree that he first exteriorized. Now he thought you exteriorized by becoming wise, following in the pattern of Dharma. Now that religion has gone now into the majority of the areas of Asia and did itself really civilize three-quarters of Asia.

That wasn't much information but he introduced several ideas along with it. And one was, that you should be civilized. A shocker, nobody ever heard of that before, you see, just be polite and so forth, you know? Very novel ideas.

Well, man has not yet accepted the idea that he should be polite, but he's getting there. In some areas of the world they have overdone it a bit. So as they cut each other's livers out they say, "I withhold my foul breath from your face," you see? [laughs]

So, this action of exteriorization was not in actual fact doable to any great degree. The lama – the lamaists came along afterwards and tried to develop some sort of a technology and an explanation for all of this and so forth, and you get squirrel Buddhism which is Lamaism. That's right, that's all it is. And what Buddha didn't cook up they thought they could. And of course they were moving into a zone where there was plenty to be found out. But the big strike had been made by Buddha, which is that somebody can exteriorize.

Now of course we are then gainers to the degree that there is some longevity to the idea of the soul, that there is such a thing as a soul. This has some longevity, a lot of people accept this. Where it goes, what it does, what it consists of, they haven't a clue. But that there is something called a soul which goes someplace has actually dominated Greek, Roman thought for a very long period of time now, it's about 2000 years or something like that. It also dominates various portions of Africa and the Middle East under another prophet's name and so on. But it is the same – the same channel of thought that there is such a thing called a soul.

Socrates is the primary originator of this in this – he's the primary forwarder of the idea in our present philosophic history. He said there was such a thing as a demon, and so forth. You see, if you're not in Greece you'd never know the story of Socrates. You only get told the story of Socrates in Greece, you don't read it out of philosophic textbooks. Quite interesting because there's a sort of a verbal tradition, vocal tradition, in Greece concerning Socrates which never gets into the philosophic textbooks. So of course the thing which I have added is that a philosopher should know something about life. That's so novel that it has practically never been done before.

Now, Socrates was holding forth for the existence of a personal being, or as we would say, thetan. And the religious ah, bigots, ah, bums, ah, tramp – ah, the religious hierarchy, excuse me, I was looking for that word! Having an awful time there – they disagreed with this. And they disagreed with this so thoroughly that they slipped him the hemlock. And he was so henpecked at home that they couldn't even get him to escape from jail. He went ahead
and drank the hemlock just to make them good and guilty. And he made them guilty, man, they still preserve his jail.

But then some time later, sometime later the Nicene Creed was developed which we now have in the form of the Dead Sea Scrolls and which was then put forward about a hundred years after its original development by Jesus of Nazareth. Now he – this church is having an awful embarrassing time with that. But I don't see why they should have an embarrassing time of it. So the guy was a powerhouse and he had a philosophy which had already [been] kicking around and so forth, that was pretty good.

But they have to acknowledge the existence of the Dead Sea Scrolls, don't you see? And they date one hundred years before Christ and they contain the New Testament. You didn't know about that? There are some pocketbooks out on it and you should read them, it's very funny. And the Arabs get ahold of these things, there are lots of them, they find them all over the place now if they know where to look. And the Arabs get hold of them because they can get something like five pounds for a little centimeter square scrap of one of these scrolls. They tear 'em all up! [laughter]

And then some high muckymuck, some super-sultan potentate-God-help-us, he figured out he was going to make a real – real grab out of it, so he, by force and other means, managed to collect a tremendous collection of these bits. And he unfortunately let them be copied photographically and so he was never able to sell his collection. He's still got it.

But these Dead Sea Scrolls are a terrific embarrassment to the Christian church at this particular time. I don't see why they should be. But they are. And all of this is simply the advance of Buddhism as an idea into Western culture. And it's easily traceable. There's even the tradition of Christ having studied in the East, you know. Where did he disappear to for thirty years or whatever it was? You know, there's a lot of these traditions. And this doesn't make less out of some fellow who went through all that, you know? But it was pushing wisdom into the West. And the West has been very, very hard to push wisdom into.

The early monks of Christianity tried to push wisdom into these areas up here. And over there in Scandahoovia – Scandinavia – I didn't mean to use it as a verb – and into Ireland, into these chilly northern climes. And they uniformly were spitted on stakes and chewed up and so forth. The monks would come in and they would say that they were going to cure them up with some relics and so forth. They were healers basically – and they moved in and they were going to help the community and so forth. And the answer was to skin them alive or something – or other delicate process.

So, trying to push – well, the way paganism fought against the basic ideas of Christianity and so forth is a very gory chapter. And the way the Christians then fought against the non-Christians during the days of the Spanish Inquisition is also gory. But by that time they'd lost most of the philosophy. Man had a soul, it was over there, and it belonged to God and he was nothing. And they had things pretty well scrambled up. By the time Buddhism had been transported, in other words, from India through the Middle East to Greece, to Spain, to Scandinavia, to Ireland or the North Pole or something, it was almost an unrecognizable idea.

Now, just giving you the scouting background history of this thing. Now the most that was ever achieved by any of these was a type of Release. And since the beginning of the uni-
verse, so far as we know; there has never been anything but a Release. There has never been a Clear. There has never been a cleared anything. So that these are all forms of release.

Dharma is release by wisdom. Buddhism: that was release by exteriorization. Christianity: release by repentance and being good. And you have in actual fact then, the total background history – if you want to read about these chaps and know more about these chaps, in fact it might make good fun. But it's those things which are there to understand in the light of what we're doing today.

There are no more complexions or complexities than that to understand about these. I would be accused by any scholar of these works of considerable oversimplification but I could answer from the very interesting height of saying, yes, it took twenty years to make a bodhi but we can make one in about twenty seconds. And we can, at a far higher percentage.

It is so easy to do, it is totally neglected. We don't even do it. There's a point on this gradation scale somewhere which should contain thetan exterior or bodhi. He could be almost anyplace. But we, in actual sober fact, let it happen. If it's going to happen we let it happen. And it could happen at 0, I, II, III, IV, V, VI – it could happen in any of these areas. And that it almost immediately unhappens – does not then qualify it as a stable release. It isn't a good lasting state.

As a matter of fact, after you've done it to somebody two or three times he becomes very anxious, he thinks you're going to cost him his body or something of the sort. You can pop him out of his head and after you've done it two or three times he begins to tell you that he isn't. And he wants nothing more really to do with this because he thinks you're going to foul him up. And he becomes anxious about holding on to the body. People have a bad experience – after you've made somebody a Theta Release. You've just banged somebody out of their head. They're no longer in their body, that's all.

The psychiatrist looks on this with the greatest of askance because he occasionally in institutions finds as an inverse, or an inverted exteriorization: a fellow who cannot get into his body and is going frantic. And therefore he thinks anything in connection with exteriorization is insanity, but then of course he's branding three-quarters of Asia insane. But then naturally he is insufficiently cultured to know anything about Asia, so – that would be it.

Now, this state of thetan exterior occurs. And it just occurs, and it can occur almost any time and anybody processing anybody sooner or later is going to get a thetan exterior on his hands. And what you do about it is shut up. You say: "Well, that's it" and you knock it off. It's the same as a floating needle. It's a visual manifestation which is different than what occurs with a floating needle. They're not the same thing at all. But it's something you do not go beyond. You don't go beyond a floating needle on a pc on the meter, and you do not go beyond an exterior state. Don't say one more command or order of that level on which you are working or whatever you are working on. Shut up! Because if you go on any distance at all you will walk him right straight back into his bank and he will be very cross and justifiably so. Because you've unreleased him.

Now after you've made one of these fellows, you will find out that within the hour, three days, a week he will have tangled up with more reality than he is prepared to confront in his somewhat tremulous uncleared state. He's just a Release, you see. And he's been asked to
walk in this big broad world barefooted and he's still got the anxiety and problem holding on to his body, he doesn't know quite what to do about this. He's afraid he'll forget his body. On the past track it's happened to him before many times. Because you see, it happens to him every time he dies and is associated in his mind with death. And he's had unfortunate experiences when he could do it at will somewhere way back on the track, leaving his body in the inn to pop off and do something of the sort and then coming back and find out they'd buried the body. You see, and he's lost his body and his possessions and so forth and he didn't like that.

It has very sour connotations with it because he is not competent to cope with the state at all. He's way in advance of himself. He's in actual fact on a harmonic of OT. An OT could care for it. He can't care for it down here when he is a Dianetic Release. And maybe not even that, you know?

And, I'll give you an actual, typical experiences and so on. I'm not making nothing out of Buddha, this was a considerable advance, this was something very remarkable indeed. And, it must have been remarkable if Socrates copied it. And then it became traditional thereafter, which it did. You'll find, by the way, there are some here and there, there are some primitive races who believe man has a soul. But, scattered pieces of stuff; it's a piece of truth that isn't easily camouflaged. But for it to actually be worked on or admitted or something could be done about it, something like that, in a culture, was quite new.

So Buddha, when he exteriorized people and when he brought about exteriorization, he brought it about through wisdom so the fellow had some kind of a philosophy at least to back him up. But as far as we're concerned in Scientology, there is one little string of words that, you take almost any human being out here anyplace and set him down in a chair, get him in some quiet place and say this little string of words to him and it's going to happen. In a large percentage of cases it's going to happen. Sixty, seventy, eighty percent some such percentage. He's going to exteriorize, man.

And a certain number of them are going to exteriorize, be total, total reality, looking around, you know? And a certain number of them are going to be totally real outside the second they come back inside they say it's unreal and didn't happen. Scared, see? And a certain percentage of them will go out and back in without knowing anything ever happened, except weirdly enough, a total change of personality takes place in front of your face. And you find this amongst the insane.

There was so much about the insane the psychiatrist could have known about and could know about today if he'd care to listen. I have – I've had an insane person sitting in front of me – not a psychiatrist, necessarily – I've had an insane person sitting in front of me and I've said the magic words. Had the person go totally sane, backed out there to several feet back of their head; totally sane, able to reason, solve their problem, set it all up, all squared around, very happy to talk to me about it, totally rational. And then back in: insane. But not quite as crazy. This is remarkable.

Well, there is one notable Scientologist in New York who said it over the air to several million people one time. I often wondered what really happened when he did that. That program since then has been very friendly to Scientology, it's an all-night program, "Long John."
But, here is a piece of technology which simply forces what is going to happen naturally sooner or later. And you don't have to know trick ways to exteriorize somebody, you see. I'll give you the magic words, you might as well put them on tape, put it on record someplace or another. It's "Try not to be three feet back of your head." Man is on such an inversion on the subject that he goes clang!

Now, the road of philosophy has been very, very difficult and it has taken a long time for a basic philosophic idea to manifest itself in the society in which it has been expressed. What's particularly notable about Buddhism is that it was such clear-cut truth that he advanced, that it spread like wildfire within his lifetime. And in the few succeeding lifetimes, a very short period of time, he had almost, well he had about three-quarters of Asia right there – bang!

For instance, he brought the first civil… his people brought the first civilization to Japan. And those were within living memory of Buddha. And that is an awful long ways for that – modes of travel of that day from Northern India. Japan is quite a far cry. They brought the first shreds of culture to Japan. They brought writing and to this day the Japanese use Chinese writing pronounced with a Japanese vocabulary.

And that was brought to them by the first Buddhist monks who came there. But those fellows were very industrious and they got it fast. But they had moved from a state of "man is meat" to "he is a spiritual being" and they had manifestations of this, and they had a rather powerful leader and there it went.

Now this is and can be considered only, a sort of a state of release through wisdom, because they didn't have any command to tell anybody to back out of his head. The fellow would simply become wise and they find out that when he became wise enough he would exteriorize, they hoped. They had a lot of failures along this line. It's very difficult to do this because it's booby-trapped by the bank.

Now in one fell swoop with no pause for breath, we have capitalized upon the idea that a man who is improved becomes free. We have brought about a twenty-year effort to exteriorize down to a point where it can be done in about twenty seconds. We have found what prevented the efforts of Dharma from being perfect; we have found the totality of what barred Buddhism. Here we are in a society which in actual fact is only bolstered in its culture by Dharma and Buddha, with the problem wrapped up.

Now don't be amazed that you're having trouble carrying the word. Don't be amazed at all because the fate of missionaries and so forth carrying the word that there is a – man is a spiritual being and that sort of thing, has been rather grim. But notice that the missionary was many vias departed from the truth. Notice this. Notice that he had some bank connected with his action, very thoroughly. It wasn't very clean truth. It's not a condemnation of Christianity. Anybody Clear knows what I am talking about. They went around – they went around telling people they had to do this and do that and the other thing and they were using bank words.

Now these chaps didn't have a sufficiently pure version of it to do more than take over the society. That is about the limitation of it. They have civilized it to a very, very marked extent. They've done a terrific job of it and so on. But to bring a society up that is no more
cultured than this one – and as far as man's treatment of man is concerned, this culture is about as high as a cat fight. It is a scientific barbarism, I assure you.

Now the reason they didn't get any further than that is they were a little bit too far from the truth. There were too many vias, you see? There was the via of Buddhism to Socrates, to Christianity, to organized Christianity, to the various arguments of Christianity to – you see? And they were weak to that degree. Now compare this, compare this with the Buddhist spread within living memory, three-quarters of Asia. Very fast. But he was close to home on the subject of Dharma. You see, he was capitalizing on Dharma, that wisdom would make you free.

This carries with it some interesting implications. It carries with it the implication that there is a possibility to be free. You see that itself is a terribly hard thing to teach men. But Asia knew it. Asia already had then a spiritualism and a religious background. And he capitalized on that and three-quarters of it – zoom, bang! Three-quarters of Asia. That's on exteriorization, which is an incidental, but the final result of, Scientology.

Now perhaps the speech in which all this was given was a little more flowery, perhaps there was wisdom, perhaps a lot of things. But the truth of the general situation is that no matter how information is conveyed, if it is conveyed at all and it is truth it will take root.

So I don't look for you to go for the next 10,000 years before Scientology bites, you see, I don't look for you to have to wait that long. I would say that the largest scope possible one could imagine for this particular society and so on, basing it on other things and not giving anybody any pats on the back including me, the absolute outside will be something on the order of half a century.

You see if Buddhism could go that far in that span of – short span of time, on the limited result producible by Buddhism and the rather barbaric atmosphere in which Buddhism was spread – was actually a little more barbaric than the atmosphere in which we exist today. And I would say that if you take a half a century to get Scientology around, you're really slow, man. You notice I said "you."

Now, what are you then attempting and what are you achieving with a being? You're capitalizing, in the first place – as you first address this being – you're capitalizing on the past indoctrination and belief of the being. That's important for you to recognize. Because you will very often get a terrible shock that in your inability to communicate any part of Scientology, recognize what you're communicating up against.

It was like – it was like a Scientologist we had down in Central Africa. The government was engaging on some groundnut program or something of the sort – it was another wisdom. But they were teaching soil erosion to the African. A Scientologist went in on the project. They were in despair. They couldn't teach the African to, you know, prevent his soil from eroding. They thought that was – terrible. And a Scientologist went in on it and he found out what they weren't teaching him, they weren't teaching him the basic fact that soil should be preserved.

As soon as they started utilizing that as an idea, why then the program made some progress. Well, you're going to walk into people who have not heard the teaching of Dharma.
Now of course you're going to walk into everybody you meet practically and they never heard of Dharma. But somehow or other, the wisdom of Dharma has not come up through the line. You run into them every once in a while.

"Well, what do you want to teach the people for?" There's one zone where there's a horrible revolution going on at the moment, it's not a battle, it's just an underground cat fight going on in the middle of South America. Where the ricos in that immediate area who have been used to hiring the peasants for nothing and letting them live and die like pigs, you see, that these ricos have been walked in on sideways by the philosophy of Dharma. And it came from someplace and the peasants all of a sudden have got the idea that they ought to become educated so they could become free.

And all hell is breaking loose because the ricos are trying to keep them from learning anything now and their economy is all going to pot, and they're going through the entire convulsion that old Yea-and-Nay Plantagenet went through in his days and so forth when the monks would get around and make certain people into clerks and this was not really thought well of amongst the feudal barony.

God knows what would happen if, and it sure as hell happened and fast, the philosophy of Dharma got to them and there sat King John signing his name on the Magna Carta. That is direct – direct dissemination of that information. It's interesting, it's – that one piece of philosophy: You become educated, you'll become free. The church had come in here, they had educated people to read and write. They had introduced manuscripts – you couldn't say they had introduced books – and they'd been chipping around at the edges here for some time. And all of a sudden, why, not only had people become more educated but people became free.

We have an example of it, a horrible backfire of this in 1936 in the Spanish Revolution. Now the Spanish Revolution was really begun by the philosophy of Dharma. You say, oh heavens, how can you possibly connect those up? Very easy. The paperback was imported into Spain in the decade previous to that revolution for the first time. And cheap literature and the translations of the works of all the great French and English writers had occurred in Spain. And up to that time there was the ricos and the pobres, the rich and the poor, and there wasn't any other strata of society.

And as soon as the poor started assimilating and were able actually to buy books out of their pay, you see before – never before could they do this, before sometime in the twenties. And they could actually buy books. And they started reading Balzac and they started reading Spinoza and – and where were these fellows, you know? And they said: "We know something, we should now become free." They instantly: boom! And that was mostly because they had considerable resistance to their freedom. That's the philosophy of Dharma, see? That's a – that's a fact. You notice that it is a fact? Well, that was Dharma's discovery.

Now, where you are going to fail is that somebody doesn't know soil should be preserved. They don't know that wisdom sets anybody free and of course when you're dealing with a somewhat fascist governmental hierarchy, the last thing in the world they want is a free people or an educated people. And when you see education being skimmed and frowned upon and so forth then you know what type of a government you're dealing with. It's a government which has not yet reached the state where it has heard of Dharma. Or it's suspicious,
having maybe heard of it, it's a suspicious that the phenomenon will occur and people will become freer. They don't want anything to do with this. They don't want anything to do with the philosophy and they are suppressive to the philosophy of Dharma, that people should become wise and therefore can become free.

Now, you're just cutting in too high. Now you're talking, in the main here in the West, to a Christian people who have heard of the soul but unfortunately it is an owned commodity that one should not play with. And when they speak of "their soul" they are not speaking of themselves. And therefore there's a bit of counter-philosophy to the situation. But these are the points you have to solve. They are stunned at the idea that somebody could exteriorize, so they are really not up to Buddha. They have gone past Dharma but have not arrived at Buddha, and it is to those people that you are teaching Scientology.

So you have to be careful not to go in over their heads. Now fortunately, fortunately they do agree with the gradation scale of Release. And when you talk to them about exteriorization, you're actually talking to them about something that doesn't make any sense to them on the subject of OT. Now you mustn't talk to them about OT.

Now you can talk to them about Clear. They understand Clear, although they don't know anything about Clear. That's a very peculiar thing. But they understand that a fellow does not have barriers to his thinking. They understand that and they think that would be great. So all you have to do is teach them that man shouldn't have barriers to his freedom in the form of his mind and that technology exists to move him up from that.

But do you know there are so many undercuts to that that you could teach him, many undercuts. And the first one actually, it isn't factual that Dianetics is the first undercut, the public will accept Dianetics, but it's a relatively enlightened public that would accept Dianetics. Dianetic processing actually belongs below Zero. And the old Dianetic co-auditor type rating and the Hubbard Dianetic Auditor actually belong below the – what we now call a Hubbard Recognized Scientologist. And the degree is by the way, being revived just for that purpose. But you're already talking at a very enlightened level.

The levels of Scientology will be more easily assimilated by the public at large if we speak of Grade 0 as a recognition – ah, pardon me – a communication process, a communication, a Communication Release. Just to put that a little more distinct. They can get the idea that it'd be perfectly all right to have somebody communicate better. Now that's easily expressed. And he's released from an inability to communicate.

Now they immediately want you to apply that to stammerers and backwards children and people who can't talk and so forth, and this gives you some difficulty because they themselves are standing there, about as tongue-tied with noncommunication as they can get, telling you that would be fine for backward children and stammerers or something. And you're not quite up to that, don't you see. A man could communicate more freely.

Now our next level here, Level I, they could understand that man does better if he doesn't have problems, perhaps they could understand that. And so you could go on up the line and there's a high probability there of the – of making a communication or a connection with the situation. Comprehension, trying to get people to comprehend what you're talking about. But I stress to you again the fact that wisdom brought about freedom is the basic idea.
on this chain. Now do you see what I am getting at? Now that releases a man from imprison-
ment by ignorance. And that is your first form of Release.

You teach a person that if he learns something he would be freer. And when he has
learned that he is then released from the idea that he can't know. So that is really your earliest
stage of release. And I would thoroughly advise your trying to argue with people on the basis
of the first premise which is that of Dharma and which is the direct and immediate ancestor of
Scientology. You see? There's your fundamental.

Now of course you couldn't tell a fellow named Smitty 8 that he ought to teach all of
his Africans population anything because he would instantly sense something would be very
wrong with all this, and he would start to feel very hunted. He would be – feel hunted in the
extreme. And so we find in that country there is no free education anywhere – anywhere. It is
all very expensive. There is one little school, it has two hundred and some children in it, most
of them Africans and it's taught by an American named Howitz down there and they've even
had him up before the high court for daring to teach Africans for nothing, you see. So they
dimly feel that there might be such an idea that wisdom makes one free. But if that idea exists
they're against [against] it, do you see? They don't want anything to do with that idea, not even
the idea of it.

So that is your first level of Release that is meaningful to you. Now of course there is a
lower level of Release that if you're going to work with animals or something like that, you're
going to find out that there's a lower level of Release. It is simply getting the idea it's a sort of
a lower harmonic of a Communication Release; it is simply getting the idea that one animal
could in actual fact express an idea to another animal. And I dare say you're going to find
some races at some time or another someplace who do not yet have that idea. So that would
be a lower level of Release. But it isn't common now so I'm neglecting it.

Now you have to know you're in something before you can get out of it and that is the
main difficulty in communicating levels of Release. That's – it's very interesting, I mean you
do, you have to know you're in something before you can get out of it. And people are not
aware of the mind. They see another bloke, they don't see any mind. The psychiatrist goes
scratching his ribs up to the person and cuts out a big section of his skull and sees a brain. So
he says there is no such thing as a mind. He does, he says this – bang! Because all he can see
is a brain. Well, the brain is just a neural shock absorber; it has very little to do with thinking.
The number of maps I have seen of the various things which are found in various parts of the
brain are only amusing by their numerousness, because they're all different.

The way the research was done originally was silly. They took wounded soldiers who
had lost certain portions of their faculties or expressions and so on, and found out where the
head wound was and then, you know, one case at a time, just one case for each thing, you
see? If they were shot in the left side of the head then they would say, well, speech is con-
tained in the left side of the brain, you see, because the fellow was wounded there and he
couldn't talk. I know a lot of fellows who've simply been kicked in the pants that can't talk.
[laughter]

8 Editor's note: reference to Ian Smith, Prime Minister of Rhodesia from 1964 to 1979
Now your basic sweeping agreement, then, is something the society has already accepted. And that is that a person can become a Release or become more free or become released from some of his travails on the idea of becoming wiser. Now that's why you find philosophy is such an agreeable statement to people, when you try to — try to tell them about Scientology as a philosophy. Because you're simply telling them of the philosophy of Dharma.

Now your next level of Release that was acceptable to the world at large — that man is a spiritual being. Now that is in decay. That has been known and has been suppressed, and has been suppressed since 1879, Professor Wundt, Leipzig, Germany. I always like to remember the man's name. Man was an animal and he was nothing but an animal and therefore it was all right to kill him, maim him, shoot him, do anything you possibly could to him because he was "Nyaa, no good," see? Now this is something like some of the Christian philosophy that was advanced in the second or third century A.D., that man was conceived in evil and was evil so it was perfectly all right to kill him, maim him, harm him, do anything you wanted to. Do you see these things as justifications? Justifications for overts, no more than that.

So you have the entire, what is laughingly called "field of philosophy" — it is a field, too, out there in the rain, man. You have what is laughingly called a field of philosophy embracing now uniformly, the idea that they're dealing with rats or something. Well, they're not going to make very much progress and they could get themselves into one awful bloody revolution. I'm not using that as a swear word, I mean a bleeding revolution. They could, they could be cut down in the streets, man. Because the Christian has not yet found out that the psychologist is an atheist. And there is atheism being taught right in the colleges and there's a bunch of bigoted Christians going to find out about that someday and they're going to get mad. Fortunately for psych... for psychology it is such an inarticulate subject that it hasn't made itself sufficiently plain to be understood that it's an atheistic subject.

But if your psychologist were ever to succeed he would have to come closer to the truth than the brain is all that is there, and a man is dead forever. Because it's very unpopular, very unpopular. But suppressives would like it, and so psychology, psychiatry and things like that tend to be supported by governments rather than by the populace. The populace think anything is better. They think psychology is silly. But governments employ it. So you see suppressives employ these nontruthful subjects or subjects which prevent philosophic advances, or subjects which prevent releasing.

So your actual — you'd be surprised how far you could go just doing this — you actually could move in to the whole subject on the subject convincing somebody that man was a spiritual being. See, he's already halfway agreed with it. "Well, you're a Christian, aren't you?"

"Oh yes, yes, yes." You know he knows better than to say he's not a Christian. He gets an auto-da-fé.

Well, you find even in Christianity — you know the whole subject of reincarnation was barred very recently by the Roman Catholic Church — very recently. Only in the last few hundred years. They carried reincarnation right along with them, pocket-pock. They said the guy who hadn't been good enough had to come back and live it all over again. And somehow or
another they dropped that, they had an edict of Scrantes? Or something, I don't know, some stupid edict by which they abolished wisdom.

Now, therefore that man is a spiritual being and not an animal – you could become very involved with as an argument – but if somebody bought the idea, if somebody bought the idea that he was a spiritual being rather than an animal, you have then got a state of Release. He's released from an untruth that could trap him. Now very possibly – very possibly, this is where you could use exteriorization, but I do not advise it. What's useful at this point is Dianetics. Because a person goes rapidly back, but it's a little bit ahead of itself; don't you see? There isn't a perfect answer to this.

Ah, a guy goes back and only runs so many engrams and there he is sitting on the parapets of the castle, you know, watching the enemy march across the plain. And he says, what am I doing here, this is obviously me. And he makes it up out of his own head that he must be an immortal being because he has lived before quite obviously. Dianetics will bring people up to that point. But, this is a release from this lifetime. A person is released from the very narrow span of just one lifetime. And that is a terrific release because the death of – the terrible consequences of death fall away, he stands around and laughs as the funerals go by, you know.

I mean, I remember a long time ago I was – I had to pull off the road – I had to pull off the road down in Arizona to let a funeral go by. And boy, people's eyes were streaming so that it looked like rain falling out behind that funeral. And boy, everybody was real sad. And I sat there and watched this, you know. And I just go through gauging on some researches into the immortal nature of man, you know. But it suddenly looked so silly to me that I sat there and laughed like a fool for about ten minutes. I couldn't get the car going again, I didn't dare drive. It just suddenly seemed so funny. All of this action with regard to this one thing, you see, such a production. And of course it was a very big funeral and a very sad one for a banker. Of course they… I knew he'd never get to heaven. I know he would be back there stirring it up again.

Anyhow, you, in that fashion would take people out of the one-lifetime idea. And that is your – a tremendous breakthrough that is available to you because it's a release from the idea of one lifetime. There is a breakthrough for concentration which is quite acceptable to the society in which we exist.

Now people do know, fortunately, there is such a thing as a mind. They've been told there is such a thing as a mind and they haven't been taught well enough to know the psychologist is defining the "brain" as the mind. So you catch the philosophy which has been put forward to them that men have minds and things go wrong with their minds, that there are mental things about existence, and just redefine it before it takes root. You see? What they mean they're putting forward this philosophy, is that people have brains which get their neurons crossed and you give them biochemical and electrostimuli of some kind or another or surgical stuff; why, you can do something with this brain mass, you see.

Well, you move in, just move in ahead of this and you say, "The mind, well, yes, they're speaking of mental image pictures."

"What?"
"Well, have you ever had a picture?"

Now you see, A looking at B never sees B's mind. So it doesn't come through to him that B has a mind. See, if he's very, very wog, why he thinks B only has a brain, see, that's getting pretty wog. Now the only thing you have to put across is that because this fellow has a mind, that fellow has a mind. That's just a different new observation. Now right on the heels of that will follow that he's immortal. With a little Dianetic auditing he can't help but find it out. Do you see? Now you've released him from the idea that man is matter. You've released him from the idea that he only has one life, and these are stages of Release.

Now when you're teaching people realize that you are working in the field of releasing people. Realize that. That you can in actual fact, by talking to people, release them. But you start crawling up the line here very far and you're going to run into far more mass – mental mass – than you can easily talk them out of. By the time you get to here, skip it. By the time you get to VI, it would be fatal to try to talk them out of it, and if you tried to talk them out at Class – well that's, that's not… All you've got to do is pass a despatch with VII materials on it through the lines and you have, "Where's Janie?" "Oh, she's in the hospital." "What happened to her?" "She came down with appendicitis yesterday." "Well, what happened?" That's right, I'm not kidding. I… there's too much – too much horsepower.

Now, the funny part of it is, there's technology up here that the Clear doesn't notice. A lot of Clears go suddenly, "What? What's this?" Interest! [laughter] But you should recognize that an ultimate in Release would be a Release from the universe. True. You say, who's going to fool around with the things that makes the universe. Is somebody going to fool around with what's making the universe, and so forth, somebody's going to fool around? You'll be glad to know that we have now got a policy letter out which forbids destructive actions – [laughter, applause] you see.

So you see you can very rapidly go outside of people's head. What they did in Melbourne during that inquiry down there – this guy Peter Williams just cons… insisted on spinning people with past lives. He just – all he would talk about was – was Grade V stuff you see, all the way up the line and he'd let them get no subjective reality on it, and it spun them. That was what upset that whole thing. He wouldn't follow any order I gave him. He's had himself a ball.

Now, recognize then, that when we use the word "release" we mean freeing. Now we can free somebody of an idea which enslaves him or entraps him.

And recognize that all traps are basically ideas. And if a man can be talked or persuaded out of a certain idea you have freed him to that extent. So the word release is best understood on the basis of freeing somebody from something.

Now as we progress from Grade 0 up – see, I've already shown you there are many grades of Release below zero. We are now getting extremely sophisticated when we get to Grade 0. This is a very sophisticated level of Release. We are actually starting to free him from his self-manufactured trap called a mind. And we're starting to free him directly and intimately as a spiritual being. And we're working on it right at that point just as surely as though we're digging a ditch. And we release him from ideas that he can't communicate and we make a Communications Release.
Now the funny part of it is, to do that we've got to actually pull him out of a little bit of mass that he is in that tells him he can't communicate. Do you see? So from here on we're not only pulling him out of ideas but we're also starting to pull him out of his own mental mass. Now at this level, Class VII, we don't pull him out of any more mental mass. We turn around and eat the tiger. We eradicate mental mass. Erase it. Now that of course is again a form of Release that we call Clear; it means he's cleared the being of his reactive mind.

But we note he's still in the universe. He's still associated with a body, he's still in the universe and still this and still that. In other words, there are some grades of Release above this. But in actual fact that is such a triumphant level for a man to attain that you find not many people below it look any higher. It's quite adequate, it's big. It's quite absolute – very nearly absolute.

Now when you see on this meter, this needle somewhere between 1.9 and 3.25, we will allow for the slight vagaries of your setting the trim knob, [laughter] and you see this needle get floppy and it's a little bit hard to set this for a moment – SHUT UP! [laughter] Because you released him from something. Now of course you probably have to know why, to get him through Qual. [laughter, applause] That is really too bad.

But you would best do it from your auditing notes not from the pc. Now accidentally anywhere from the moment that the guy hears about the fact that wisdom will make him free on up to some idea that he is a spiritual being, on up through to a Grade 0 or a I or a II or somewhere up the line, the guy at any time may blow out of his skull. You may even find somebody that isn't in one. He's very surprised why other people are in their heads. Horrors! I've actually run into one or two.

You'll actually run into this thing called an exteriorization. Now that is a relatively premature manifestation which will remain very unstable. Now most states of Release have a certain degree of stability and those which we have listed and those that I'm talking to you about have stability of a sort. Of a sort. The guy's ideas get invalidated, he gets invalidated that he's a spiritual being, somebody chops him up somehow or another, he gets suppressed, something like that, and he gets over the idea, and so on and he ceases to manifest as a Release. But wait a minute, he is actually not as bad off as he was before. A Release never unreleases to the same degree of Stygian dark that they were in before they got released.

Now this, then – this then is what we mean by Release. What we mean by Clear is an erasure of the mental mass which inhibits their thinking, postulating, and so on. You should see a Clear postulate on a meter; it's very interesting. I've got a couple of Clears right now that are doing a little bit of fooling about with the first part of the OT course and they've skipped a couple of steps in the OT course and now they are finding various banks. It's very interesting – it's very interesting because they really have not discovered that they're quite capable of postulating a bank. So after they postulated it they haven't bothered to blow it. That's very silly.

I received, almost hilarity, a report, two reports from two of them, and I obediently checked them out. It was quite obvious what they were. They have not realized they are very skilled people, they can make a bank. [laughs]
Now this is what you are doing with human beings. These are the states you are attempting to achieve with a human being. These are the manifestations of having achieved it. The E-Meter in the early days I used: "Ahh, no kidding! Hey!" And that would be a Release. And in the early days this was so good that a Dianetic Clear – we're making them now, we're making Dianetic Clears again. I've gotten two or three thank-you despatches and things like that. We're making Dianetic Clears. But of course a Dianetic Clear is actually merely a Release and unfortunate, but they strangely enough have approximately the same manifestations that are described in Book One. And the way we started making them again is we stopped overauditing. Man was making his Releases too well. It's something on the order of: you make a Release, this guy becomes – let me talk at – about it at a lower level. The guy got the idea completely, he's got it now, "Hey, you know, gee! That's true! That if I knew more I would be freer. Gosh! That is right!" you know? And you start teaching him that if he knew more he would be freer.

Now at the moment he realized that and you had him on this meter his needle would have floated. And his needle would have floated quite handsomely. But if you'd continued to teach him, his needle would have ceased to float almost right away. Now what fools you is that a Release, a lower level releases – now let me get this mystery explained for you. A lower level Release is released at the level they're released at. And there are higher levels of Release to be attained. And they don't so much relapse as go into the sticky plaster of the next level that they are going to have to climb to get all the way out. Do you see?

So they in actual fact, in auditing very rapidly – unless you just suppress them by continuing to audit the same gain which they already have which is sort of an ARC break, not acknowledgment or so forth. But when they walk out of that session and come back in the next morning and they haven't got a floating needle, realize they have simply moved up into the mass of the next strata they should be released in. They haven't unreleased. You understand that? So don't overrun them and don't get worried that they fold up awful fast. As a matter of fact I've considered it sort of – sort of like the Indian, you know. He has several different types of pony. And you've noticed all the Indians' horses along a hitch rack and these Indians' horses will be tied with different knots of greater and greater complication until you finally get to a knot which is very complicated that's tying up this one pony. Well, this one at the end – the other end, you see, he's just a dunce because he can – he can't even untie just dropping the reins across the hitch rack, you see? But this other one up at the other end, he's such a clever pony that he can untie any kind of knot anybody could dream up so they have to tie the most complicated knots anybody ever heard of to get the pony to stand there, you see? And they call him an enterprising pony.

Now, if you have a Release who for some reason best known to man or beast, insists on staying there with a floating needle for days and days and weeks and months and if you were to pick him up a year from then and still find his needle floating, I would tell you you had a very unenterprising pony. [laughter] He's become smarter so he should become speculative at that point. Because it's quite natural sequence – these sequences of Release. And if he was able to think or act, to look around at all of course, he would dive into the next level very promptly.
Now does this make the whole subject of Release seem a little clearer to you? I hope it does because the next audience I have to tell: "When a needle floats and goes free you stop the process, and that is proper end phenomena for any conversation or any process anyplace up to Grade VI," I'm going to collect a dollar apiece from them. Be – watch it! Don't be part of that audience. But that's what barred the way. Not knocking it off and not acknowledging the fact that such states existed.

Now in this lecture you could probably also find ways and means of dissemination, you could probably spot your errors of dissemination. I don't say that there aren't additional methods of dissemination, but I'm just pointing out those that have been startlingly successful and which in actual fact, are the dominant points of philosophy in our society today. Where they are lacking the society is barbarous and where they are present the society is advanced. Therefore you could fully expect a society to get very barbarous on psychology since it has yet to assimilate the principles of Buddhism. That tells you how backward any race is, is how far have they moved up that line.

Now, the other – the other thing that is interesting to note before I close is that Releases seem to want other people to be released and Clears want other people to be cleared and all of this is very heartening. If that fact – which is quite accidental – did not exist, and so forth, why the whole of the race would be hopelessly lost. And if man were not basically good it would be extremely dangerous to improve him. Improve his abilities, would be very dangerous. But he happens to be basically good. Anybody who tells you basically – man is basically evil, of course is fixing you up so that you then will be afraid to make somebody good.

Now you can have a great many qualms about clearing or releasing even, somebody who is a benighted villain. Should I release him? Well, don't – don't worry about his activities after he's released because these will be better. His abilities will be better but so will the nature of his activities. Don't worry about that, worry about it on the basis of, has he got a good enough statistic that I'm going to do him this much favor. And don't release people to make them better for other people's sake. It is something which is a reward, it is not something which has to be done. And that is why I always object to Dianetics and Scientology being used only on backwards children classes, because I think the geniuses in the class are really the ones who need it.

Now, therefore, I hope this will be of some small use to you when you find yourself sitting there looking at somebody and he has just asked you this embarrassing question: "What is Scientology?" Maybe if you remember this lecture it will help you know where to chip in, at what moment and what to tell him about.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.
STUDY AND INTENTION

A lecture given on 18 August 1966

Thank you. Thank you.

Well now, if I look – if I look a little bit used today and secondhand, the… if anybody thought Clear research took it out of me, man, OT research – wow! Yeah, you think you got it all solved, you know? How did you get in this much trouble? How did I get in this much trouble? Yeah, man, you try to take the postulate of a 190-mile-high being and while you're only five foot ten and a half; or something like that, take it apart – it's "Where's your head?" you know?

This is very interesting. When you get Clear, I've got a little piece of advice for you: Why, get enrolled in the OT Course and do it step by step, politely and quietly. Don't get ambitious. I'm the only one that's expendable around here. [laughter] Every time anything happens to me they say, "Well, it serves him right," and any time anything happens to you, that's my fault. [laughter] Yeah.

Anyway, what's the date?

*Audience*: 18th of August AD 16.

Eighteenth of where?

*Audience*: August.

August.

*Audience*: AD 16.

AD 16. Thank you. You're helping me out today. And what planet?

*Audience*: Earth.

Earth. What… yeah, good. Earth? [laughs]

Well, actually, what this is all about – I really don't have anything to talk to you about today. I want to make a little bit of a – well, I want to make a little bit of a correction. If you, as I did after the last lecture, go and look up Dharma (D-H-A-R-M-A) to find out what has been preserved of all that, why, save yourself the trouble. Dharma is anything from "supreme law" to "the total caste system of India" to "fate" and respelled "love" and rephrased some other way, it is something else some other way, and so forth. And in no authoritative reference book that I've looked at to date that I have around at this particular time, is there any correct definition for Dharma. Boy, that is really great, you know, it's really great! And in Buddhism it means "the way," see.
Now, I tell you, you go around getting your name synonymous with things, you know, and then your name becomes the thing, you know. If you make very good Frigidaires, why, eventually all iceboxes are known as Frigidaires, you see. But it's worse than that, it's worse than that. The name becomes identified with the product rather than the source of the product, which I think is very fascinating. I just thought I would give you that as a little side note on the last lecture, because I thought, "I wonder what they're saying about that these days," you know. "I wonder if there's any record of it around," you know. By George, there isn't! I notice, however, in many books such as the theosophy texts, and so on, that it is bounteously mentioned, but it doesn't really say wherein.

Well, the age we're in, by the way – the age we started, by the way – already has been named. This might also be an interesting side note to you. It's the Age of Love. There was the Age of Reason and the Age of Science and the age of a lot of other things. But twenty-five hundred years ago, why, Gautama Siddhartha said that in twenty-five hundred years, the Age of Love would begin in the West and this is an interesting prediction because the first thing that Clears start talking about is love, you know. It's interesting. Of course, nobody ever made this before, so how was he to know? But, anyway, this is supposed to be the Age of Love. No longer the Age of Reason – thank God! [laughter]

Well, there are probably a lot of things I could talk to you about – I don't know any of them at the present moment that would be more useful to you than another. Completions are up so I don't have to worry about that and you seem to be doing fine on the course, so I don't have to worry about that. But there is a lecture that I think you could use in a high degree of generality and that is a roundup of the study materials.

There was never really a final lecture on the study materials and in this lecture I will not for a moment adventure to give you a summary lecture which includes all the salient points of the study materials. There are quite a few of them. But there are some additional materials about the study materials in general which I think you might find of great interest. And that is the basis of intent – intent during study. Now, this is a very; very important subject.

As you study, what do you intend to do with the information? Very important point!

There are points on the basis of faulty source, as you are studying. This we haven't really looked at. We have presupposed that all sources that we are studying are themselves perfect, you see, and have – (1) have information to deliver and (2) are delivering it in a way that it can be assimilated. We've more or less assumed that and the student is always asked to take the effect point and assume that he is studying comprehensible, worthwhile material. This fact, all by itself tends to knock the whole subject of study appetite over tin cup because very little of the material you are asked to study has any value or comprehensibility out in the wog world. And it is a rare textbook which actually relays the information and subject matter which you are supposed to assimilate – a very rare textbook.

Now, when you get study gone mad, you really have a mess. This is one of the reasons why there are such a tremendous number of suicides in universities – and there are a great many suicides in universities. The proportion is fantastic. It is not as high as psychoanalytic
practice suicides, which amount to one third in the first three months. Did you know that? Well, for some reason or other, it's never been advertised.

The source of that is the psychoanalytic bureau, or whatever they called it, in New York. We've more or less finished that subject, by the way. Very little of it left.

But the suicides which occur in French universities is probably the highest in the world and French students blow their brains out and jump out of windows all over the place come examination time.

The number of failures in a university do not, however, have anything whatsoever to do with the product turned out by the university. None of these things are related. Because their examinations are very hard does not make it a good university. You see, the ones with the hardest examinations are not necessarily those that produce the most brilliant students. It's not a coordinated fact.

There are many other facts which don't coordinate with regard to this and that is because study is a very fruitful field for a suppressive. It, like government, attracts suppressives like honey attracts flies. And you can get all types of suppressive reactions found in textbooks as well as behind the lecture rostrum. As a result – as a result, we have to, when we speak of the subject of study, discuss whether or not the subject itself has a clean bill of health. Is the subject an ethics – or the rendition of the subject – is this an ethics subject?

Now, I will tell you a field which, without any doubt whatsoever, would keep a thousand ethics officers busy a thousand years and that is the field of navigation. Now, I'm somewhat expert in this particular line, but I very seriously doubt if I could walk into a Board of Trade or Bureau of Navigation and pass today my master's examinations in the field of navigation. I doubt this very, very much, because it has so little to do with navigation. And I have had the unfortunate experience of having had to navigate in many oceans off the cuff; on my own – inadequate equipment, stopped chronometers, and all of this sort of thing, and missing tables, and so forth. And somehow or another these barriers would not put you into a position – must not put you into a position where, of course, you lose the ship. So you navigate.

And the method by which you navigate is the all-important thing in an examination on navigation and that you navigate is the only test that Old Man Sea requires of you.

And I usually – usually when some chap has just passed his navigation examinations with "A" and walks aboard a ship that I have anything to do with, well, I get very alert. Because this doesn't say to me that he can navigate at all – has nothing to do with navigation. I've had such a chap walk aboard, take a look at the helm and say, "So that is a wheel! Well, I've often wondered. And that is a binnacle, that's a compass! Oh, goodness! And that's an engine room telegraph! How interesting!"

And I thought to myself; "How interesting!" The man had his ticket; he must have passed his examination. But he hadn't even reached the point of where he knew the environment in which he was supposed to do his navigation.

And you break navigation down to its basic principles, you just have certain elementary principles which are just the facts of it, and they are very, very streamlined, obvious facts. For instance, the whole subject is dedicated to the location of where you are on a
sphere. And in view of the fact the sphere also has rocks, shoals and land masses, also has somewhat tempestuous areas which are less safe than others and has calm areas that you jolly well better stay out of; it becomes somewhat important that you know where you are.

And in view of the fact that the sea is a water surface which obscures the things even a few inches below it… I remember one time sailing along in a perfectly beautiful flat calm and doing all right and looking over to port and seeing a sea gull walking on the water! [laughter] You don't think at that moment I went slightly pale! Because of tide-races which had been caused by a storm or were going backwards according to the tide tables, and so on – the depth of water over a shoal just alongside of me was not twenty feet, but was one inch! So you see… It was supposed to be high water at that time.

Now, therefore, all navigation performed with mathematical activities only can only be counted on to do one thing: wind you up on the rocks. That you're fairly sure of. Because the whole subject is dedicated to knowing where you are. And the next thing is not running into, on or colliding with objects which you're not supposed to frequent or associate with. That's easy.

And then we have some other facts: that the stars don't move very much; and cliffs and headlands don't move very much; and the sun, it moves pretty regularly; and the moon moves erratically but very regularly – you can predict its erraticness. And so you can look at these things and if you have a chronometer which happens to have been wound up or can get a time signal from some place, you normally can locate where you are on the sphere by its reference to stellar bodies or, in case of piloting, by recognition of land masses. That's actually all there is to the whole subject.

Now, do you understand something about the subject?

Audience: Yes.

I assure you that you now understand far more about the subject than a first-year midshipman at the Naval Academy. Because he's given a book that is named Dutton. Dutton is the bible. Now, Dutton might have been a good textbook to begin with, but it has gotten into the hands of admirals; and it has been ceaselessly rewritten.

Now, the Primer of Navigation by Mixter was the elementary textbook which kept the officers who stayed off the rocks off the rocks in World War II. He published it in 1940; it became the bible of the young officer of World War II. And it now – Mixter is dead – is now in the process of being rewritten by the admirals. And when I read it the other day, I just picked up a copy of it and looked – read it – "This doesn't sound like Mixter."

So last night, I got ahold of a copy of my World War II copy of Mixter, and a brand-new copy of Mixter's that just came off the press, and I read them page by page against each other and it's considerably different! The words have gotten longer.

Now, Bowditch has undergone this process for so many years that from a little tiny textbook published at the end of the eighteenth century in simple language – so that even Bowditch's cook could navigate after a cruise to China – has become a textbook about three or four inches thick which is staggeringly full of sines, cosines, haversines, tables, traverse tables, equations and all kinds of mad things. And it's become an enormous book of tables. If
they don't know what to do with a navigational table, they put it in Bowditch. It is now an official textbook of the United States Navy I imagine there are things in the Royal Navy which have gone this same evolution.

But the main point I'm making here is that you would have thought somebody would have paid attention to such a subject -- lack of knowledge of which kills men. See, you can die awful quick through an absence of navigation, you see -- and not -- sometimes not so quick, sometimes rather messily. You'd have thought they would have made every effort to make it simpler. Well, it's true that they've evolved simpler methods of taking star sights, but their textbooks are so complicated that the first time I ever picked up a copy of the Naval Academy textbook on navigation, Dutton, I read the first four sentences, I read them again; they still didn't make any sense. I read them again. I put the book down and that's as far as I've ever gotten with Dutton.

Many years later -- many years later, I read the first four sentences again and I found out that if you were an expert navigator and needed no information of any kind on the subject, the first four sentences of Dutton made sense.

Well, I think that's very interesting.

The Encyclopaedia Britannica, in its earliest editions, is a rather simple encyclopaedia -- very interesting. I don't like editions later than the eleventh, because you find all sorts of things in editions up to then. They're rather simply written. They're written on the basis that a person owns an encyclopedia because he doesn't know certain things, and he'll want to look them up and find a quick rundown on them. Well, more recent Encyclopaedia Britannica, I'm sorry to say, publish articles on the subject of landscape gardening that only a landscape gardener could comprehend or be interested in. We've gotten into the world of the expert.

Now, the expert, in writing a textbook, very often goes mad. Last night I picked up a textbook on the subject of... I'm using navigation at this particular time instead of photography, as I was using in the subject before, just to get a parallel subject. I picked up a textbook on the subject of yacht equipment... yacht cruising equipment. Oh, very, very authoritative text, very modern. And there was a chapter there on binoculars. So I looked into this chapter on binoculars and it's just page after page after page about binoculars. It's very interesting because it takes it up from the days of Galileo. It tells you how to build -- without being specific about it, but being very complex with complete formulas -- a Galilean telescope. I think it's very useful; I can see me now out on a yacht in the middle of the Pacific building a Galilean telescope. I can see this now.

So anyway, it goes on from this -- which is comprehensible -- you say, "Well, anybody would put that in the first paragraph." No, he puts that in the first two or three pages.

And we go on from there to the assimilation and -- of light by glass and various types of glass and how the glass is made, and we go on and on and on about the formulas now by which you grind glass. I can see me now, you see, just outside the Diamond Head at Waikiki, wondering which binocular to pick up and, "Let's see now, what is the glass formula that ground the glass of that binocular?" you see. Silly!
So anyway, it just goes on at this mad rate and at the end of it finally concludes, without any preamble of any kind whatsoever, that a yachtsman needs a 7 x 50 type pair of binoculars – an authoritative conclusion based on all of the optical formulas. A yachtsman is not an optician; what's he got the formulas there for? Completely batty!

Now, the truth of the matter is that that chapter does not contain the following: how to preserve, waterproof and clean glasses being used at sea. And you can wreck a pair of glasses just that fast if you don't know that. How to set a pair of glasses to your own eye prescription and be able to set up any binoculars that you pick up instantly so that you can use it instantly without fiddling about – didn't contain that. Didn't contain the fact that in small vessels, the vibration and the bounding about is such that the shake of the glass makes it impossible for you to detect numbers on buoys, or identities of or names of ships at any distance if you use too high a powered glass, and a 7 x 50 will inevitably blur out on the motion of a small yacht. It is not the glass for a yacht at all. What you want is a three- or four-power for a small boat, and then you can read the numbers on buoys. So even his conclusion was wrong.

Fascinating! He spends all these pages, see? But somebody comes along that's had to live with binoculars, knows all the things that dumb, brandnew, untrained quartermasters can do with binoculars – you see, he's used binoculars under all circumstances and he finds out that what the fellow wrote has nothing whatsoever to do with the subject.

But wait a minute, wait a minute. A fellow that's been using them for years under those conditions doesn't need that textbook, does he? And if that textbook doesn't inform the user of any of the data that he will require in order to use… What is this?

Wow! There's more to this than meets the eye. Considerably more to this than meets the eye. Let's read a few books picked up at random off the shelf on the subject of the sea. And unless you are very clever – and a Scientologist – you will not notice that all it speaks of is disaster. It just tells you, consistently, page after page after page after page, how disastrous it all is, how you must do this and that because this is going to happen, how you must do that and this because something else is going to happen, how you must not do so-and-so because something else is going to happen. You read in vain how to get another half a knot out of your sail set. But you read all about how the tracks to the front of the sail as they attach it to the mast – not to go technical on you – how these little gimmicks that they put on the sail to go up the Marconi track, how they tear loose in storms and jam sideways and make it necessary for people to get up and climb up mast, which is impossible.

And if you read very much of this, you would not go to sea; you would be scared stiff; just scared stiff!

And even on a person of considerable experience this creeps up on him and he doesn't notice it. And eventually he starts going to sea, and he gets in a sort of a half-hysterical frame of mind. Beautiful calm day, he's out in the middle of a channel fifty miles wide, there are no ships in sight and he's worrying about his azimuths, or did the subpermanent magnetism of the hull change the last time she was in dry dock, and is his compass reading right, and will he pick up – oh, just worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry. He'll never sit back, you know, and say, "Great!" you know?
Now, if you want to go into hysterics sometime, read coast pilots. For light reading, for those who like horror stories, that is what one recommends.

I remember one time considering taking the big jump down from Alaska – just going outside all protection in the middle of winter and tearing on down across the wide reaches of the Pacific and fetching up at a California port as a direct \textit{bang!} you see, with an expeditionary vessel – without going behind anything, and so forth. And I sat there and the mate I had was sitting there, and we were both reading – we had two copies of the same coast pilot. And we were looking it all up – and it wasn't – but it was not the same coast pilot; his was British and mine was American – and we read it.

It seems that five hundred miles off of the coast there are fantastic currents which, when the wind and fog come together – because the wind comes with the fog at the same time in the middle of December and January – you can absolutely count on being torn to pieces, sunk, engaged, involved, becalmed, messed up and in general finished. And it was so bad – it's much worse than I'm saying – and it was so bad that he and I, sitting up... It was already, you see, complete black dark outside at high noon, you know, and we were going to take this run and somehow or other we were going to get the hell out of there. And we all of a sudden simultaneously broke into hysterical laughter Nothing could be that bad, you see, but nothing! The British pilot, American pilot – nothing could be that bad!

One time I read about a terrible tide-race. And it was a tide-race. And it told all about how it had sunk a Canadian gun boat and lost two hundred men, and that this tide-race went sixteen knots and – every time the tide changed, and there was a huge rock in the middle of it that split vessels apart but was visible at night because of the spray leaping into the air.

Well, normally you would go through these things at slack water anyway. I went through it at slack water, and the cook, all the time we were going through it, was cooking up hot flapjacks and pushing them up on the bridge, because I was sitting there eating my break-fast the entire distance through this mad tide-race.

I shot another tide-race one time, a narrows, where "anybody that entered it was practically sunk, but sometimes the ships caromed off the sides of the cliffs and kept afloat somehow." And I was in the middle of this thing in the middle of the night, because there was an error in the American tide tables – a two-hour error – and I'd hit the thing at race instead of at slack. And the water was going through there just boiling white and, man, I came near that in a sailing ship and I was into it before I could do another thing. And the lights of the cabin were shining through ports on the cliffs, so close up that you could see the moss. And the tiller broke, and left us with no tiller. So I rigged an emergency tiller in the middle of all of this and steered her on out the other side and suddenly realized we'd gotten through it. And I realized something else about it: I never really at any time ever had to know anything about that millrace at all, if I'd hit it at slack water, high water, or any other way, it didn't matter if it was fast; it always sends a boat through. What was I studying tide tables for? So it runs fast. You get the idea?

Well, of course, it's very nice to know all these cautions, but what did the captain of the \textit{Indianapolis}... He was a US Naval captain. And they have stripes, you know, that go clear up to their cap. This fellow took the cruiser \textit{Indianapolis} through this first narrows I was talk-
ing to you about. And the local pilots cautioned him about it and he'd read all the tide tables and he was a graduate of the Naval Academy and he was a man of great experience, I'm very sure, and so forth. And he had all this information, because every time they graduate, you know, up – I mean every time they get promoted they have to pass complete examinations on everything, you know? I'm sure he had the information – "A" student all the way. And he got the *USS Indianapolis* crossways in that channel at full race, with its stern stuck on one bank and its bow on the other. This he managed. I can't for the life of me know how he could possibly have done it.

But if you look very carefully through these textbooks, you will find the bulk of them simply tell you not to go to sea, that it's very dangerous. And a person who studies them very, very hard and abides by them totally, eventually loses all the fun of going to sea – and doesn't.

So, there is suppression throughout that field. Now, of course, it is very nice for them to tell you that if you let the boat flood with butane gas and then strike a match, the boat will blow up. We're glad to know that! It's very nice to know where the rocks are. But let's not concentrate on them for the rest of our lives. Let's also point out where the open, easy-sailing water is, but we never hear about that; we just hear about the rocks.

And we could, then, take any subject and write it up for study purposes as a suppressive subject.

Now, you want to tell people the dangers – sometimes you can tell them too lightly, that's true. For instance, it – I'd hate to tell people… There's two extremes here: I'd hate to have to omit the idea that if you do an incorrect Search and Discovery you can make your PC quite ill. You get the wrong SP, the person can be sick; he can now get sick, because you've restimulated the right one, you see. And that is what's making him sick. You're not making him sick, the right one is.

Now, I can tell you that, but now to go on raving and ranting and describing S&D as only how not to get the wrong one because you're sure going to do it, I could get you into a frame of mind – I don't say I would – but you could be gotten into a frame of mind whereby you would probably never do an S&D because it's too dangerous. Interesting! You could be scared right off of doing the right thing because it's too deadly.

Well, now, that would be how you would curve a subject and make it suppressive. That's a suppressive rendition of the subject. It's not the subject that's... But we could just go on talking about "People get sick when you do an S&D on them if you do not so-and-so and you want to set up your meter because people will get sick. And your meter has to be trimmed, your trim knob has to be so-and-so because people are going to get very sick. And then it's your fault as the auditor, you see? And then so on," and we never talk about anybody ever recovering because of an S&D; we just talk how sick they'll get if you do it wrong, do you see? Then it becomes too dangerous to do.

Now, they've done this about the mind, and they managed to have scared off – the SP on the track managed – has managed actually to scare off all intelligent research on the subject of the mind and soul. You've heard time and again how dangerous it is. "You mustn't fool around with the mind!" Perfectly all right to take a meat ax to the brain, but you mustn't fool around with the mind!
I got my belly so full in 1950 of psychoanalysts telling me how dangerous it was to fool around with the mind. But I finally more or less rejected it with laughter, because I looked at who was talking. And when he said fool around, man, he meant fool around, because I found out he could not study Dianetics; he could not do it.

And do you know our main departure from training psychoanalysts and psychiatrists and medical doctors is not really based on the fact we are antipathetic toward them at all. It's the fact that they can't seem to duplicate study materials. And it's just so hard, it's so tough.

A person comes off the street; you can teach him a Comm Course in a week. Well, you'll teach a psychologist a Comm Course in something like six or eight weeks. Rough, see? Because the guy has been very suppressively taught. He can't duplicate anymore on this subject. And it's contra everything else he has been taught, you see. So it's all going in sideways and backwards and he's got preconceived notions and he's actually in Remedy B of *The Book of Case Remedies*. That's what he needs.

Now, the suppressive subject then is something which booby-traps study, and all of the work which you put in to get somebody to know his algebra, and so on, might be all lost because he hasn't got a textbook which teaches him algebra. You see? Now, what is needed is an appreciation of the study materials by the people who write materials to be studied.

Now, blokes will try; they'll try very hard. I was reading a book on ocean cruising the other night. It was very fine. It was not ocean cruising but *Coastwise Navigation Wrinkles*. And he said, "But what you should use if you have a crew who isn't trained," something like that, "and it's much safer, you should always have a grid compass." A grid compass. He starts it out with the fact that everybody must understand his work. That was the condition under which he wrote it. And in the first few sentences here is this phrase "grid compass." There's no further explanation of any kind whatsoever. So, just for fun, I picked up various navigational and equipment texts to find if I could find a grid compass: a picture of one, a definition of one. I picked up two or three nautical dictionaries to try to find a definition of a grid compass. Didn't exist – very hard, very rough. Now, there was a guy who was honestly trying to do a good job and he skidded because he didn't know that he mustn't put in a word that people wouldn't know.

Now, in Dianetics and Scientology we've been consistently up against the fact that we're beyond the limit of language. The English language does not include the parts of a subject which was unknown. You understand, I mean, if you don't – if nobody's known anything about any of these things, you see, well, they have to be named, which unfortunately gives us a lot of nomenclature, and so on, which we could be very happy without. We have to have it because it isn't in the language.

Now, once in a while a psychoanalyst tries to turn it around, or a psychologist tries to turn it around to his own nomenclature, and you get the real reason why some things which could have been called by old terms aren't – is because he's got an entirely different definition and his definition is in argument with the other definitions in his own field, so they don't know what they're talking about. So, it's a completely messed-up area.

Now, where they did have some words, the words didn't mean what they're supposed to mean, do you see, and then there's argument about the definition of those words.
So the solution to this was actually to turn verbs to nouns where possible, to use no-
omenclature which was expressive to some degree of what it represented. Now, not knowing
the study materials when the material was originally written, it was not possible to apply all
this and go back to the beginning and sort it all out up the line. Now, this would be a very,
very long and rough passage. This would be a tough passage to try to rewrite everything all
the way down the line.

Now, we suffer to the degree that we don't even have a dictionary; we do not have a
real dictionary at this time which would give – and that is because every time I get a copy of a
dictionary, and so forth, I have to, myself; check the whole thing. And I find myself making
changes and corrections in it. And then I have to work very hard, you see, on it, and then
somebody else has been working on it, and it's a major project. And just about the time I will
get started, you see some – a lot of it's been done, and then I've got to carry on through with
corrections – something will come up, something will be totally demanding of total time, and
it doesn't get done. And this dictionary – we've been on dictionaries for I don't know how
long, trying to get you a dictionary.

Well, it's a rough job. It's a rough job at best.

But you will find nearly everything is defined in the text where it originally appears.
Therefore, were you to cover all of the data, you would get all of the language. And that is
one of the reasons why I said that a Saint Hill student had better go back to the original
method of study. And the original method of study is you covered it all lightly. You covered it
all lightly and you wound up then with a good grip on the entirety of the subject. And then,
what you really had to know, well, you then studied that hard for star-rate. But volume was
what it took.

Now, of course, you're up against not knowing where the word was originally used
and there are probably a great many tapes missing. I don't imagine we have many Wichita
tapes, and I know we have few or no Elizabeth tapes compared to the lectures. There were
eight hours of lecture a day there on many days; five hours was routine, teaching different
classes and units. But this gives us a difficulty right there. But we're clever enough to know
we have that difficulty.

And now what I'm going to tell you is going to solve this to a very marked degree, and
this is the subject of the intentions of study. For what purpose are you studying? Now, until
you clarify that, you in actual fact cannot make an intelligent activity of it.

Now, most students study for examination. That's folly! Complete folly! You're not
going to do anything with the examiner. You're sitting there studying for examination, study-
ing for an examination, studying for an examination, "How will I regurgitate this when I am
asked a certain question? How will I respond? How will I pass my checkout?"

Well, it's very hard to keep "demonstrate" and "example" and "clarify" into examina-
tion. It's so much easier to fall back on "What did it say in the bulletin," you see, and get di-
rect quotes of the material itself; when in actual fact that's really not proper examination. Be-
cause the fault that can be found with education in the university, the argument the practical
man has with the academically trained man when he first gets him on the subject and has to
make him fully acquainted with it – you know, like the guy who's been out there building
houses for a long time and he all of a sudden gets an assistant who's just been trained in the university to build houses. He goes mad! Guy doesn't know anything about the subject at all. He's been studying it for years, yet he knows nothing about it and he doesn't know why this is.

Well, I can tell you why it is, because the fellow who just went through the university studied all of his materials so that he could be examined on them. He didn't study them to build houses. And the fellow who's been out there on a practical line is not necessarily superior in the long run at all, but he certainly is able to get houses built because all of his study is on the basis of "How do I apply this to house building?" Every time he picks up an ad or literature or anything else, he's asking the question throughout the entirety of his reading, "How can I apply this to what I'm doing?" And that is the basic and important difference between practical study and academic study.

Scholastic or academic study is not worth very much. Why you have a fellow go through a course and wind up at the other end of the course unable to audit, it's because he in actual fact studied for the examination. He did not study to apply it to people. So he winds up with the material unapplied. That's regrettable. This is why you get failures in practice after certification, and is the whole reason.

Now, if a fellow were just studying for the examination, he would not have to know the exact meaning of all of the words. He could sort of gloss over it and pass it off because he could include the word in the totality of its sentence and merely quote the sentence if he was asked the question. And he wouldn't really have to know the meaning of the word. So he tends to move out the material over here and have sort of nothing to do with the material while he is busy studying the material, because he can just rattle it off. And this explains the student who can rattle off his material so beautifully but doesn't know anything about the subject.

See, you say to him, "Fulcrums." He doesn't know what a fulcrum is. He hasn't a clue, but he knows it fits in a sentence that says, "The law of the fulcrum is rat-a-tat-tat tat-a-tat-tat," so he can write it all down rat-a-tat-tat. And he knows how to solve fulcrums because those are the formulas by which you solve them: distance, weight, so on. So he just applies it for the problem he's given, "rat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat trrm-pa, there we are."

One fine day he's got to move a barrel. And he stands around and he looks around at this barrel and he scratches his head and he doesn't know how he's going to move that barrel, because he can't get one end of it picked up to slide anything under it, and he couldn't hold it up if he did, and so forth. And finally somebody who doesn't know anything about fulcrums at all comes along, takes a pole, sticks it over the top of a stump and sets up a "fulcrum," see, and moves the barrel with the big lever. The person watching this is not likely to connect his lessons in physics with what the workman did. And therefore, we can get very educated dumbbells, and that's how they're made. It's on the intention of the study. He's studying it to be examined on, or he's studying it to apply it, and it's just those two different things.

Now, where a subject is booby-trapped and suppressive in the extreme, it can be studied for examination but can't be studied for application. Doesn't matter how complex a study is, no matter how suppressively written, no matter how badly organized, it still can be memorized. It can be spat back on the examination paper, if you work hard enough and your mem-
ory is good enough. But you can't apply it. You can't begin to apply that subject, because there was no understanding in it with which to apply it. Isn't that horrible! There was nothing there to be understood and if there was nothing there to be understood, of course, it couldn't be applied.

I imagine you could write up a whole textbook on the subject of "weejacks," and nobody would ever know what they were, you didn't know what they were, or anything else. You could write a very learned text that was full of mathematical equations by which the whole situation of "weejacks" could be completely fixed up, and wind up at the other end of it with a subject on which some students could get "A." Totally synthesized subject.

Now, on the other side of the picture – the other side of the picture – if you studied that subject for application, every time you hit a bump that was incomprehensible in the text, you yourself would require clarification. If it wasn't in the text to be understood and if it wasn't in any parallel text to be understood, why, in order to apply it you would have to clarify it. And you wouldn't run into a bunch of misunderstandings, because you would stop at them when you arrived at them, and you would get them clarified. Do you see?

Now, your difficulty in studying Dianetics and Scientology is basically the lack of a dictionary. But I call to your attention that I just got through turning you out two tapes and a bulletin which, if you look through them very carefully, you will not find anything in them that isn't defined in them. You noticed that about them? Well, that's the Dianetic materials which is directly being applied at this moment in the practice of Dianetics. Now, that's totally defined for total application, and so therefore, the application is possible and you can study it for application. And we notice that students who are auditing in Dianetics are getting rather interesting results.

Now, in addition to that they're told to study this material so they can go audit, right now! Do you see? Now, that would produce this other frame of mind of studying it for application.

Now, if anybody is making any – having any trouble with the Dianetic materials at all, it is simply that they have not studied the Dianetic tapes or bulletin for application. They have studied them for examination. Now, if you were to go back, brand-new, as though you'd never heard of it before and study it for application, and every time you got a single sentence of it, wondered how you were going to apply this to a pc or what this had to do with your performance as an auditor in the application of Dianetics to the pc, you would wind up at the other end with no case of indigestion. You would wind up with a complete grasp of the subject, able to get results. Bang! Bang! Bang! Do you see?

But one is taught very bad habits of study in universities and in schools in this society at this time, because so much stress is put on examination. The stress on examination is so terrific that one can become a social outcast through failing his examinations.

I notice in the United States, now, they call them "dropouts," "Rrrhh! Dropouts!" Guy flunked, he's finished. But it's also interesting to note that of the four fellows who dropped out (I think it was Princeton) in one semester – now this is very paraphrased data, I'm not going to try to give you their histories – four "dropouts" in one semester at Princeton, from the lower classes of Princeton (you know, freshman, sophomore, and so on), all were making in excess
of twenty-five thousand dollars a year within the year. Wait! What! Whoo! What's that? Those weren't the failures; they were the successes in that class.

Now, we check in vain to find a single philosopher, except Mills, who ever got a passing grade in school or who stayed in school to its end. Read the list, man: Bacon, Spencer – just read them off. Bang! Bang! Bang! This one, that one, the other one, oh yeah, well, he was kicked out. He was in there seventeen days. He was at Oxford and they gave him the deep six, and so on, so on. Why? Why?

Well, man for a long time has just avoided this. He knows it exists. But he's avoided it totally because it's a complete assignment of failure to his educational system if it can't teach the bright boys. And he's given many explanations to it, and so on. But the explanation is simply that the study materials that are given are not for application, and these birds are doers in life and they want material for application, and the university texts are not arranged to apply anything to anything.

Now, I'm not riding a hobbyhorse in my own resentments, but I will tell you this brief anecdote. I was flunked in analytical geometry, and I was flunked resoundingly! I was given a great big "F." I know it sounds like a mathematics, and unless you're acquainted with mathematics in general you've probably never even heard of it. And that's because it's a dead mathematics. It has no possible use – according to the professors.

But I'd sat back at the end of – the back of the class and I got intrigued with this stuff because it could be applied to aerial navigation. And I found out that you could draw up a formula out of it which would solve the drift of wind – you know, wind drift, and a few other things could be applied very easily – and I found out that it might be a jolly useful mathematics. Oh, I made a mistake, man! That finished it. I made a mistake! I told the professor – name was Hodgson. If you ever saw a flame light in any man's eye, it was to see this beautifully dead mathematics being given purpose and application. I told him rather indifferently. I didn't try to push it through. I wasn't doing anything, not arguing, very polite. He flunked me just like that – the whole course.

Well, fortunately, I was able to go over to the chair of mathematics of the university. His name was Taylor, he was one of the twelve men in the United States at that time who could understand Einstein. And I don't think he knew whether he was talking to me or not talking to me, but I told him that I required a reexamination on the subject. So, he ordered Hodgson to take off and make a new examination. And so Hodgson put every formula in the book – you had to know every formula in the entire text verbatim, you had to know every theorem in it verbatim, and so forth. And he said, "I'll fix him – trying to make a live mathematics out of a dead mathematics." I got ninety-eight on the examination.

But this was a direct assault on the citadels of "We've got knowledge nice and dead, let's keep it that way." And I erred there by telling him there was a use for the stuff. It was a fatal error on my part. I should never have opened my mouth. I was also flunked one time in a class on free thinking, and so forth, because I'd decided that you could think freely. [laughter, laughs]

The entirety of study materials depends, then, on the material to be studied and the attitude with which it is being studied – the purpose and intention of the student.
Now, if you were to go over Dianetic materials and Scientology materials just on the basis of "How could I apply this, and how can I use that, and how can I apply this?" And if you examined principally on the basis of "All right, we've got bulletin number 642..." I would expect people to know the auditing commands verbatim, but "How do you apply this? HCOB blankety-blank date," you know, and the Examiner said – he didn't say, "What's in this bulletin?" see – he said, "How do you apply this bulletin?" You just read it. I bet you would get an awful look of horror in many a student's eye. He has read it to be examined on; he hasn't read it to apply it. But now he, in actual fact, will have no use for it of any kind whatsoever if he has read it to be examined on. But if he has read it to apply it, then he will find it is useful information. Got that?

Now, I say you have the liability in the fact that you're dealing with a subject which has no tradition in its vocabulary; its vocabulary is new. There is – singularly horrible to have it missing. There's a missing dictionary, and so on. But most of the materials, if you're studying them broadly, are defined in the text themselves and you can gather what those things are. Also, your Instructor generally will know what it is, and you can ask questions to clarify them, and you should clarify them.

Well, now, these materials concerning study amplify, of course, the other materials we had about study.

And I'm very amused at one particular subject, which is one of – probably the biggest football and causes more trouble to man than any other single subject, and that is the subject of economics.

And the subject of economics has been used to forward political ideologies. So for every ideology there is an economics written up to fit it, to a point where people no longer believe there is a subject called economics. But the odd part of it is there is a subject called economics, and it has certain raw, fundamental basics which, if violated, wreck the works. But these things have all been carefully set aside and a brand-new facade has been erected in its particular position in order to forward communism or fascism or some other -ism, -ism, -ism; and then you, of course, you get the socialist using capitalistic economics, the capitalist using socialist economics. I don't know how they do that, but they do, you know?

You know the Labor Party right now uses nothing but capitalistic economics. They're dedicated to the destruction of capitalism, but they're using capitalistic economics. I don't know how they're going to succeed with that. The Conservative, on the other hand, who is dedicated to capitalism, is using nothing but socialist economic proposals to remedy things. I think it's the most wonderful mess I ever saw.

But there was where a subject was taken to fit a certain, to use a crude word, pitch. You see, the subject was written up to have a curve. "This is communist economics," see? "And the rudigadders of the whuterbuds all go whir-whir, and the formulas are 'for every man according to his bla-bal'," you know? Yuck!

The second you start applying it, it violates the subject that there is a basic subject. There is a subject called economics and it is a very simple subject indeed, and it's been obscured.
So there's something else you can do with a subject: You can pervert a subject to such a point that the subject is no longer applicable or assimilable, or if applied, becomes catastrophe. So, that's something else that can be done with a subject.

That's what they did with Freud's work. I'm sure Freud had a lot of workable technology. It's – doesn't survive in the practice of psychoanalysis, I assure you. Because what I was taught in 1924 as Freudian analysis isn't in any textbooks anymore. I know it seems a long time ago to be taught the first time about psychoanalysis, but it is true, that was when I first got this stuff and it sounded very interesting. It's all gone. I haven't heard any of that for years. I've heard other things. I've heard how the "autoerotic economic system very often recoils upon the society because of the perversion of the id."

You want to take one of Horney's books, or something like that on psychoanalysis, and to – read it to a party sometime. Just take a paragraph at random, read it out of context. There's nobody at that party will believe that that is in that book; they will be sure that you are just quoting gobbledygook. They're absolutely positive that you will be quoting gobbledygook, because no textbook could be like that. But that's how you could take a subject.

Now, all of man is being caught up in an economic web. He's being caught in an economic net at this particular time. Every hour of his day is being monitored by economics. It isn't – interesting that the subject of economics has been so overcomplicated and so bent and so badly defined and turned off and made so suppressive that nobody can get at the root of what they're doing. The most beautiful obfuscation, the most beautiful obscuring of motive which I have ever seen.

Now, you are studying a subject in which there is no curve. If it errs in any direction, it's probably you aren't warned enough at certain places. But there isn't any curved intent in this. You're studying, actually, along the line it was researched.

So that if you were to study this subject for application, you would quickly find out in it what was not applicable and you would find out what was incomprehensible to you, or just is there but is incomprehensible. You would find these things out. And gradually you would get any kink shaken out of your materials, whether I sat down and wrote a dictionary or not. You see?

So anyway, the next time you want a good laugh, pick up some text on some subject, you know, like "Landscape Gardening for the Beginner," and find out whether the book is an ethics case or not. It's quite interesting. You will find amongst the texts by which man is hoping to carry forward his culture and civilization, you will find the SP very well represented. You will also find perfectly good blokes who go right along fine. But you will also find that some of these chaps, who are very good and have done a good job, are the most damned people that anybody ever heard of.

For instance, Will Durant in writing *The Story of Philosophy* and attempting to clarify philosophy, and so on, if he's still alive, actually spent the entire latter part of his life in seclusion in California in shame and horror because so much hell was raised with him for writing that textbook to make philosophy simple and comprehensible to others. Interesting, they hounded the man till he just didn't want to do anything but die.
There's a fellow by the name of Thompson that – nearly every calculus student in the university will sooner or later get ahold of this fellow Thompson's (oh, it's either Thompson or Carpenter) little textbook; and it begins with what calculus is and explains calculus. And you read the book, you find out what calculus is. And it's sufficiently simple that you wind up laughing, you see, and you go ahead and you can do something with calculus. But that isn't the calculus textbooks in the university. I have had professors who severely warned their students against this book, because it permitted the mathematics and its very abstruse language to be communicated to the student. So you will even find teachers who warn people against simple textbooks, and you will find large stratas of the society get a "down" on simplification.

Well, study materials – study materials needed a few other remarks. Maybe this lecture has helped you out a little bit; maybe it's clarified what you're doing. The next time you're studying something, why, take a look at it and you'll find yourself up – "And the Examiner is going to ask this," and so forth, and you just haul yourself up at that particular point and ask yourself this question instead, "Does this have application? Does this amplify my understanding of the mind? Does this broaden my grip of the subject? And if so, how? How can I apply this, if I knew this datum, out in life?" and so forth, "Of what use would it be to me?" And you all of a sudden will find yourself recover from any indigestion you have from studying too much too fast.

Thank you very much.

Thank you.
Thank you. I'm a bulletin board today! What's the date?

Audience: Twenty-third of August, AD 16.

Twenty-third of August, AD 16. This is a notable day. I hope you – I hope you get something out of this lecture because I had to knock off my afternoon research session to give it to you, putting the OTs that far behind, you see. Make you all guilty now. But the truth of the matter is that I'm making very good progress indeed and all is well in that quarter.

People who are picking on Scientology at this time – you know, they're perfectly right, [laughter] they're perfectly correct. From their personal point of view, why, what they're doing is very dangerous. [laughs] Yes, those fellows who're picking on Scientology know just what they're doing in their insane way – they're in danger. [laughs] Matter of fact, HCO shouldn't issue Suppressive Orders on them, but Danger conditions. [laughs] That sounds like a threat. It isn't; it's a promise. [laughter, laughs]

Well, today I'm a bulletin board! I've got more people and more things.

I'm told that there are now 130 students total on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course and Solo Audit Course. Highest number of students ever and plenty more coming. [applause]

Yes, we already have OT projects going. You can expect to see these people start disappearing any day now. [laughter, laughs] Of course, not Craig; he's Case Supervisor, you know. You know that the hierarchy of the Tech Division now are all of them Clear, you know.

Well now, today – today I'm going to talk to you about organization. I've never talked to you about organization before. [laughter] I never have!

During the entirety of 1965 and something into 1966 I spent literally thousands of hours on the subject of organization, and out of that area of study came a great deal of data.

And one of the first things I found out is the reason that a business organization pattern would not fit a Scientology organization was because a business organization never had isolated the principles of organization.

Now, in a Scientology organization you are handling a commodity known as life and that is the commodity it handles. And, of course, it is handling it with a vessel made out of life. And this is something on the order of trying to pour water into a pitcher made out of water. So it will find out at once every frailty in an organization. It'll find out every missing law. It'll find out every misplaced datum at once and quickly and it will show up very huge.
So that in an ordinary organization, they get a board of directors together and the board of directors appoint a general manager. And the general manager starts organizing things and he gets a production engineer of some sort or another, and he goes down and builds a plant. And they start putting the Coca-Cola bottles through the plant and it comes out of the other end filled up full of Coca-Cola. They have a sales organization; they go out and sell the Coca-Cola; and then they have an Accounting Division to fend off income tax and that's it, no strain, no pain – all very smooth.

Of course, we notice strange things in an organization like this. I wouldn't go so far as to say the thing was completely perfect. For instance, the way they – they get a new head of the company is to marry the boss's daughter. The way they regulate matters is usually by somebody's prejudice. And all of their selection of personnel is done by a system just hiring and firing. They keep hiring and firing until they find somebody that – who can hold the post down somewhat and they're away.

But wog organization was based on a complete ignorance – and I mean a total ignorance – of all the basic laws of organization. It's the most clean sweep that you ever had much to do with.

There was one law that they did not violate – one law – and that was that "any organization is better than no organization." And that's true. The individualistic efforts which have gone forward along the time track are very great and they're very stellar and they have absolutely no endurance.

Now you get a bunch of individuals operating together doing something, they will always fall apart when they collide with an organized group of individuals. I'll give you a very gory example of this: Spanish Civil War. The government of Spain was, after all, the government of Spain. It was duly elected and so forth, but it had been slow, slower than the rest of Europe in throwing off the various suppressive shackles of a – of an aristocracy that no longer knew its job.

It isn't that aristocracy is bad or even a bad system of government; it is just that the aristocracy got machine-gunned often enough and long enough and became so no-good they could no longer do their job and they themselves were totally disorganized. So that when the society itself began to organize, or when groups of – of politically minded radicals became organized then the aristocracy fell apart. It was not itself sufficiently organized.

For instance, the last days of the court of whichever Louis it was that lost his head in the French Revolution – I didn't know him personally – they all just sort of stood around the court and wept while France was going up in flames. What they should have done, the king should have said, "Hey, you guys, go back to your – take over your baronies and fiefs and hang a few people and get some law and order in the land and let's straighten this out." No, no, they just all hung around and finally the king got hanged, you see. They were a completely disorganized mess.

They had a terrific organization of etiquette – who could sit on a stool and who couldn't sit on a stool in the court, you know, this was a case of, well, a fellow could practically be excommunicated for that.
Now the French Revolution was simply a badly organized rabble against a completely disorganized aristocracy, and the resultant product was a mess.

Hah! You ought to read the history of France sometime before you take any recommendation for rabbles organizing things. France itself has never had a government as far as I can figure out. It right now has Charles de Gaulle, but it doesn't have a government.

You want to – if you want to go into just hysterics sometime, pick up some short condensed history of France and try to find a stable regime since 1400. It's fantastic! But, therefore, in that scene any slightly organized group could blow the head off the rest of the disorganized scene. Do you see? Badly organized group, but it nevertheless was organized to some slight degree and so could take down the products of the Sun King, and vast history and France, the court language of the world and so forth, all went by the boards. I'm not teaching you how to be a revolutionary, I'm just showing what's happened. I don't have to teach you how to be a revolutionary. [laughter]

Now, in the Spanish Civil War, the organization of the state did exist and it was duly elected as a government, and it tended to fall apart within itself. And one of the reasons it fell apart within itself – the dominant philosophy of it was anarchy.

Now, according to the capitalist, an anarchist is somebody who walks around with a bomb in his hands with the fuse lit. That is not true. The anarchist is, in actual fact, simply a subscriber to the theory that government is unnecessary. And he works out a terrific organization to organize an organization that makes the organization unnecessary.

Now, the predominant military force which fought against the rebellious generals who came in and said, "This sort of thing can't exist and therefore we are revolting." And the revolution was actually by their military. When the military came in they, of course, were far better organized than the anarchists, and they started to persevere. And the anarchists were running around, they couldn't even agree on who was going to be executed so they were just executing everybody. And there were small groups of anarchists that every night had a goal of executing so many aristocrats. And they would take them out in the suburbs and line them up in a ditch and shoot them and so forth. There was no organization even as to who was going to be shot, which must have been very complex indeed.

So the communist, being a relatively suppressive character, gave Spain too little too late and gave communism one of the biggest setbacks by just being totally ineffectual. They just used Spain as a proving ground for their pilots and aircraft, and they didn't even throw in any infantry. But outfits like the Loyalist Brigades and so on were the hardest fighting of the organizations, but these were not Russian communist type communists; they were international type communists, and there were very few Russians in the Loyalist Brigade.

But these boys had the idea of organization and although they weren't as tightly organized as, let us say, a fascist military, they nevertheless were very, very tightly organized indeed. And when communism started walking in against the anarchist, the next thing you know there were nothing there but communists. And this wasn't that the anarchists were better or worse, or those who were subscribing to communism were better or worse; it was the fact the communists were better organized than the anarchists. And so they absorbed the revolutionary force unto themselves and then with no support at all from Russia, of course, fell on their
heads. And the very superior and gallant organization of the Spanish military was able then to crush them rather effectively, financed and helped by Mussolini and others.

Now, this – this is simply – within living memory a historical example of better organization taking over, not against somebody, but taking over in its own ranks. The communist, as sloppy and stupid as his organization was, was not quite as bad as the anarchist and so it became a communist dominated revolutionary force, do you see?

Now, there are many examples of this particular character and if you want to look up – look for the ultimate victor in any situation, you want to look for the best organized.

Now, brilliant leadership can only go so far. It can only go so far. Brilliant leadership needs execution of a sort, and where it doesn't get execution it gets failure.

Now, in communism you had a progressive statistic which even carried on long after his death, so long as Stalin was masterminding the situation and as long as people were being shot all over the place carrying it out. Now, there's a perfectly horrible regime; they could never have made it for two minutes if England and the United States had not been pouring in more war equipment than the Russians could break up before they got to the front. I think they were using butter to grease their tanks – real, real serf, man, that was pretty horrible. And yet they were able to hold the German military machine by weight of numbers and by tremendous support and by internal organization.

Now, the Russian lost Stalin but remained organized. And as – for a little while after Stalin kicked the bucket or was shot by his own political pals – they didn't announce his death for a dog's age – as long as that was going forward, communism continued to have a climbing statistic. Its statistic right now is planed off and has now dived. The communist statistic has dived. Now, that doesn't say it won't resurge. But it has dived. It has lost Indonesia. It is losing in Vietnam, whether anybody ever finds there's going to be anything left of those poor people in South Vietnam or not, they are still losing.

The complete disorganized state of the Viet Cong cannot be made up for by a superior esprit and elan on the part of the Viet Cong and so they are being smashed down by a superiorly organized military force. Do you see?

Now, this is not in favor of the Viet Cong or the communist or anything; it's just commentaries on various organizational patterns. But the communist – communist now departed from communism to quite a marked degree. Russia isn't quite sure that it shouldn't be in a coexistent state with the West. It isn't quite sure that communism works. They have had now a long period of time here – they've had something on the order of, I don't know, 1917 forward; they've had time enough for all the old-time Bolsheviks to die out – to find out that communism does not work. And it doesn't. It is not workable.

The reason it is not workable is because there are two specialties of the two philosophies of capitalism and communism. Capitalism has the philosophy of reward. All it – all its philosophy consists of is reward, reward, reward, reward, see. They don't like to punish anybody and they're pretty soft-headed. They like a buck. They seem to have no value in dead bodies, and capitalism goes along at a high level of production. And communism does nothing but punish, punish, punish, punish, punish, and they never dreamed of a reward.
Cuba, right at this moment, could probably solve its whole situation – production and everything else – by just doing some rewards. But it isn't solving anything. It's going downhill like it's on a toboggan because all it's doing is punish, punish, punish.

The Russian idea of getting a factory operating is to take all the workers out of the factory, shoot them and put some new workers in. You know, they deify the worker; that's why they make him into a spirit so often. [laughter] But there, there we have an organization which has ceased to be organized the way it was organized. It has departed.

Now, China is frothing. It says that Russia shouldn't do this and China is trying to exercise pure communism and go ahead with the proper communist organization, and for a poor country like China, with which I have a lot of acquaintance, I think it's absolutely fantastic they're making any progress at all. I know very well I could go fifty miles outside of the city into a village and ask the head man or anybody else in the village, "What is communism?" and the fellow would look at me very blankly and say, "Oh, aren't the Tartars still in charge?" They make a lot of splash in the newspapers but I don't think they're making much splash in their back country.

China has successfully absorbed every political philosophy and conqueror for the last several thousand years. And never even noticed when he went down for the third time. And that's because China has a basic organization the communist now is trying to smash. And China has an organization that consists of families, and there are a certain number of families and they are organized with a head of the family, the heads of those families are organized then in a sort of a council and then there's several of these groups in a city, and this goes up to a higher council and then the military conqueror of China does business with the top of this. He even exerts law and orders through this particular top, and that's the basic organization of China which probably still exists at this moment.

Communists organize on the basis of cells, but nevertheless they are organizations. And when you have an organization and it's not confronted with a superior organization that organization will normally win – when it's not confronted with a superior organization.

Now, therefore, we ask the question, "All right, what is a superior organization?" Well, it is one that is better organized. Well, how would you better organize something? Well, you'd have to find out something about the laws of organization.

Now, man doesn't happen to know anything about the laws of organization. And if I ever have had a picnic it was trying to go through the mass and morass of material that made up the bulk of organizational technology that is used on this planet. I tell you the American Management Association itself, oddly enough, for many, many years has slavishly copied everything we put out organizationally. If you don't believe it, look at their congress program sheets and their seminars and so forth; they even copy it to the number of lectures and all that sort of thing. It's really fantastic. But we haven't fed them any real data on the subject of organization because beyond a book or two very early on we didn't actually release any of our organizational data.

Now today, after a year's sprint on this subject and a great deal of practical work, and that all followed many, many, many years experience in this line, we have a stack of policy letters – I wouldn't adventure to say how many feet high it is, but it is feet high and it actually
contains a write-up of the whole subject of organization. And it's pretty good to be able to get it into a set of policy letters just a few feet high, let me assure you, because this is an interesting subject.

An organization is a complex mechanism. It's made up of associated individuals who have an agreed upon goal or intention. They're going along in some direction which they do not too violently disagree with. And it will make progress to the degree that it stays in agreement and holds its form and to the degree that it refines its form to meet new threats to its existence and so it will survive.

Now, regardless of the historical lines, organization is as good as it functions. And I can tell you this right now, if I haven't already, that there is no such thing as really a perfect organization, and there's not even actually such a thing as a good organization. And even with all of our policy and all of our materials and so forth, there will never be an organization, no matter how carefully we run it, which approaches a perfect organization. That is because it is dealing with individuals in its organizational pattern who are to a greater or lesser degree informed of the laws or rules of the organization and who have a greater or lesser degree of agreement with what the organization is doing and who to a greater or lesser degree are skilled.

Now, I was very struck with a set of statistics not too long ago – less than a year, about half a year ago I think it was – I started to look over these statistics, and I found out that the statistic of each division was in direct ratio to the state of case of the divisional secretary. They were being successful or unsuccessful just exactly to the degree of whether they were low level releases or if they were moving up on the VI Course and so forth. Their statistics, their overall statistics, were dependent upon their state of case.

Now, this was not an absolute observation but is an indicator. And it tells you, then, that a democracy amongst a bunch of completely uneducated hill tribes would be a complete bust. It tells you that an organization must to some degree consist of sentient and educatable beings, and when you have them very much at each other's throats you can't have an organization.

So the basic unit of the organization is still the individual. And when you look at some country and say, "Well, we're going to give it democratic independence with a new constitution," and... Look around and find out how many headhunters they've still got in their hill country. That will tell you pretty well the state of the thing. What level of literacy does this have?

Well, we know at once the Spanish Revolution could never have succeeded, it could never have depended upon its people in an organized group because its level of literacy is terrible. The level of literacy of Spain is awful. Mr. Franco right now has been trying desperately to pick this up; he finally got the word. They'll never be self-governed until they're at least literate enough to be able to read the proclamations pasted on the walls, you know.

And so this basic unit, this basic unit of the organization is the individual. You take now a democracy such as England and its high level of education and so on. That level of democracy is, of course, a very high and advanced democratic level and is, all due respects to this or that, pretty good.
Now, unfortunately for England she went mad twice since the beginning of this century and she got involved in two fantastic, catastrophic wars, and then got involved in the reconstruction of countries which could be her trade competitors, and then let all of her machinery wear out so that she couldn't compete. And that's about where she is right this minute.

Now, in this particular case the management has been fantastically knuckleheaded. So an organization can go downhill with knuckleheadedness at the management level. And never lose sight of that fact.

So here we have two facts – here we have two facts. We have that an organization is composed of individuals, and it can be no better than the mean average of its individuals. And it can get ahead very rapidly led by a high-caliber leader and can also deteriorate – but not as rapidly as other things – by a low-caliber leader. And some of the leaders which they elected into power since the beginning of the century, and so forth, have been not quite as good as they needed.

You take Chamberlain and chaps like this and so forth. Eli sits there – he had the intelligence reports on his desk. They were actually stacked on his desk as the exact intentions of Nazi Germany and yet he went to Munich. He never read the intelligence reports, and he gave Hitler just that breather Hitler needed. This is just bum leadership, see?

Now, we're getting a sort of panic leadership at this particular time. And frankly, it's my real belief that conditions in England have never been better than they are at this minute. Business potential, production potential, finance potential, what the country could do for itself, how it could clean itself up, the way it is going forward; it's simply somebody is falsifying the statistics.

I look around me and compare this England to an England I knew in 1952. Ah! It's a much better country than it was. Its production figures are up. Do you see? We have a management that is – right now, that is crying wolf. Well, they're not being too vicious to us at the moment so I shouldn't be critical of them. But they have a far, far better organization here than they realize, and they're suffering a little bit at the upper story right at the present time.

I don't know what would happen if the Queen suddenly took over. She's quite an able administrator. But it's a cinch that what you read in screaming headlines in the newspaper about economic crisis in England do not compare in actual fact with the true state of England at this moment. And one of the reasons for that is, is the average level of the individuals of England is high.

Now, the United States, which has put more pressure on education even than England has – and it has – and which has more natural resources and which has a heterogeneous population whose prejudices were so many and so varied that hardly anything could get into a stampede.

You see, by the time you've taken a lot of Czechs and Germans and Poles and all kinds of chaps from various countries and you've pushed them all together, each one with their own mores and customs and each one with their own screaming prejudices, you'll find that very few of them can – practically no group – very few of them could get anywhere with its prejudices. They can go and preach these prejudices and scream them from the housetops and so
on, and nobody's paying any attention because they're trying to push forward their own prejudices. After a while, why, nobody listens to anybody with prejudices.

And America has sort of worn the rough edges of all this off and because very highly skilled people have been pushed in there and because of its verve and so on, it is the richest country on the planet just now. See, not the least reason was, however, it's the fact that nobody's prejudice really counted. They still have some Christian prejudices which were interesting enough to make them burn all the Beatles records the other day. This they could agree on.

But America is one of the tightest organized areas there is. An American business is much more tightly organized even than an English business. Boy, if you want to see organization roughshod in its roughest form and so forth, you ought to take a look at American business organization. They shoot them quick. You take big companies like Standard Oil and so on. They put out fabulous sums in the education of their employees, and they expend fabulous numbers of rounds of ammunition shooting them down when they fall slightly short. Management in America is tough; it puts up with nothing.

Now, they are developing a great strata of incompetence on the political front which may sometime cause them a great deal of trouble, because they have now developed a philosophy of election which: "He who can spill the most money into the taxpayer's pocket gets elected." Well, who's got to pay it?

The taxpayer has, of course. And they've gone out on a program of being the little brother to all the world, and pouring everybody's pockets full of money and thereby inflating all their currency. They've got a political hierarchy going which is probably going to be the death of them one fine day.

But in spite of that, last year – in spite of everything else – America is supposed to have had the greatest year in its history, and I think if somebody had looked at the statistics straight in England they would find England did, too.

Now, this is organization. Now, what are you – what's going to happen – what's going to happen in Boojiewooyiekoojiekabloomie-land, huh? It has a tradition of an entirely different type of organization – entirely different type of organization. And suddenly you're going to throw a new organizational pattern down its throat that it has no familiarity with and no agreement with; its education and literacy level is zero, and you're just going to set them adrift. Maybe they'll make it, maybe they won't make it; maybe this desperate action is the thing they need, maybe it isn't. But the main point is, is here we are going dead against and dead into the teeth of the former political system. In other words, we've changed the mores and customs of the people. You can only go so far with that.

Actually no law which is passed which is in the teeth of the mores and customs of the individual will be eventually enforceable. It can be enforced a little bit but it can't be enforced very much.

So we get one of these countries suddenly going into tribal organization – it's not in democratic organization, it's in tribal organization. Although it is a democracy in its organization, the only people who can stand for office, be elected or hold office or be a civil servant
are the members of the president's tribe. Well, that isn't a democracy, and I don't think anybody's pointed it out to them. And they quickly and almost instantly revert to a military dictatorship.

But they have simply reverted to the type of organization that they are accustomed to. They feel safer in this. They don't like this idea of the changing head of state all the time because they know what happens when a new head of state comes in: he kills everybody who was an enemy [friend] of the old head of state. So now you don't know who to be the friend of because if the state head changes, why, he's going to shoot everybody and therefore you can't be his friend because he's going to be out one of these days and you'll be shot for having been his friend.

And you should just see how some poor people I've seen out in the world sit with their chin cupped in their palms looking very gloomy, and you say, "What's the matter? What's the matter? Don't you like all this new freedom?" "Yeah, it's all right, but we don't know who's going to be in charge next." Well, you'll think immediately they're talking about revolution. No, they're talking about election. Election looks like revolution. So they're having to get used to this kind of thing.

The basic building block is the individual. Now, if those individuals were self-supportive and did not need to be supported, if they were actually working in a culture with which they were familiar – you know, they've got a Western culture being shoved down their throats and so on. I'm talking about India, Africa, even South America. You get a situation where they not only have a new culture, but they have a new political organization. And then as individuals they don't – aren't able to fit into this new political organization, and then the head of state's a fool.

Now, what you're going to get out of something like this, man? You're going to get a mess. But oddly enough, even an organization as bad as that is superior to a disorganized group of the same types of individuals.

And that's the only excuse an organization has, is in the long run it is better for individuals and better for their survival and better for the culture and better for its survival to have things organized.

Organization has tremendous drawbacks. The drawbacks most of the time do not offset the things it has in its favor. But never lose sight of the fact that any organization has drawbacks. It limits the power of choice of the individual. It very often swallows up the talents and potential contribution of the individual. It very often plays hob with the very principles it's trying to forward. Wrongly led, it becomes a machine that goes straight over the cliff to destruction. But at the same time organizations endure better than disorganized activities.

Now, I don't like to talk much about the whole track, but it is true that the only great societies of outer space are those which have continued under organized OTs. Now, they're merely released OTs, which is quite remarkable, but they have tremendous duration, and that's the only place where OTs survive – organized OTs.

But you'd say these fellows are completely unorganizable because they have total differences of opinions and so forth. Yes, yes, yes, they have total differences of opinion, but
they also recognize it's better to be organized than to be disorganized. They also recognize the liabilities of organization.

It's very interesting on an OT organization to see the shift about of posts in the upper hierarchy of them. Those posts shift. And they shift up and they shift down and back and forth and they shuffle around amongst themselves, this sort of thing. But they're a great minority. They're a minority group in charge of fantastic majorities.

Now, if you took on, all by yourself' as a released OT – we don't know anything about cleared OTs but as a released OT; we can merely guess – if you were to take on any part of this civilization, and I would say even the worst wogdom that had just been organized as a new democracy, I think you would eventually come a cropper because it's the individual up against the organization. I don't care how powerful the individual was.

That's interesting. That's interesting as a fact and is the only thing, in actual fact, which excuses organization. It has endurance. It has survival. The average fates of the individuals in it are preferable to disorganized activities. There's nothing more can be said for one.

But imagine an organization organized by people who knew no – knew no slightest part of the laws of organization. Now, that would be a ruddy old mess. You know no laws of organization and yet you organize an organization – I think you'd get a radio set that wouldn't play very well. If you didn't know anything about how to put together radios and you put together a radio I think it'd be a mess. And that's true about organizations.

Now, unfortunately, I have not had time, due to the breakneck pace of research and so on, to isolate out of all of this mass of material the basic laws which monitor it. Those basic laws are strewn through the material occurring where they are pertinent. But there are a whole set of basic laws and those occur where they occur in the policy letters. Now, they aren't even phrased to be high-sounding laws sometimes. But when you're studying this material, you look through it and you will find out that some law has been stressed more than others. Sometimes a law has been placed in solid caps, the whole paragraph, and you will find one.

Now, here is a law which is of interest: A large organization is composed of groups and a small organization is composed of individuals.

Now, I've just got through telling you that the basic building block of any organization is, of course, its individual members – that's perfectly true. But when you get just so many of these individual members, you lose touch between the head of the organization and the individual member, so that he then depersonalizes the individual member and tends to treat him as a cog in the machine and goes the way the communist is going. The fellow is nothing but a number, he has no feelings, he can be stamped on at will and so on.

Well that's because the hugeness of the communist state is so much – well, is incomparable magnitude to the individual communist or even a communist cell. So you get the magnitude of the state versus, really, the cell which – which may only be composed of five or six members, you see. That's too great. The comparable magnitude there is all out and it makes the individual feel oppressed, and that is what is wrong with the socialist state and that is really all that is wrong with the socialist state. It is the state governing the individual.
You know this old law whereby when you stamp on the earth then the earth moves to that tiny degree – yes – and so on and then moves back against your heel. Did you ever have the physics professor that let you in on that bunk? Well, you know, I've stamped on planets and stamped on them and I've never had them move. I've stood outside of a few a few lives ago and had them move, but... Incomparable magnitude!

It's like a grasshopper. You say, "Well, if a grasshopper hit a ball often enough and long enough and so forth, the ball would eventually move." No, the funny part of it is the ball does not move. And you get this state as a huge bowling ball running down across the little ant or the individual citizen and he is smashed and he is smashed right now.

Now, they got this going in the Roman Empire to a point where there was no place to hide. And they can talk all they want to about the drop and decay of the empire and why it pulled all of its troops out of every place and no place could defend itself any more. And it was dependent upon the imperial troops to defend the community, and when they disappeared, why, of course, that colony fell in. They can theorize like this, but how come the community couldn't organize to defend itself with the imperial troops gone? How come eventually were they only able to employ barbarians as imperial troops? Perfectly true. Praetorian Guard eventually got to be nothing but solid barbarians. And that was because the state had leaned on the individual so long that they had smashed him flat. He no longer had spirit enough to defend himself or anything else. Because the individual citizen could be leaned on by the state. They thought nothing of issuing an imperial decree against a sergeant of the guard – as I once experienced to my sorrow.

Incomparable magnitude. What is all of this huge organization called "the people" bringing a charge against John Jones for stealing a bottle of milk? Aw, John Jones just goes flat. He looks at all the – wow!! See it's a mechanism which sort of tries to make a paranoid out of him, you see; everybody's against him. You get crime, you get a dispirited citizenry, you get people going around saying, "Why should I vote? My vote doesn't have any count on anything anyhow. No point in voting any more," and so on. These are the signs of decay which you see when you have merely individuals and the state. And it's the primary reason why communism will fail. Socialism will inevitably fail.

Now, where you have permitted companies to exist – I know the Russians have collectives – they're kind of a joke. Where you have companies, the state has to deal with the companies and the roughness with which the United States deals with companies like Standard Oil right today is horrifying. Boy, they're in there with hobnailed boots stamping all over the place, you know. Those companies, by the way, maintain whole accounting departments that you'd have to see the end of – you could only see the end of with a spyglass; you know, just mobs of people doing nothing but taking care of the government claims and pressures on the company.

Now, if a government can stamp all over a company to this degree – and sometimes they put them out of business with this stamping – why, what can they do to an individual? Well, in the Roman Empire nobody had any place to go. The only civilized area of the world was already owned by Rome. There was nothing but barbarians who ate sour milk outside the borders of it in all directions. You had no place to go and you were crushed.
So, the ideal organization is not an organization which is composed of individuals only. It's composed of individuals formed into subgroups, and you must compose the individuals into subgroups. So we get this law: "A large organization is composed of groups and a small organization is composed of individuals."

Now, that law is so much a law that if you try to expand an organization which is only composed of individuals – you know, everybody's wearing everybody else's hat and they're all very skilled and all very fine individuals and they try to expand up – just, you know, bring their – their volume up 20 percent – they all go appetite over tin cup. They go all to pieces, they can't make it, you see, because a large organization is composed of groups and a small organization is composed only of individuals.

So the small organization being composed only of individuals will remain a small organization as long as it's only composed of individuals. You see, the law works in reverse. It limits the size of the organization. And so, whenever you have a socialism or a communism where you have this huge thing called "the state" governing this little tiny fellow called "the individual," it eventually starts shrinking, do you see? You get shrinkage, and the state will actually get less and less powerful and more and more confused.

Now, income tax is the total violation today of the government ruling the individual. Every individual has to report to the government every year. And that is a direct violation of it, so income tax willy-nilly will make a country grow smaller. It will bring down... It hasn't anything to do with economics. See, it's the fact that every individual in it can be jumped on by this huge thing called "the government." Every individual's got his chest bared to the government. He hasn't got any senior he can go to for any buffer or protection. Well, therefore, the state inevitably will suffer for it and will become a smaller and smaller activity. That's volume, will have begin [begun] to suffer.

Now, it hasn't set in, in the United States, as fast as it has set in in England, but England has had income tax active longer than the United States. It'll catch up with the United States, too, because it violates that law. A small – you see what I mean about these laws, you know. It is a law. It isn't an observation. And it operates any way that you apply it. A small organization is composed of individuals; a large organization is composed of groups.

Well, how would you make a large organization be composed of groups? Well, you would try to cut off the organization versus the individual and get the organization versus the group, do you see? You would have the individual as part of a small group, and that small group is what is leaned on by a larger group which is what is leaned on by a slightly larger group, what is what is leaned on by a slightly larger group. And so we say larger group, smaller group, what are we talking about?

Well, a group does have an optimum size. If a manager wants to work himself mad he has about seven or eight things under him. Now, if he is very good he could have seven or eight things under him, so that he came into contact with seven or eight separate individuals or seven or eight groups who are represented each one by one individual, do you see? He'd work like mad. Well, if he only had two under him he'd loaf like mad and so it's someplace between two and eight.
Now, this depends to a large degree upon the individual capability of the manager in handling the – what number. Is the manager so bad he can only handle two, or is he so good he can handle eight? So we take a rough average of this that more or less holds good, and we say it's five. You can have a manager and five, or a head of a group and five. And so we get down – "how big is a big group," then, would be ten. You know, too big, see. But big. And a small group would be two, three. Two, three what? Well, either two or three subunits or two or three individuals down at the lowest unit.

So we get the optimum size of a group of individuals which would be five. Now, by the time you get five and then you expand and you add number six and number seven and number eight, by that time you'd better split the thing into a couple of groups. So we're really studying how do you split things up into groups and hold them that way.

And that, in actual fact, is the hardest task I have in Scientology organizations, is making a secretary take responsibility for a division, and divisional members only look to the secretary, and that broken down even further, that members of a section look to their section leader and the director only looks to section leaders, and the secretary only looks to directors.

And yet, because things are rat-a-tat and tippy and emergencies come up and Danger conditions occur, then they make Danger conditions. And a real Danger condition would be a secretary giving direct orders to one of the people of a section officer, bypassing the chain of command, because immediately you're going to make the organization smaller. The organization's going to get smaller. The more you do of that the less size your organization's going to have because it violates that basic law.

Now if you follow this basic law you actually can move it on out to where your group could contain the popula... I mean your organization could contain the population of the planet. Size doesn't mean anything as long as you know that one law.

Therefore, you need an expansional system which is expansionable and contractible – the thing has got to be made bigger or smaller; it's got to fit little organizations or big organizations; you've got to have some kind of a pattern which is expansionable. One time I hoped to get this pattern down to as few as two staff members, but I find out that that is not possible. It can be gotten down to the basic size of a group which is an optimum group, and could be gotten down to five or six people and you can fit this organizational pattern on it, but you can't get them down to two because two isn't a group really, it's a pair.

Now when you get a state which is breaking down the family, even breaking down the family as a group, if there's nothing substituted for it... You see, every time you get – the state is death on business, the state is death on the family, the state is death on any of these group formations – you get this type of vendetta, you see. The state is death on social groups or death on the church. And by the way, communist states are death on a lot of these things and you'll see them shrink. They become unmanageable. They become very unhappy. They are very miserable to be around. They are awful to try to work with and they will eventually come appetite over tin cup. They will come unstuck.

So chain of command may be looked upon as one means, and only one means of just making people miserable and giving people status and making somebody better than some-
body else; but in actual fact without it you do not have an expansionable group – the group will never grow in size.

Now, what contracts a group in size is its managers become overworked. When a manager becomes just too overworked he ceases to expand, he sees to it that he doesn't expand, he becomes too overworked. So one of your – your greatest liability then, is an overwork of a manager. If you want your group to expand then you had better fix it up so your managers aren't overworked.

So that if you were to set together a group that was going appetite over tin cup, you prob... would be very foolish as an efficiency expert, and if you knew this and if you'd worked in a Scientology organization and knew these policy letters, you'd go out and, frankly, general managers and heads of departments and so forth would look at you with round eyes. They would say, "Good heavens! Where's this come from because this is true, you know, this is true. I've worked with it, yes!" You know, and they'd be agreeing with you all over the place, diving in your front door.

Actually, one of the heaviest drives I got in Scientology in Rhodesia was trying to teach people organization, Scientology organization. They wanted to know all about this; this was interesting – very applicable to what they were doing.

So that an individual going into a group would be very foolish and the efficiency expert can cut his own throat by going down and doing time-motion and stopwatch studies and telling workers what to do without consulting their foremen and violating things in other ways. Any GM that thinks he can hire some – some efficiency expert and not pay any attention to what's being made efficient is crazy, you see, because he'll eventually get unhappy with him.

The only person I would work with would be the GM, and preferably the chairman of the board. And one of the first things I would do would be to hire him more stenographers and more clerks and set him up a communication center. Well, just by doing that all by itself you would improve the business. It would follow automatically. And then you could start breaking the organization down into its proper groups.

Well, we get down to what is a proper group? Well, oddly enough, our seven divisional system which we have here today, this seven division system that you see posted on your big org boards and that sort of thing, that's a very, very interesting pattern, because if itself is very much violated, why, things again won't expand.

There are all kinds of odd little laws about this. You can't have a section that isn't dependent on some other section. A group must be interdependent.

You can't have a division which sets up autonomous activities which then require no further service from the rest of the organization. The second that you set up a unit here, which is going to float free, it'll float free and collapse! It must have service and communication with the remainder of the organization.

It's all very well, somebody says all of a sudden, he's out someplace, he's setting up some hospitals that we've inherited or something like this and he's setting these up. Well, he wants his own purchasing unit and so forth. Well, he could have his own purchasing unit,
providing it came from our Treasury Division. Not to him, but for his Treasury Division, see. You get violations of this. And you will get yourself trouble. Interdependency. These must be interdependent.

Now I don't care what you call them. We call them divisions. Now there are seven divisions. And they go One, Two, Three, Four, Five, Six, Seven because it's a circle. It isn't a two-dimensional plane. It's a sort of a cylinder. And a proper org board would be drawn on a huge cylinder. It meets itself coming or going. So to emphasize that fact we put Division Seven up in front of Division One.

Now the entrance to an organization is in the first department of the first division. Now weirdly enough, this thing is organized so as to impel a particle from the first division right straight on out the back door. And any particle entered early will shunt late. And that is the way that thing works. And regardless of how you try to stop it, it eventually will. It will enter and eject.

Now as they come around to Seven, Seven doesn't necessarily catch – which is another reason it's there – it doesn't necessarily catch what's ejected over here at Six. So there is a way out. [laughter] But this is a sort of a – so there is an ejecting flow here. And you start it in here bzzzppp! It'll go out the back.

Now if you violate the position of anything on this chart, you cut your throat, which is fascinating.

Every once in a while somebody will begin to have a great deal of trouble. And he won't know why he's having trouble and he's having trouble because he's got a section or a function wrong on the org board. And they are actually found by trial and error. Once they were put down in this order, then they had to be adjusted and readjusted.

We got enormous trouble – we got into enormous trouble because we tried to put what was essentially Origin – or Construction down here in Department Nine. And every time we tried to put it into Department Nine, it obviously didn't belong in Department Nine, it actually belonged way up at the front here at Origin. The least place it could have been put was Department One. That was as deep as you could have gone into the organization, but it came back here towards Source and you had to get Construction back towards Source, otherwise it just wouldn't work. You see?

So if something is mispositioned on the board it will be nonfunctional and cease to work. So that's the first test of whether or not something is properly organized, is does it function?

Now this – these – these are not named according to a master name chart that I drew up on this thing, but these divisions actually are the various actions which would take place if you were setting up a factory, a government, a service activity or anything. These are the native basic things that must be set up and they must be set up in this sequence.

All you'd have to do is get to be an expert on Scientology organization and you could go run rings around any efficiency expert on the planet right this minute. It's fantastic what suddenly starts showing up. But remember to learn well what you learn.
You start learning our communication systems, you got our communication systems going in some offices and so on. I just put it into a total wog office. And boy, I had trouble getting it in. Oh, man! Did I have trouble getting it in. I finally got it in. And once I got it in, why, it was just all smooth as glass. And they didn't ever know how they had ever worked under anything else. They kept trying to tell me that it hasn't been like that in offices we've worked in. Letters would come in and just lie in the middle of desks undelivered and nothing ever logged and nothing ever filed. And each girl when she typed a letter had a little file of her own on her desk and nobody ever checked anything. I don't know how they lived. That was the organization that they were used to, which was no organization at all.

Now, as we look this over we see that this first division in actual fact is the Communications Division. It's called HCO with us but it's the Communications Division.

Now, this is analogous to getting things communicating as you would have to do in putting together any plant or factory. You'd first have to start something where people could get into communication with somebody about what you were doing, you see, otherwise nothing would happen thereafter. And then, with the communications, you've got to have some kind of a dissemination. Well, in a factory or something, you might have to sell stocks and bonds or something to get finance. That'd be dissemination. You'd have to tell people what you were going to make and all kinds of things of this character. And that would come under the general heading Dissemination.

Your next one is really your Organization Division. We call it Treasury now, but it's actually the division which organizes the actual most of the production activities. It gets together the sand to make the glass for the bottles, and the sugar and saccharin for the candy and so forth. It does the assembly of this type of action and it also has the idea of money, assets; what it makes and so forth all must come in at this point. You must have your money before you can buy the sand for the glass and so on.

And then we get into what – we call it Technical. In actual fact the right name is Production – your Production Division. And that is your Division Four.

And then your next one is not really Qualifications but Correction. Should be called the Correction Division or the Adjustment Division. But Qualifications would also serve.

And then we get the Distribution Division where they get rid of it, you see. But in the process of getting rid of it they've got to have a full sales – personal sales organization and that sort of thing, so when they're busy getting rid of it they are also making new customers who enter in here.

You say, "How about Seven? Doesn't anything go through Seven?" Well, yes! Everything tries to go through Seven. [laughter] Like on an E-Meter. So, we get a – the organization here that keeps the machine going, that gives the machine sufficient authority in order to travel and resolves the various problems and bugs it runs into – it sits up here at the head of the line. But it can equally sit at the bottom of the line.

Now the departments all have names. And these names have nothing really to do with any name that you have heard as the names of departments.
And these are, the first one would really be the Office of the Executive Director or the General Manager or something of that character. It would be the person who was in charge of it. Now, this could be – if the Chairman of the Board or somebody like this were actually the manager of the company and some such action, then his office would be there.

Now ideally this would be Source. And this would also be the person who had developed the product. And you'll notice that that often happens in companies and so on. But the main thing that man had never solved and the reason you have all different kinds of politics and disorganizational patterns, and so on, is because man never solved the problem of succession.

You know, you get a whole bunch of red-hots and royalists and everything else together and you ask them what's the ideal form of the government and they say a benign monarchy. And they all tell you this. And you say what's wrong with a benign monarchy? Well, you can't succeed it so therefore it's no good. That's their only contest with it. You ought to try it out sometime.

You get a bunch of guys, no matter what their political affiliations are, arguing and they will eventually agree that it's a benign monarchy and – but it can't be succeeded.

Well, actually, we've worked out succession in our particular case and so on because what is developed by these other two offices here becomes approved by the LRH Communicator according to policy and he approves anything that is not against policy. If it's not directly against policy, why, he can approve it.

So therefore you get management and you don't have to have succession. Which I consider quite interesting; because the internecine warfare which has occurred amongst man, and the whole destruction of – Rome, and so forth all occurred because of succession.

So, there was normally somebody who started the company, and in the United States that ought to be the Office of George Washington. Got the idea? I don't know who was the first bloke over here, in this present racial strain in England but it would be somebody. I suppose it would be William. I guess it'd be Bill. "Bill the Bastard." [laughter] And that ought to be his office. And that ought to be going strong. And they would have saved themselves all kinds of bloodshed and civil war and all kinds of things and so on. But he also would have had to have written up a lot of policy letters. Anyhow…

So this is Source. Now each one of these departments has its proper name. And it's Source, Existence, Conditions, Recognition, Communication, Perception, Orientation, Understanding, Enlightenment, Energy, Adjustment, Body, Prediction, Activity, Production, Result, Review, Ability, Purposes, Clearing, Realization. And that's the lot. And it's because of those successive names that it actually regulates the function of the department. And if you understood this adequately you could understand the department much more easily by noticing its tag, its action.

Now it doesn't fully explain it and so forth, but nevertheless it gives you the code word of the department. For instance, the Department of Routing, Appearances and Personnel is Recognition. And that's essentially what it does. It recognizes. It says "Hello." It lets other
people recognize what it is and let them see where the door is and a few minor things of this character, you see.

So, you get Communication, then you get Perception. This is your Department of Inspection and Reports. Department Three.

You can go down here. You pick any of them up. Not to go over them all because you can have patterns of this. You get Department Eleven, the Department of Training and it's Activity. Now why Activity? And why Production? Well, you actually – your production – this a moot point, whether or not we should have training in Department Twelve or training in Department Eleven. You have to decide on what we're actually producing. Well, the ultimate production of Scientology is not auditors but is states of case and so, of course, we get Department Twelve being Production.

Now all of this pattern is put together in that fashion. Now each one of these departments have five sections. And it shouldn't have more than five. If it has more than five it should be written up again. And some of those sections put in. And then those sections are divided into subsections and then really, patternwise, are divided into units. At the moment why, they're dividing sections directly into units. Well one fine day they will have to divide it into subsections, divide it into units, to subunits and so forth in order to make enough space and personnel.

But this, in actual sober fact, is a flow chart. And if things don't flow on it there's something wrong, so we get one of these other primary laws of an organization, which is fascinating, and which I have the hardest possible time teaching anybody, and the one I have the awfulest time teaching anybody – it's terrible trying to get this point across – it's the fast flow system of management. And of course, everybody sits there and says, "Oh great! Fast flow system. Sure, everything's got to go fast! Yeah! We understand it!"

Man! Probably it ought to be called something very complex so they'd think they had to grind away to understand it because the truth of the matter is, is fast flow system of management is don't inspect until it goes wrong. And the trouble with every bleeding, blinking organization since the beginning of time, has been that when it was right they inspected it! And all they did was hold it up and hold it up, and you get blanket arbitrary laws being thrown into the organization continuously!

Something like this: "Well, let's just make sure we don't get any suppressives aboard. Let's make everybody who comes in to take any training or processing immediately take a 'Suppressive Test.'" You see what that does? That instantly stops your flow. So anything that stops your flow is anti-organization. And every time you find something being inspected which hasn't been found wrong, you're going to get some kind of a slowdown.

This is a typical mankind action. One sailor is late coming back for liberty. So the captain of the ship issues an order saying, "All sailors, hereinafter, may have no liberty." Typical. Typical suppressive human action.

So we find one pc has managed to skid by Certs and Awards with the wrong certificate, so we put a certificate checker in to make sure that each pc that goes through Certs and Awards has his certificate checked afterwards.
Well, that isn't the way you run an organization that is going to expand. The way you run an organization that is going to expand requires nerve, something like a World War I fighter pilot. Don't be so damn nervous. When something is found to be wrong, swoop down on it from the executive secretarial, from the secretarial and every other level, inspect it, cross-inspect it, scream, shoot, execute and so forth. *After* it has been found to be wrong. Do you see? Then act; don't fail to act at that point. But just let it run giddy as hell right up to that moment.

Pcs are tearing past the Examiner at a mad rate, not even checked, not even checked. It goes on day after day after day. It goes on week after week after week. And all of a sudden we turn up with some guy who didn't even go near the auditor getting past the Examiner. [laughter] At that moment, the Executive Secretaries, the Secretaries involved, the Section Officers involved, the Guardian, everybody else involved, descend on that point. [laughter] It won't happen again for another year. [laughter] And your flow will come out. But don't put in permanent preventers on the line and you get a flowing organization.

So an organization, regardless of what it is, must produce something. That's why you don't have a government that is any damn good on the whole planet. [laughter] Because they produce nothing. Their total production is paper. They must *produce* something.

And you cannot have an organization that isn't staticized. The wrong people always get shot. Every eager beaver that's making a little more motion than anybody else, being a little more critical, he instantly is going to get shot in any organization that isn't staticized.

What do we mean by statistics? That means every person in the organization has got to have a statistic. As long as the statistic is not in a terrible state of decay, and is going up, why, the guy is safe. And if it starts to decay and cave in, he's not safe.

Now, if you don't have that system, you can't have justice in an organization. Because all the guys who are doing their jobs and so on are relatively safe inside the organization. The people who are not doing their jobs become very unsafe, but of course they're making everybody else unsafe, too; their fellow staff members and the organization itself is suffering.

So organizations which are not staticized are very, very dangerous to be around. That's why governments are very dangerous to be around today. They're not staticized. There is no way.

I tried to tell the head of a committee in a parliamentary body how to staticize his civil service. He was head of a committee which was going to do something desperate with the civil service. And I said, "Well, why don't you staticize them?" And I spent two or three hours explaining to him what a statistic was and, boy, it was going in one ear and sticking right straight in the meat. [laughter] He told somebody the next day he couldn't tell what I was all about!

Well, he had some basic law that hadn't even vaguely come up for air I suppose the basic thing that was out on him was he didn't realize that anybo… thing – anybody should expect anything from anybody else. I suppose, you know, that he wasn't up to a point of realizing that an organization should expect something from an individual. Or something of this character, you know. Something wild was out there – *big*, you know.
So anyway, the way the pattern is organized, it's organized to flow and it's organized to expand. For me to give you more than just a few comments at this time is very, very adventurous indeed.

But I do want to tell you that – just these few little things that I've already told you about: Organization is better than no organization; no organization is any good, but it's better than not having any; an efficient and effective organization is a survival organization and it's better for the individual to be a member of an efficient and effective organization than an inefficient, ineffective one – naturally.

That organizations should flow, that they should be expandable, they should be contractible, and that their primary thing that gets violated is people start inspecting things that don't need inspection and therefore interfering with things that don't need to be interfered with. And basically that the Scientology pattern of organization which is in use today, if understood in its basic fundamentals and if studied from that line, is applicable to any business or any activity or any government.

Reg and I had a ball down one time working this over on a basis of a – suddenly dawned on me that we might possibly have a government – or it dawned on him – that this might be a governmental pattern. And sure enough it works out to a governmental pattern. It would be a government that would take into itself every company there.

And I suddenly realized that in this we have something which is far more socialistic than socialism. Far more communistic than communism. And we can say with some sneer to the socialists and communists, "Au!, pif! Bunch of conservative..." [laughter] We could say, "Do you know there are people in Russia today who are not staff members!" [laughter] They're second-rate staff members. They're called citizens when they do have it, you know. The United States, it only has citizens, no staff members. Leaves a man completely on his own.

So actually, this is much further to the left than anybody has ever gone. What you'd do would be to introduce individual companies into your Production and Activity units as service or production units, you see.

One last thing I'll tell you. This actually is based on something that is in actual fact trillions of years old. And it is an old, old, old, old organization that gave me the basic clue on which to go. And it is an organization which lasted itself about 80 trillion years and is still going strong. And the reason you see three – you see, there could easily be eight, there could easily be fifteen departments in a division – but the reason there are three, and the reason it goes into units of three and so on is because you have mind, body, product.

If you want to understand this, the basis – mechanism on which it is organized, you have a Thetan, with a Mind and a Body and a Product. So you have a Secretary, who has a Mind, Body, Product.

And when you put together your little units and that sort of thing and so on, it goes Mind, Body, Product. There's somebody in charge of the Mind, the Body and the Product. And if you want to look at some Secretary and wonder why she isn't doing too well, recognize she doesn't have things laid out on the basis of Mind, Body, Product.
If you want to know why a typist isn't doing well, she really doesn't have these three things. She doesn't have Mind, Body, Product. She doesn't figure out what she's going to do, you see. There is no body of anything with which to perform it, and she doesn't look on anything she's doing as a product. Or one of these things will be missing.

And that, however, is not graphable. And it is good enough to have caused a civilization to have lasted 80 trillion years. But it is — is not graph — able, because you just try and graph it sometime, to put a Thetan with a Mind, Body, Product with a Thetan with a Mind, Body, Product inside a Thetan with a Mind, Body, Product. We used to do it with lenses. Not on a two-dimensional graph — it was done with multiple lenses — and it actually was a galactic type government that carried planetary systems and planets, and a nation was almost too small to be a flyspeck, you see. Big populations involved. But it was all on Thetan, Mind, Body, Product. And this is a refined version of it which works, at our level, and which gives us a very broad view of what we're trying to do.

You're perfectly at liberty to curse organization; you're perfectly at liberty to find all kinds of faults with organization. And while you're doing so, just remember that there is no such thing as a perfect organization, and that any organization is better than no organization.

Thank you.
How are you today?

*Audience: Good. Fine.*

And this is the what?

*Audience: 25th of August AD 16.*

By George, you're right. Twenty-fifth of August AD 16, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

This article, this article and lecture – you will see something of an article on this later – is not necessarily dedicated to a government, any particular government. And it is not really dedicated to the East Grinstead Urban District Council and I would not say that it was, you see. And any similarity – you know they put this on the beginning of books, you see – any similarity between actual individuals and this lecture are totally accidental. [laughter]

And the name of the lecture is "The Antisocial Personality." [laughter]

Now, I told you I would keep you advised on such ethics matters as might concern an auditor. And this is one of those lectures. I've sat down and I've very, very carefully made up what must be a complete list of all of the characteristics of a suppressive person, and put this together on the basis of the interrelationship between that individual and the society around him, that individual and the auditor and that individual and himself. And I hope you can see some benefit from this.

Now, ethics, as you know, has as its basic purpose getting in technology. That is its primary purpose and it doesn't have any object of social betterment. And it goes this far in getting in technology: that if people are going to advance casewise, they must do so in a relatively unsuppressive environment. And you can't have people advancing casewise when they are in a suppressive environment, and suppressives don't advance casewise. So you might say ethics and the idea of suppressive persons and the idea of potential trouble sources, the idea of a roller coaster – what makes a person get better and then get worse and get better and get worse – these things are, all of them, part and parcel to an auditor's bag of tricks. If an auditor doesn't know about this and doesn't pay any attention to this, then he very soon breaks his heart.

I just had a long letter from an intern here giving me a bunch of data on what auditing a suppressive-type person had done to him personally. That was interesting, you see – not what it had done to the suppressive, but what it had done to him. Well, he very soon had be-
gun to believe, you see, well, Scientology didn't really work and he wasn't getting anyplace and his ideas were wrong and that he really couldn't audit, and all of these things began to creep up on him, you see.

He was auditing somebody who was *yak-yak-yak-yak-yak*, invalidate, invalidate, and you know had eighty thousand hours of auditing and he'd never gotten any gain, and so forth. And he knew that his father was suppressive but he had murdered his father last year and – with hot flatirons, but that hadn't done him any good, either, so ethics didn't work.

And this auditor felt like a gooney bird. He was flopping around with no goals left, you see. He'd come up against this brick wall. Well, if he'd really known his ethics and really known what his characteristics were of suppressive persons, he would have taken one look at his case assessment form as he began the pc – or he would've done one – and the person had been eight thousand hours in auditing and had been audited in Milwaukee, Mexico, North Pole and hadn't ever gotten over his sciatica; and had been audited in Los Angeles and New York, but somehow or another he kept at it even though it had cost him a great deal of money. And he'd never had any improvement, particularly in his sciatica and so on, but he'd kept at it because he was – well, he just kind of wanted to show people it didn't work, you know.

And the auditor at that moment would have exercised any HGC auditor's prerogative which is simply not to audit the pc. That's the least he would have done. See, any HGC auditor can say, "I don't care to audit this pc, period." And that's it. And it's been that way for many, many years. Every once in a while Ds of P get enthusiastic and say, "Well, that may be the custom but here we don't really exercise that," you see and kid the auditor in and get him in there pitching again. Actually, it's a bad thing if he does so because it's enforced help, you see, and so on. And they won't get a very good result on the pc.

Do you know that you'll get a better result on a pc if you simply take the auditor and run O/W on him, regardless of his grade of release – just run a little O/W with him on that pc. You ought to make it as a little experiment someday if you're in an executive auditing position – you know, your lower-grade type auditors – and just run a little bit of O/W on the pc before they audit them. Pc will make marvelous gains. It's fantastic.

So the auditor in this particular case, had he been able to have – been able to call off what are the characteristics of a suppressive – *bing-bing-bing-bing-bing*! – why, he wouldn't have sat there getting his anchor points punched in. Now, it's one thing to have a critical pc and another thing to be trying to audit a suppressive pc or a pc who is a potential trouble source. These are quite different things.

The critical pc – of course, a pc can become critical simply by having a withhold or an overt on the auditor. That's the first thing you check. You don't sit there and take it on the chin. Pc was all right yesterday. Today he says, "Well, are – are you sure you – you've – you've gotten your – ever gotten a classification for…" and so forth.

I never would say anything – it would astonish me if I saw an auditor do otherwise than say, "All right, is there anything being withheld? Have you committed…? That's it. That's it. That's it. Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. What?" [laughter] That would just be that, see. Well, fellow would give it to you and say, "Hmp-hmp." [laughter] And if you – if the fellow just went on nattering and complaining about having been audited thousands of hours and not
having gotten any case gain and not having – been shoved into it because of his wife and proving to her that Scientology didn't work and that sort of thing. I wouldn't sit there and take that, not as an auditor.

You see, I'm – personally I have never done anything in the universe that I owe anybody Scientology. See, I don't owe anybody Scientology. That's why we've made that much progress, which is a remarkable fact that when you are too propitiative, far, far too propitiative – you know, you feel that you've been mean to people and you're trying to make it up and all of that sort of thing – why, you get into all kinds of reactive complications. All kinds of them. And you get so that you really can't help people. But the main thing that you get into is the fact that you then do anything – you don't do proper actions; you do anything to help them – and you let them get away with anything and you exert no control of any kind whatsoever. So you really don't have a very good run in it.

But I never owed anybody Scientology. And I trust you didn't either. So there isn't any reason to take a knocking around. One of the first pc-control techniques there was… This sounds very rough. We didn't know at that time, you see, that it was a withhold that made the person critical. And the person would get choppy and refuse to do what you said and refuse to go back through it again – old Dianetic-type auditing. And the control technique was simply to get up and say, "Well, when you decide you're going to, why, I will come back and audit you" and walk out of the room. I vividly remember it. That was actually in force before the official publication date of the first book. So that goes way back into pc control.

Now, in view of the fact at that time I was getting my first psychoanalytic-type pcs – you know, pcs who had been into psychoanalysis and were now swinging in toward Dianetics – and got a tremendous number of failed cases, a tremendous number of roughed-up people. It was interesting, you see, that I, in scouting around in an average level of the society, was not in actual fact running into the failed psychoanalytic patient or some of the very, very, very rough cases that the society had. I was running into and had acquaintance with some criminals and some insane and so on; but not the people who had been – let me be more explicit – had been roughed up by psychotherapy, whose actions and behavior had been more or less confirmed or perverted by psychotherapy, you see. They're a special, very special type of case. And it was this type of case, on which an auditor could easily fail, that we got a tremendous number of in the first Foundation. And they were very, very hard to handle, and today I would recognize pretty well what the bulk of them were.

They were either SPs or PTS. But one of the things that they were PTS on was, of course, the psychoanalyst and the psychiatrist. Now, let's be more explicit here so that nobody gets adrift on this. You all know this but I'll give you the datum.

What we call a suppressive person is a person with certain behavior characteristics which we will cover here and who suppresses other people in his vicinity. And those other people, when he suppresses them, become PTS or potential trouble sources. And they are called potential trouble sources because they really do make trouble. They roll coaster. They natter. They go up in smoke.

Now, because a person is raising the devil does not make him a suppressive person. The suppressive may be sitting back there with a covert Mona Lisa smile. And the PTS is
busy going up in smoke or running around and doing weird things – PTS is active. PTS might be going insane, being put in the local asylum or something like that. You haven't got the source of the social difficulty. You've just got the PTS. And this person is PTS, a potential trouble source, simply because they are intimately associated with a suppressive.

Now, if you recognize that all by itself, a tremendous burden would come off of your auditing. You would know what you were looking at. Joe is okay today, he's gone bad tomorrow. I remember a notable case of this. I put a – one psychoanalyst, a very prominent psychoanalyst in New York City, very well known – I took this psychoanalyst, just in a demonstration, and sent this psychoanalyst right straight up into seventh heaven. See, the psychoanalyst was in beautiful condition. Got rid of her "schiosis" or whatever else she had. She felt terrific, you know. I just erased the secondary, actually, necessary to resolve her case. Felt fabulous. She'd been trying to get at this for years in psychoanalysis and couldn't… She was in Jungian analysis, by the way, and couldn't find it in having been a Druid.

Anybody says to you, "Well, Scientology is weird because it believes in past lives," why, look at them rather oddly and say, "Aren't you familiar with the subject of psychotherapy?" Be mean, you know.

And they say, "Well, yes. Oh, yes. I'm a professor of Uptygup, you know." [Laughter]

And say, "Well, why is it that you didn't know that one of the primary branches of psychoanalysis and so forth – that of Professor Jung – believed implicitly in returns to druidism. See, we're not being new at all."

I don't know whether it's in his immediate textbooks or not, but I remember this case vividly, and that was what she had been jumping around in. She had been jumping around trying to pretend she was painted blue, living in trees in her past lives. This is Jung. And there is – Jung and Adler were the principal squirrels in psychoanalysis. And she just went right up to the top of the Tone Scale, man. She was in beautiful shape. She stayed that way for three days and she crashed harder than anybody I've ever seen crash. Terrible shape – sick, miserable, moaning around. And in those days I took the psychoanalytic explanation. It wasn't that we were doing psychoanalysis, it was just – if you understand what I'm talking to you about on this – was because we accidentally were getting into psychoanalytic patients and practitioners. They were moving in our direction.

And we used to attribute it to the fact that she'd not been benefited but had just hit a manic. Get that phrase: "hit a manic" – had become manic for three days. Therefore one could say it was very dangerous that she was processed and all this. I know today exactly what happened to her, all these ages afterwards. She hit an SP, man, and he plowed her through the wall. I even know the guy's name. It's Art Sapos – I wouldn't want to publicly vilify anybody. [laughter] She maybe hit more than one. But boy, she sure went through the wall. And that was simply a rolly coaster: better-worse.

There is no such thing as a manic – a person gets on an enthusiastic euphoria that life is great. It's just that psychiatrists hate people in that condition. And so they promptly cave them in. They go bow! The guy says, "Wow, at last I realize I can be sane, and isn't the world wonderful!"
"Oh, my God! You're in a manic. We've got to give you eighteen extra shocks and transorbital leukotomies and trowokkhhr!" [laughter]

So there has arisen this thing known as a "manic condition," which is very harmful. And there's a thing called "euphoria" which is very bad. That's so if anybody says he got any benefit or did anything good, why, they can plow him in quick. There are no such conditions. See? The guy got better. They couldn't stand it and they caved him in. Bang! Whoever was in his vicinity that was suppressive caved him in quick.

Now, when you as an auditor see that sort of thing, know what you're dealing with! Don't be a reasonable idiot! You're in this field, no other field at all. You're in the area that I'm talking about in this lecture. You are not in some new factor which has just arisen. I want to be very positive about it because if they developed such a thing as a "manic personality" to explain away somebody feeling good or getting better, then they will develop this theory again. And I say "they," I mean suppressive-type psychotherapists. They will develop it again. And they will develop it individually for you, and give you lots of reasons why it really didn't work and why the guy caved in, and how it's very dangerous to process somebody because this happens. And this is the only mechanic of it happening.

Now, I have trouble impressing even executives in this organization. Every once in a while they'll think, "Well, there's some other reason why a person has a worsened condition." And the weeks go by and the weeks go by and I will repeat it several times and all of a sudden they throw away the rest of them, and they to their own satisfaction have isolated the fact that it is contact with a suppressive which has worsened the pc's case. It was not the auditor, it was not the Case Supervisor, it was not this and not that and all the other thousand things that can be blamed!

Now, you hear of somebody going along all right and then getting worse in, let us say, the Poughkeepsie Foundation, see. And you have a tendency to say, "Well, they don't know much about auditing in the Poughkeepsie Foundation and so made the person worse." No! No! No! No! No! Give your fellow Scientologist a break. He was trying, too – always!

Don't blame the auditor. Don't blame the past auditor. Don't blame the past HGC. Get off of it! There is only one reason it happens. And maybe in this HGC there was an SP. That's very doubtful, but maybe there was. But that isn't that HGC. Do you follow? That was an SP, a suppressive person. And honest, please, it's the only reason. There aren't no others.

You will hear this and hear this from pcs that come in and say, "Well, I was out in Portland and they ruined me out there. They audited me on processes they shouldn't have audited me on." And he's learned some patter you know – like "They overran it," you know; and they did this and they did that. And he's learned this various patter line, and he'll give you these explanations and so forth. Well, I know he's right there and I know he's very persuasive. But please, for my sake, don't buy it, because there isn't a word of truth in it.

What is true is that after his case improved he encountered a suppressive, roly-coastered, and is now actually an ethics-type pc. And you've got no business doing anything with him at all! He belongs to the EO – Ethics Officer. Owned property – and belongs to nobody else. And you say, "Well, our Ethics Officer's no good, and so forth. Because, after all, he's been to see the Ethics Officer and his case didn't immediately improve." Well, I don't care.
whether his case improved or not. If he's an ethics-type person, he's at least off the technical lines.

If ethics did no more than that we would all make it. Even those people would eventually make it, do you see? But as long as they stay on the lines knocking around, you have in actual sober fact a situation where people are in many respects caving in simply because we have let ethics-type personnel along in our lineup. We put them in the technical lineup not the ethics lineup. Do you see?

And if Ethics was just a place to put them, at least the rest of us would make it. And if there was no place to put them at all, I assure you that we would not make it at all! – that serious.

Now, I speak from the vast gold mine of experience of the first Foundation. Never talked to you too much about the first Foundation. I didn't have control of this organization – just by dint of personality and shouting. And it wasn't in operation twenty-four hours before it started to squirrel, right in its own internal actions. People were being told that auditing was not a scientific type activity – auditing was not a scientific type activity. Being told it was an art, that it could not be learned, that it was a sort of a knack you had.

And they were being told this by Mr. Joe Winter – Doctor; the late. And his overt was that he and the publisher had arranged it – because I was "too hard to do business with" – they had arranged it to do a more agreeable book by Joe Winter on the subject of Dianetics which would get the medical doctors interested in the subject. That was his overt. He did – he wrote such a book. It was, I think, A Doctor Looks at Dianetics.

And there were people around there galore, and they were just tearing Standard Procedure to pieces. People that I had trained just prior to that activity were actually still able to get results. And people around there couldn't get results. And I couldn't hold in technology. Because I, one, didn't have control of it and, two, didn't have ethics. And we could never hold in technology until we finally got ethics.

So curse ethics if you want to; think it's terrible, but here we are who owe the rest of the world our services, being mean, too; and deplore it all you want to, but realize that it has great value. And if you as an auditor are in great disagreement with ethics and so forth, then you must also be in disagreement with auditing people and getting gains that stay there.

Because if you go into a practice of auditing suppressive persons or continuing to audit a person that you recognize as suppressive, you're going to get your heart broken because he isn't about to go anywhere, man.

That's our biggest source of losing auditors, see, tie into and try to audit a suppressive, don't recognize it and there they go. And the other one is they must be able to recognize a case gain and a loss of case gain and recognize in those two actions – remember you've got to be able to recognize a case gain before you can recognize a loss of case gain – and to see in those actions an ethics situation, not an auditing situation.

It's perfectly all right for the individual auditor to turn around and put on his ethics hat. If he hasn't got an Ethics Officer closer than eighteen thousand miles or something like that, why, let's put on his own hat, put it on himself and become the Ethics Officer. But he has to
be an Ethics Officer when he's an Ethics Officer and an auditor when he's an auditor. They're two different guises.

If he sees a suppressive or a PTS situation and does not realize – recognize them and realize what to do about them, he will not last very long as an auditor or if he does his own case and progress will be completely stopped. I speak the truth. This is what we learned in the first Foundations – dearly bought.

It isn't whether there are good guys in the universe and bad guys in the universe. It just so happens that there are guys in the universe who – really no different than other guys, if a little bit weaker and stupider – are more susceptible to not being here at all and who think they are someplace else, being fought by people or things that aren't there either, and behave like a bunch of northbound horses, you know, and make a horrible mess out of their lives because they're fighting things that aren't there for reasons that don't exist! And they look like a bunch of apes – worse than that. If you could see with an inside view the visio of an SP, it would startle you half to pieces because you wouldn't know there was anything quite that gaudy.

He doesn't see the world around him. He sees a three-dimensional motion picture of enemies always attacking him. Now, once in a while you have run into somebody who didn't have a wall there who had a picture of a wall. You run into these people every now and then. It's very funny. I don't know how they even manage to walk in and out of doors, but it's absolutely true. The wall isn't there, but a picture of the wall is. And it frightens them half to death when you start auditing them or running reach and withdraw on walls or something like that, because the wall shakes and it looks like it's going to go to pieces. And you think they're going OT because they can now erase matter. No, they didn't have a wall there, you see? Notice that the wall isn't erasing for you. If the guy was OT, it would.

Now therefore, this is where the universe is really a mock-up. It's really just a very thin, flimsy mock-up. Of course, it is a mock-up, but to you and me it has solidity. Now, this other bird, he doesn't have the wall there that you and I have. He has another wall there entirely. Now, that person isn't necessarily a suppressive person. This is what we call dub-in, using the phrase out of the motion picture industry of putting a soundtrack on top of something that isn't there.

Now, that guy when he starts to run one of our contact processes gets into huge cognitions and gains because he finds out that his mocked-up wall isn't the wall that's there; that the wall that's there is the wall you and I see. And this brings him tremendous relief. Well, that does not make him suppressive. That is not even one of the characteristics of a suppressive, particularly. We're not interested in that characteristic as a suppressive characteristic. All I'm trying to tell you about is: as that wall is a mock-up for this person, so is every one of us a mock-up for that suppressive. We aren't there. In the places we're standing, God knows what's standing there – pink alligators, Martians, FBI agents – something else.

Now, somebody will say, "Well, he's just taken paranoia and specialized on it, and so forth, as a primary source of the thing. And of course, we know paranoia and we've always known paranoia" – just dismiss the whole thing. Hell, what they hold up and call a paranoid is such a mild version of what I'm talking about that we haven't any interest in it at all. A para-
noid simply believes people are against him. Sometimes people are against somebody so they say he's a paranoid. You see. Works both ways. There's homicidal maniacs and so on.

No, this has nothing to do with psychiatric classification because it really, mostly looks totally sane. Once in a blue moon you get one of these boys in an institution – once in a blue moon. But I really think he would look so normal to the average psychiatrist that he'd be let out at once.

Now, they know that there is somebody who believes people are against him. Well, this is not as simple a definition as that. It is a person who is surrounded by identities which are different than those others see. And others have different intentions. They don't have the intentions you and I have noticed in people. They have entirely different intentions.

This is an interesting point of view because it's sort of like the fellow lives in a sort of Cinerama. He's in a cave filled with Cinerama, except we are the dramatic personnel when we walk in and out of his lives. Now, you see a paranoid usually is delusive. He has fictional people walking in and out of his lives, in that he doesn't have to have anybody walk into and out of the room to have somebody in the room. Do you follow? No, in this particular case of the suppressive you really have to have somebody walking in and out of the room for him to have been confronted by one of his fictional people.

This is a very, very, very hard thing for a sane person to envision, that somebody could go through life fooling everybody on this whole line. But they exist.

The exact anatomy of what's wrong with their case is they're stuck on the time track. They are stuck somewhere in life in some activity where they're in a very tight spot and are being surrounded, badgered, tortured or injured in some way by a people or a group. And whereby that has happened to all of the rest of us at some time or another, we have moved on up the track. Well, the suppressive never has. He has never gone another inch beyond there. He is there totally. Today is that point on the track. It is always ten o'clock. Do you see?

Time does not move for this person. To get him to run an engram is next to impossible, because a person has to have a concept of motion on the time track in order to get from one end of an engram to another. And you have to be able to go over something in order to erase it on the time track. And of course, this person is not about to go over anything because he is in no place else but this precise, pinpricked instant in time.

Now, all of us in an aberrated state can find a point on the track where we're (quote) "stuck." In other words, we have for long time had an incident there we didn't notice before. Now, that's not the same thing. The suppressive, for a long time, has had the world there and didn't notice. See? There's the difference.

Now, this person is simply in that condition. There he is. Only he's sitting right here amongst us, being a revolutionary, being put down by the Spanish Inquisition, and we're all priests. And I don't know, but I think he even sees us in robes. And he says weird, out-of-contextish statements to us, every now and then, which he hastily covers up, because he's also learned that he mustn't be told that he's wrong. And that's his world. So of course, he butchers everybody.
Now, you'd have to know something about the mind before you could know anything about the anatomy of a suppressive. That, of course, lets psychiatry and psychoanalysis out.

Now, let me give you, in rather rapid order, the actual attributes, one right after the other in a very machine-gun fashion. And this is the "antisocial personality," I've called this. That's because you, in speaking of it and so on, actually marry up with old technology, because they've looked for this fellow called the antisocial person for a very long time. Freud uses the term. Psychologists use the term. It's been used for a very long time. They know there is such a thing as an antisocial personality. And this is the personality for which they were groping. We're calling it a suppressive because it's more explicit.

But if you were speaking of this broadly or generally, why, you'd be very clever to say, "Well, an antisocial-type person." You're on technical firm ground. Now, this in actual fact is quite adequate as a discovery of some magnitude. The attributes of the antisocial personality would, in psychology, be an isolation study and a discovery of considerable magnitude to the psychologist. He'd be terribly interested in this. He runs into them all the time and doesn't know what he's looking at.

Out of this, by the way, you could make up a type of personality-analysis test that would isolate these birds at once. You would just have as many columns as I have attributes here. Make up a gradient scale on that column, see where the person is and you would – if he rode low on the resultant graph, why, you had one; and if he rode high, why, you didn't. It's almost worth doing.

But it would be of only great value if you were trying to go through a firm fast, and straighten it out. You've got the Bide-a-Wee Biscuit Company on your hands, and in the line of organization, why, he's asked you as a Scientologist – because the Scientologists seem to be very well organized and succeeding – what you would do. Well, if you had a personality test of this character, it would be of great value to you. You'd just deal them out and those people that flunked them, why, you would set those aside and get them off the assembly belts and the firm would promptly recover – just like that. Bang! Of course, there's always the danger that it's the GM. Anyway… Not if he's asking you for help.

And this is the first attribute: This person speaks only in generalities and that is the first first thing we noticed about them. They never spoke in anything but generalities. It wasn't "Henry said it" – ever. It was always "Everybody said it." Such a person will get one letter in, criticizing the magazine, out of seven thousand avid readers and will immediately report, "The readers all think…" One instance becomes every.

Now, every human being has this tendency to some slight degree. But this person pushes it home too hard. Any piece of bad news becomes an "everybody." It's what the community thinks of you, you see? See? One casual remark dropped someplace or another becomes immediately the total public opinion of England, you see. But it's this generality – the use of generalities to a totality – that give us the hallmark that was first noticed of a suppressive. They use this to pieces.

Now, it affects PTSES, so PTSES will echo it. When you hear somebody says, "Well, everybody in this community just hates Scientology." You know you're talking to a PTS or a
suppressive – immediately. And you don't have to further qualify it. Now, if you want to find out if it's a PTS, it's somebody told him. And if it's a suppressive, he dreamed it up.

And this is one of the hallmarks of an ethics-type personality and is this antisocial personality. Now, of course, it has – people just haven't been doing this since we've been around. They've been at this for a long time. I imagine they were busy telling Nero – such suppressive persons as he had in his vicinity would hear one whisper from one guard and immediately this became the opinion of the population of the entire empire. "The people of Rome," or "All the people of the empire believe..." see? Some pish-tush that was uttered by some little goose that was down in the fifth corridor who's just stubbed her toe, you know, and this becomes public opinion.

Now, the newspaper tries to bring about a public opinion, and you very often find newspapers dealing in sweeping generalities they ought to be shot for. Now, I'll show you a borderline generality which you might not think is a generality sometimes, but "865 dead on holiday" – banner headlines, you see. You know, I think if that many people took a holiday that was not the news story. I think that dealt with the minority. You get my point? The newspaper's got a headline there about the people that died in accidents on this holiday which unfortunately involved some twenty-seven or twenty-eight million people. And they speak of the eight hundred in a certain way, so it looks like holidays are sort of dangerous or roads are dangerous.

Airplanes have been catching it of recent years, and yet the airplane has a better safety statistic than the railroad. What they did was continue to carry more and more and more and more people, you see. So when they did have an accident it was very spectacular indeed, but statistically and so on was less accident per passenger mile than the railroads had and is, I think, a better statistic by the way by far than some of the other means of transport man uses.

But the statistic on steamer passengers being carried, and so on, is very much on the decline, because you don't have very many steamers carrying very many passengers anymore. It's not a high traffic volume anymore. So if one steamer went up in smoke per year they would have more casualty statistic than the entire airline history for that year. Do you follow? Passengers carried – very small numbers.

Newspaper doesn't bother to explain all of this, but the newspaper itself is, of course, itself a generality.

There is certain types of governments – the communist state these days is a generality. It is the people. Everybody tearing around, "the people". Doing something for the people. I can make these people really upset by seemingly intelligently trying to isolate the people, trying to find the people that are being helped, because everybody I see is being shot.

So if there is some abstract image here called "the people" that have [has] nothing whatsoever to do with the people. Communism is one of the finest methods of government ever developed by suppressives.

They don't ever govern anybody who is there. They only govern "the people" or "the masses". And they don't ever have anything to do with the people and masses. Nobody ever
finds "a masses". Big, beautiful abstract that sits out there. And as you get into these super-high powered collective-type civilized philosophies and so on, so-called civilized philosophies, you are just getting in suppressive philosophies.

Now, this generality is a big factor. Now, it doesn't make a person who simply says, "Well, they're mad at me," inspecifically – that doesn't make him a suppressive person. But if he's using it to push things down your throat, it rather tends to. "Everybody at school believes you're no good." "They," "all" – these sweeping things connected with bad news.

There's great value in knowing this. Because the rebuttal of course is, "Who is 'they'?" "What is 'everybody's' name?" And the guy – he's either PTS and has simply just been told this, and therefore he isolates it and makes him feel better or he's suppressive and is mad as the dickens because he's been trapped.

All right. That's the first characteristic: deals in generalities.

Second characteristic: Such a person deals mainly in bad news, critical or hostile remarks, invalidation and general suppression. Now, of course we know that. But did you ever know anybody who never said anything good about anybody ever? Well, that person was a suppressive. There's no further qualification is necessary. That person was a newspaper – I mean, a suppressive.

There's the hallmark of the suppressive because that is the extent of the operation in actual fact. They also do bad things to people, but there certainly – there isn't anybody good anyplace, anywhere, you know, ever. And it's just they deal mainly in bad news, critical or hostile remarks, invalidation and general suppression. And that's their stock in trade.

Now, if you told this person to tell Bill that you certainly appreciated his bringing you home last night, that person will never so tell Bill. Never, never, never relay a complimentary remark. Never relay good news, period. Good news does not pass. It might become an outright lie. The good news won't pass. But it might become an outright lie and somehow or another become bad news. But they will pass bad news but altered, worsened.

Number three: (This is the characteristic of which I was just speaking.) The antisocial personality alters to worsen communication when he or she relays a message or news. Good news stopped and only bad news, often embellished, is passed along. Now, that is just a common – that's a common characteristic to that type of personality. It isn't that you gave them good news or you gave them bad news. This is not this, now. This is the other one. The other one is this:

Whatever passes through their hands is altered. They alter the communication. If they say it's two – three. If you said it was Tuesday, it becomes Thursday, you see? There's always an alteration of a communication. The communication does not duplicate, the communication alters.

Now, if you had this old test that they use in the army of they have a whispered message passed along through a dozen men, you know, to find out what comes out the other end. Well, actually, in the British Army they commonly drill them and – not as a demonstration and so forth – they get them so they actually will pass on a relayed communication. But if you were to go down that twelve men you would find only, at the outside, one or two of them had
altered the communication and you would have your hands on people who were either PTS or suppressive.

The altered communication: They usually worsen the gist of the communication, but they certainly alter it, do you get the idea? That's a distinct difference from "the person deals in bad news." See? This person alters communications that flow through him.

And the next characteristic is a fact that a suppressive, the antisocial personality, does not respond to treatment, reform or psychotherapy. No response.

Now, you actually never deal with the serious ones. They're running the London *Daily Mail* and things of this character. They're running the great banks of the world – the serious suppressives. They're not, they're not in actual sober fact accessible to you. They're the insane ones. I mean, the insane one is not really accessible to any psychotherapy. He's so batty that his close staffs normally know it, but when he's moved up in a position in the world and so on, he's quite able to make this the norm – makes this the normal circumstance of existence.

You see, he would shoot at you, only. I mean, the real bad one. It isn't that you won't get one in the auditing chair. But the real bad one – he really never does come and sit down in the auditing chair, do you understand? And he, and the people he influences, are the only people on the planet who won't.

So he's not open to being audited. I'm finding it a little bit hard to make the point, because you say no case gain and so forth, this sort of thing; yes, that is the characteristic. But I just wanted to point out to you that you don't get this guy in the auditing chair – the worst ones. You don't get him in the auditing chair at all. He's back there screaming someplace about you. But he would never come in and sit down in the auditing chair.

So we, of course, knowing enough about the mind, can sandblast these people and blow them up with Power Processes used in various ways. And we could blast through with CCHs. And somehow or another, we could undoubtedly do something for them – if we had to. But that's today. That's today. And it's only because we know the anatomy of what they consist of and we know the rest of these things. We could do something for them today.

But it would take very, very, very heavy teamwork. It would take an organization, and it would take one preferably who had an institutional access to really take on this line of country. And what this is meant by, is that the person who comes along who hasn't been helped by auditing – well, we can modify that and say, well, if he hasn't been helped by lower-grade auditing, if he hasn't been helped by the usual or ordinary approaches of auditing and so on, then that person is an SP. So we can say that he isn't benefited by psychotherapy because we're not in that business. He does not respond to treatment, that is for sure. He does not reform, that is for sure. And the psychoanalyst never came within a thousand miles of him. And the psychologist doesn't even recognize him.

Let me give you that characteristic again: He does not respond to treatment or reform or psychotherapy. No response. No change.

Now, if you say auditing – then auditing is not psychotherapy and is not a normal human activity at all – but he won't respond to the lower forms of auditing. He won't respond to grade auditing up to, let us say, IV.
Now, a very skilled auditor in an organization and so forth can undoubtedly take these people and blast them to pieces if he could get them to stand still. But if you started picking up every one there was, you would need an institution.

It's not that this fellow has acted insane in the society; it's the fact that he would go insane the instant anybody looked like he was going to do anything to him mentally. The one thing this fellow can't do is confront his own mind! Now, recognize that as one of the motivations of his activities with regard to Scientology. He does not dare confront his own mind! He would go into trembling fits! He would go into piercing screams that they would have to put him in a padded cell for years if he took one tiny little look at his own mind. You understand?

And that's why you when you come along and you say we're going to audit people, we're going to process people and we're going to do something with the mind, that's why these guys go mad! You follow it?

They're right up there to the heads of states saying, "You've got to shoot these people! You've got to kill these people! You've got to do something about these people! Auhhhhhhr!" You know, they talk sanely, like that. And of course, a state that would listen to them has that type of person in charge of it. I wouldn't mention any names - Bolte* down in Victoria; Smith, Rhodesia. I don't want to get any libelous remarks out here, so I'll simply deal in truth. You got the idea?

The second they deal in their mind, those spooks that they carry with them all the time move slightly. And they just go, "Zyaahhhhhhh!"

So it isn't what you're doing. You're just wasting your time to explain to these people that you're not doing anything bad, all you're doing is helping people with their minds. It's the thought that anything has anything to do with the mind of any kind whatsoever that drives them into screaming terror! That's the kind of nut in the back of this newspaper chain up here. They got one like this on the East Grinstead Town and Country Planning Committee.

Recognize what you're dealing with. Don't be reasonable! You can't talk to these fellows about psychotherapy or about the mind or reason with them in any way. The second you've lifted the tiniest curtain of the subject, they've gone into irrational, screaming fits. They would want nothing less than your execution. And your crime is not what they say your crime is. Your crime is the fact that you have almost made them confront something that they cannot and do not dare confront! And you've almost exposed them because they - see, they're not under good control, and they recognize that if they lose control they will undoubtedly be put away. They know they're that close to insane. And that's why they get mad at you particularly.

Now, that was the fourth characteristic.

And the fifth characteristic is: Surrounding such a personality we find cowed or ill associates or friends who, when not actually driven insane, are yet behaving in a crippled manner in life, failing and not succeeding.

The people in this person's vicinity just fail. You say, "Well, there's a family and they always had bad – they always had bad luck, you know. They lost a boy and then the other one flunked in school, the other one's in prison and – and so forth. Then there was Jessie Ann. And Jessie Ann, of course, well, she's been in the insane asylum for some time and…" Family looks awfully unlucky. Get smart. This family isn't unlucky, this family has got a suppressive in the middle of it.

Now, they make trouble for others. Now, when you try to treat those people in the vicinity of the suppressive – and here's what's very important – they don't recover. They get a little bit better and they get worse, and they get a little bit better and they get worse, and then they really get worse. And then when it looks like they're really going to recover then they die. Suppressive couldn't stand that; he just wiped them out then.

This is what you're up against. You have a broad familial pattern of sickness or something like that, and you don't do anything ethicswise about it and so on, why, you're not going to get any success on any member of that group, unless you handle it from an ethics viewpoint.

Therefore, if you didn't know that you could make an awful bust out of processing people. When you have a group of people who are commonly a roly coaster bunch or kind of sick and unlucky and all that sort of thing, and you don't suspect there's a suppressive in amongst them and that they're all PTS, and that you've got some other explanation like "They lived in the swamps, and of course they were fever stricken." I don't know. Who the hell was making them live in the swamps? [laughs]

And number six is something which is a saving grace. The antisocial personality habitually selects the wrong target – habitually. They're always selecting the wrong target. Now, this is – becomes very funny. If a tire went flat they would blame their companion. But they wouldn't connect it on the basis that the tire went flat. The tire went flat, so they got mad at their companion. Now, you say, well, that's a human characteristic. Well, human beings do tend to get mad at the things around what they're mad at, and so on. But this would be on the basis of a disassociate. The tire is flat. Now, being mad at the companion has nothing whatsoever to do with the tire being flat.

And it'd go to a point of the icebox is making a dreadful racket in the kitchen – see, rat-a-tat-tat and so on – so they go upstairs and fix the pipes in the attic to the hot water system. And you, very often, will see these people and you consider that they are ineffectual on the job. They're ineffectual on the job that if they noticed anything was wrong they would fix something else.

If they were served a notice by the Salivation Army they would go down and report to the jailhouse or something. They can never quite figure out where what was which, see? And this goes in reverse. If they want to straighten out something in the society, then they will attack the people who aren't doing it. When you get a government going like this you know exactly what you're dealing with. For instance, we're not messing up the insane; the psychiatrists are. They're attacking us, see, and they're not attacking the psychiatrist. Do you see?

You get the tremendous gap there. It's a wrong target situation but they'll get enthusiastic on a wrong target the like of which you never heard of! This isn't defensive as far as we
are concerned; this is just remarkable because it's a saving grace. Because they attack a wrong
target they don't succeed very well. That means they're ineffectual. They're kind of goony.
And you needn't be anywhere near as afraid of them as people have become. Because there's
that one fact – that one fact – that sixth characteristic: wrong target. You can absolutely count
on it.

When you've got a suppressive general and he's got a ridge that has to be cleaned out
and so forth, why, he sends all of his troops into the valley. If he has to, to win the battle,
knock out all the artillery emplacements and so on, why, he will have the enemy's water sup-
plies polluted. It's as wrong target as that. If he should shoot at A, he shoots at B.

And you will see this person as a – well, as a woman in the middle of a family, some-
thing like that. She will spot the wrong reasons for things and then settle these wrong reasons.
And it gets pretty goony if you listen to it after a while. "Well, let's see, Bill failed at college." And
you expect some remark, "Therefore, we won't send Pete to college. We will send them
something else," you know. "We should go on a diet." There's a disassociation involved in
these things which is sometimes hard to catch, because you don't catch it to what was going
on. But you get them lined up. But you watch for this wrong target. But it serves you in very
good stead because he'll never attack the right thing.

And here's another saving grace in dealing with these people: They don't complete cy-
cles of action. If they start to put an apple on a shelf; it will only get halfway there, that's for
sure. If they start a war in Zanzibar, it won't be completed. That incomplete cycle of action –
that's just a total dramatization. They didn't ever complete those cycles of action. If they com-
pleted one, they'd find it out, then they would redo it. They mustn't arrive and they don't arrive
and this is because their time sense is loused up. They don't have ideas of consecutive events.
And so they don't, therefore, complete cycles of action.

These, by the way, are all empirical; these are not theoretical. I didn't tell you that.
These are not just theoretical extrapolations where I sat down and figured out what would be
this personality and so on. No. This winnows out just thousands and thousands of hours of
observation, shaking down the common characteristics. The characteristics these people have
in common. These things are not necessarily themselves associated with one another. These
are just things that you know that these were the characteristics which were common to all of
them. There are a lot of other characteristics that you could equally apply, you see, but you
wouldn't necessarily... They aren't necessarily common to all these suppressives. Some have
them, some don't. And this is empirical – that is to say, picked up by actual observation and
experience in life.

And that's one of the wildest things to watch you ever had anything to do with is can't
finish a cycle of action. You watch a suppressive trying to finish a cycle of action and so on,
he changes his mind and goes over on a wrong target. They'll shift between wrong target and
cycle of action, you see? They start to finish a cycle of action, why, then they will shift the
target to something else. There'll be some reason why they can't finish that cycle of action;
they've got to do something else and you just – suddenly you'll look at them and you say,
"Hey, that hasn't got anything whatsoever to do with what you were doing, and you don't have
to do that in order to do something else," and they just know you're wrong, man.
Now, number eight: Many antisocial persons will freely confess to the most alarming crimes – when forced to do so, will have no faintest sense of responsibility for them. That is when such a person does confess to crimes you will find out, "Oh, yes. I killed the baby. Yes, yes. Yes, I murdered all the policemen, you know. Bluh-uh-blauh, bluh, bluh." And you say, "Well, what was the baby doing to you, you had to blow its head off with a .45?" "Well, I really don't know. Don't know. Very sorry for it, yep. You got any more babies to shoot?" You know? No sense of responsibility at all. They drive you mad.

They drive a policeman mad when they try to interrogate such fellows and so on. The fellow will confess to all the crimes under the sun, you know. And reformers go mad on this, you know, because after the fellow's confessed to all these crimes, he says, "So what?" The idea of crime is – well, you think they're a crime; he doesn't. They don't have any classification of behavior, different types of behavior – that there's such a thing as good behavior and bad behavior, nice behavior and pleasant behavior. There aren't different types of behavior. And they certainly take no responsibility for some of the wildest crimes and this is one thing that shows up. And when you hear this, boy – because maybe the guy has fooled you right up to that point, see. You hear about how he murdered his wife and corrupted all of his family. And he's sitting there; he's got a pleasant smile on his face and so on. Oooh! Hey, wait a minute. That is a suppressive characteristic, and you'll find the rest of the details then, unobserved before, will now start to fill in. No responsibility for committed acts.

That sort of thing happens. It can go off into any branch of crime by the way. It isn't one type of crime or another type of crime or one type of behavior or another type of behavior. It's interesting that they explain kleptomania by "the hand wandered over and took something and put it in the pocket." And they stand back and watch the hand detachedly do this. It's marvelous. "Yes, well, they took all of the money out of the cash register. Yes, yes, yes, yes." And if you pin it down, why, what they actually did, was observe their hands take the money out of the cash register and put it in their pockets. And they did so with a little bit of surprise and maybe even a faint feeling of reproof like their hand shouldn't be doing that. But they don't have anything to do with it. It's marvelous.

Now, the antisocial personality supports only destructive groups and rages against and attacks any constructive or betterment group. If you knew a person was a suppressive and so on, you could forecast at once what his reaction would be to a decent group or to a criminal group. And if you had one, for instance, in a parliament or a congress and you wanted to know what type of group they would try to legislate against, you could pick it up like that, because any group that is a betterment group they will legislate against and riots – smiots. "So they're all rioting and killing each other out in Cleveland. Well, that's no reason to do anything about the I Will Arise Society in Cleveland. But you say the police department there in Cleveland – you say that they were attempting to preserve property and so forth. Well, shoot them." Do you get the idea? "And that there were some ministers around and that they were actually counseling moderate action and so forth. Well, we'll have them investigated."

It's a reverse. It's the negative of the positive. It's what you would have normally been led to expect as law and order, they will reverse. You know, you support the rioters and you attack the people who are trying to prevent riots, you know. You support the wage earners,
and you put the bums into the millionaire class if you possibly can, see. You reward down statistics, we would put it, consistently and continuously.

Now actions, regardless of the group character of, the actions which are approved by this type of personality are destructive actions. Well, it was a good thing – he walked in and blew his head off with a shotgun. And that was a bad thing – she made a cake and gave it to the kids.

So that if you have a good action and a person approves of it, he's probably not suppressive. But if he – a person seems to be disapproving all the time good actions, you can't quite figure out what this is all about. Well, don't be so far adrift. You're talking to a suppressive.

These good-bad actions – you know, these actions: "Well, it was probably a good thing that the atom bomb hit Hiroshima because now they've been able to… The war was a good thing because the scientists were able to invent so many new things..." What's that? You know. Well, what that is, is suppression. It's the approval of a destructive action and the inhibition of constructive actions.

Now, they, by the way, will attach themselves to constructive people to try to smash them. They will go that far. You find it in Hollywood. Boy, oh boy, man. If you ever started to clean out Hollywood, you'd have a ball.

And the eleventh one: Helping others is an activity which drives the antisocial personality nearly berserk. Activities, however, which destroy in the name of help are closely supported. Really, anything that helps somebody is bad. And things that don't help are good. But if you've got a real mixed-up mess, whereby you've got the witch doctors are uniformly killing off all the villagers, but making a big play out of what a good thing this is, why, they'll support those witch doctors down to their last penny and ounce of energy. "Yeah, those guys are great!" See?

The idea is to get rid of everybody. You can more or less extrapolate these characteristics. If everybody became miserable, then you could get rid of them all and they would all disappear and then they'd all die and this fellow would then be safe, you see. Well, that works out fine except the people around him aren't the people who are around him, so of course it won't work out, ever.

And then the last one: The antisocial personality has a bad sense of property and conceives that the idea that anyone owns anything is a pretense made up to fool people. Nothing is ever really owned. And you listen to these guys sometimes; they really just pretend that people own things and so on. You watch that characteristic, it becomes almost pathetically amusing.

The reason they took the car and smashed it up and the reason they smashed your car up is because it isn't your car. You bought it and paid for it and sweat yourself to pieces paying for the thing and you've safeguarded it and taken care of it and so on, but it's not your car. You're just pretending that it's your car.

Now, you could say that there are a couple of others of these – there could be two or three more. And you could say that it is a tremendous feeling of importance or dominance and
so forth had to do with this. Well now, they've assigned those characteristics to the paranoid personality, but they do not belong.

That a fact that some guy thinks he's terribly important and another guy thinks he's unimportant and so forth has nothing whatsoever to do with suppression.

It's another characteristic of the personality, and some guys are rather ridiculous on the subject of importance. But if you ever really want to see important blokes, why, go down and talk to some ditch diggers or some charladies or something like that. Now, they are very important people! And you think these people, because of their station in life, would think of themselves as unimportant people. Well, it goes almost inversely, that the lower down a fellow is the more he has to assert his importance. If you ever want to see somebody bridle about importance, you want to take somebody who is not really very important, and then he becomes very important.

As far as dominance is concerned, they have dominance in the society totally mixed up with suppression. There's nothing wrong with dominance. Well, I say there's nothing right, wrong otherwise – it's just dominance is dominance, you know. George dominates his business. He dominates his family or she dominates something or other – so what? See? It's what do they do with this domination that counts. That they dominate has nothing to do with anything. Do you follow?

Now, though a person thinks he's important or doesn't think he's important – they've assigned that as characteristics of paranoia. And I have seen some people who did think they were outrageously important – fantastic – and harped on it all the time. But that was just a crazy psychosis in the middle of it. You won't find that all suppressives conceive they are important. It's not a common denominator. So there are many other characteristics which you will find in this field. But I do not think that you will find them as common denominators.

I've just given you a dozen common denominators by which they can be recognized. These will hold true. Now, on top of these, there will be all kinds of wild idiosyncrasies – wild idiosyncrasies, odd differences, personal quirks and peculiarities. You'll find these things galore. But they don't hold across the boards. Don't think when you've met one who thinks that he has to have a green hat on all the time and he'd be safe, then that all SPs have to have green hats, because they don't. This was this peculiar SP.

But the other dozen characteristics which I've just given you, I think you will find hold pretty true throughout any and all of these suppressives. Now, you watch these things and you'll... They are things, by the way, which are very startling to auditors. He gets some overts off this guy, and this guy has robbed his little brother's piggy bank and hit his sister on the head with a hammer and he's just sitting there, you know, talking. Wife owns some property and so he lost it in a gambling game; she's been destitute ever since. He left her in Omaha.

You look for some reaction on this meter, see. You look for this guy to cognite; you look for something to happen. You've gotten fantastic overts off this guy and you're getting no tone arm action either. Well, the pathetic part of it is the overts probably aren't even true. He's probably just trying to horrify you. He might have done them, he might not have done them. But if he did do them he had no responsibility for them. You watch these kind of things.
So you should know those various characteristics, see? You should know what they consist of. And if you know them as common denominators, when you see one of them, this doesn't prove too much until you've got it married up with two or three more. Now you know. And you say, "Ahhhh, ahhhh, ahhhh! No wonder Josie Ann roolly coasters all the time," you see. "Look at this guy, Pete." You know, whatever it is.

Anyhow, an auditor's skills depend upon his recognition of the situation he is auditing. And when you have some isolated series of characteristics which give you a certain expectancy they become valuable. And if you have a dozen characteristics which when you have perceived them in a pc and which when they add up to several others of these characteristics of the dozen – you now know what to predict. You're going to predict no case gain, you're going to predict catastrophe, you're going to predict a total mess in all directions. And somewhere along this line you better unload, because you are auditing an ethics-type case and you got no business doing it.

When you see somebody roolly coaster – they felt good and then they felt bad – you say, "Well, Scientology has harmed them." No, Scientology didn't harm them, but by being audited, they attracted the notice of a suppressive who then proceeded to cave them in fast! And you do an S&D on somebody and find the wrong suppressive, why, the p... you'll get a roolly coaster – a Search and Discovery – you'll get a roolly coaster; you'll get a person worsening. But also remember the situation can occur that you did a perfectly good S&D and then one week later they met another SP. See, that condition could exist also.

Well, I hope that this will be of some service to you. It's a gruesome subject. I hate to run this type of thing into your lap. But I would rather tell you than have you find it out in an auditing chair. I think maybe it would be of some service to you. Now, there will be an article published on this particular subject. But you should know these twelve characteristics.

Thank you very much.
A lecture given on 1 September 1966

Thank you. What's the date?

*Audience: 1st of September, AD 16.*

First September AD 16, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. This lecture doesn't have any title because I don't have anything to talk to you about.

Well, I could talk to you about a lot of things. And there was a request that I speak to you about how to coach. And actually I'll teach you how to coach this way: Anyone who doesn't coach well should be labeled suppressive. [laughter] Now, you can learn all about coaching. [laughs]

Now, there is a lot of – coaching is an area of opinion and it's an area of "How do you go about it to do this and that?" Well, normally I go about it simply to help the bloke that I'm coaching and I try not to give him so many flunks that he quits. And I try not to give him so few that he winds up lousy, see. So I strike a happy medium and the number of flunks and the number of encouragements went... My interest is simply trying to make him sound and look like an auditor. And if you follow that rule, rather than a bunch of mechanical rules, why, you will get there very well.

But I've had this question thrown at me now for a number of years, and you know it's notably absent –the "how to coach." I've seen other people write up lists of how you do it and that sort of thing. But I don't have a list of how you do it. I just do it. And I know that's a risky line to go on, "Well, you just do it." In actual fact I can't see anything very complicated about it, if you want to make an auditor. You know how he ought to look. It's pretty obvious how he's flunking and flubbing. You know, fellow sits there and he says, [in a nearly inaudible voice:] "Do fish swim?" You say, "Ah, come on now, boy. What preclear, from hell to Halifax, could ever hear that? Now speak up, man. Get it over here."

[slightly louder, but still nearly inaudible:] "Well, do fish swim?" [laughter]

"Now look, are you going to cooperate with me or not?" [laughs] "That was a flunk."

"Oh, you really want me to do something."

"Yeah, that's right. Stop talking in back of your head and start talking in front of your face. Now say it around me."

"Well, how should you say it?"
"Well, you should say it so I should hear it."

"Ohh!" [laughter] And that's the level of entrance on coaching, see. [laughs]

And you'll find out – but in actual fact, any coaching can be improved. And I have stepped in in the old days, on session after session that was being coached and unwound the guy as a mixed-up auditor and made him audit.

Made him sound like an auditor on one or another of the TRs. It is merely – it is merely what it says. If you yourself know what the TR is supposed to do, it's very easy to coach it. Then there was other suggestions. I've forgotten what they were now. They were important, too. What were some of these suggestions? Very important. Let me see.

Was it how to be a course supervisor? Let me see, was that it? No, that wasn't it. Oh yes. It's "How do I get Clear?" [laughs] That's the burning question.

Well, today – frankly, I'm always giving this to you as a gag – I don't have anything to talk to you about, but actually I have nothing pinpointed today – I think you're doing fine. I think things are rolling along pretty well, indeed. And the HGC in a mad burst of enthusiasm has just run itself out of pcs. Which, of course, was exactly what I intended. Now we're going to run the Dissem Division, you know, a bit mad. But Qual's statistic – Qualification's statistic dropped, so with all the messed up cases there are around I should think they ought to be able to drum up some business, too. So you will probably get approached – the students probably will be approached and staff members and so forth. And that's fine and by all means cooperate. But I would like to see more of the public approached.

I've noted something recently. I've noticed that there were several aberrated people in the broader bulk of humanity. I've noticed this. You have to have a quick eye, you know. [laughter, laughs] But if you're an expert, you can detect it. [laughs] Fellow's going like this, you know. [laughs] Yes.

But anyway, Scientology has arrived at a very enviable point today and we're – we're holding – my heels are getting walked on right now on the OT Course. Clear, that's all wrapped up. But the OT Course, that's giving some trouble. That's giving me some trouble, see. It isn't giving the students any trouble, it's giving me some trouble simply to keep my heels from being walked all over, you know.

You always – these times occur every year or two, why, I get to a point where I'm just ahead of the hurricane, you know? People are right there and they're waiting for that next bit, you know. Well, it takes them three seconds to run this next bit on the OT Course and it takes me sometimes hours to figure out what it is, you see. So the ratio is pretty good. But the last bit, the last important bit, it took me actually eighteen days to wrap it up and that was long and arduous. And it took me eighteen days to wrap it up – and the bit just completed – I mean the bit before last took eighteen days, and the bit just completed only took two days. So, the ratio is getting better, and my heels are less walked on.

Now, you recognize that materials at this echelon are not in actual fact denied to you out of any willfulness or the feeling that psychiatrists will pick them up and do something with them. They will eventually pick them up and do something with them. They spin. Hate to have to say it. But it is actually a matter of protection of the Scientologists and the public.
You can get sicker than a pup on upper-scale material. The body goes creak and bango and so on. So you shouldn't get in the idea that there is a bunch of security being applied, for some reason best known to somebody else, because the reason is simply that it makes people sick – and if not given proper protective security and so on, it would have half of the – well we would have the lower class staff, you see, out on their ears if it were flowing through the lines, and so on. And then people starting to audit it, very often need very careful supervision and direction or otherwise, why, it knocks them kicking. And those who have been through this, of course, they just toss this off. This is nothing, of course. That's right – it's nothing.

But before they did I call their attention to when they accidentally skipped half a page of materials. And then went appetite over tin cup for about five sessions, before they finally got back to finding out what they did, you know? Or just accidentally turned the wrong page and glanced at the wrong thing and have the meter practically lock up and that's it.

So, when you begin to estimate the velocity or ferocity of material, you have to estimate it against the power of the individual. Let's take a wog out here. He's running on about one-quarter of one grasshopper power, see, and he looks at a lock and he thinks that – well, let's go back to Freudian analysis, see, let's go back to way back. And for five years the psychoanalyst worked hard with his patient, in order to discover a hidden memory of a sexual attack of somebody waving a book with a naked woman on it before him, while he was a baby, you see. And they worked for five years and they finally found this and explained it all to the person, and so on. And they were spinning because these were so powerful as aberrative incidents.

All right, on the Dianetic course, you find the only thing that was wrong with 1950 Dianetics is we just kept throwing people in over their heads. After you've run a few locks, why you can face some engrams. Do you see? After you've run a few secondaries you can face some pain and unconsciousness. And it's a matter of just that. So it is all gradients.

And you'll find throughout Scientology, the gradient approach is a primary and regulating factor. And the gradient approach has been very, very important in this line of research. It is incidentally quite new. You'll find it here and there. You'll find it mentioned, and so on. How do you empty a granary? Well, somebody will say, "Well, how would a bunch of ants empty a granary? One kernel of grain per ant, you see, in the line, and eventually little by little…" Well, that isn't a gradient. That isn't a gradient. The gradient would be the ant beefing himself up till he could carry the granary, see. From one kernel to the granary. Now that's the gradient.

There are jokes that go along with this, you know that illustrate a gradient. But a failed gradient is the fellow who was teaching his horse not to eat. And he got him taught so he didn't eat, all right, but doggone the horse died before he could benefit from it. [laughs] Now that would be sort of a misapplication, because he probably didn't do it on a proper gradient, really. Then there is the fellow who has got the gradient and he was going to be able to pick up a bull. And so he starts in with a small bullealf and lifts this bullealf every day for a very long time, you see. Well, the joke is of course he didn't have any processing, so he didn't make it. [laughs]
But the essence of a gradient is just being able to do a little bit more and a little bit more and a little bit more until you finally make the grade. And the gradient gets invalidated when you do too much of a jump, you know, you go from fifteen kernels to fifteen bushels all in one step, you see. No gradient, you know. Or you take too long to go from fifteen kernels to sixteen and one-tenth kernels. See, you do that in steps of one hundredth of a kernel, see. And the gradient is so shallow that the fellow gets bored to death, before he has any chance to improve on it.

See, so there are two gradients.

Now, this is less typical of life at large, than it is of a thetan. A spiritual being responds in this particular direction like a bomb. But a body doesn't, because a body is – a body has limitations. It's built into the stress and strain of the universe. Its legs can only stand so many hundreds of pounds, you see, before they snap. And the body – it is not good – not a good example – trying to pick up a bull calf every day until you can finally lift the whole bull, you see. That's not a good example because it's a gradient of a body.

Well, a gradient of a thetan is quite different. His power is probably very close to infinite and it can be walked up the line. Now I did just hit some stuff that threw my body back out of a chair. And I thought that was interesting, because I was confronting stuff and it didn't bother me and I didn't notice right away what was happening. Because it didn't seem to me that there was that much stress and strain contained in it, do you follow?

Now, similarly, you look at a pc some day and you go and you do a wrong gradient. You can do too shallow a gradient – you can do too steep a gradient. Now you, up the grades from where he is, don't necessarily react to the fact that it's a steep gradient. You overlook this fact. You can't see why he's having a bad time answering that question, because you can answer it easily. It's comparable to what you see in circus performers. You ever watch these acrobats and things like that – throwing themselves in the air and doing the wildest things, you know. Well, they've been trained from babyhood, you say, and so forth. But supposing somebody told you, "Well, get up on that trapeze and balance by one heel, as you swing back and forth across the top of the tent," and you'd say, "Yulp."

Well actually, you watch those chaps go up a rope without using their legs, they're hand over hand up a rope, you know. And if you went out there and took hold of that rope, why, you would find out you would – not only wouldn't go up it hand over hand, you probably couldn't get yourself off the ground. But that acrobat, if he were trying to teach you – and he didn't know very much about it – if he were trying to teach you something about acrobating, why, he would probably do something remarkable like, "All right, let's get up to this trapeze, here, and I'll teach you now how to time a trapeze." And there you would be trying to climb up that rope. It didn't occur to him that was a problem. See?

Well, that is the source of most failures on cases. Either too shallow or too steep.

Now supposing – and you've seen this one, too – supposing that acrobat, equally bad in instruction, said, "Well, in the next couple of years we will teach you how to go hand over hand up a rope." Well, your ultimate goal is acrobating, not going hand over hand up a rope. You figure you can learn this in two or three months at the absolute outside and you say you
got to spend that long at it, why you become very, very tired indeed at just the thought of doing all of that to achieve only that, do you see?

So, when you're handling a preclear, your failures are in actual fact – and in training – your failures are in actual fact, a violation of a gradient which can be tolerated by the person. And I always use a gradient which is just a little bit tough. I never use an easy gradient – I use it so it's just a little bit hard all the way. It's a bit of a strain all the way. But not a strain that gives failures. Just hard work.

Now in that wise, you have to estimate pretty well the individual student or the individual preclear. What is a strain to him? You find oddly enough, in wogs, that you can make an error – a great, great error – and you can actually assume that the person is at a level of gradients, simply because something doesn't bother him. The reason something doesn't bother him to do it, is because he has no reality on it at all. We used to run into this in 8-C. We would occasionally – where we had them touching the walls, that old process; CCHs – and we would actually find people that could go through the whole thing just like a breeze. There was absolutely nothing to it, there was no change of any kind whatsoever – and they were just as aberrated as coots. And the whole point was, it was too steep a gradient. There was no reality on it. They didn't have to confront doing it because they weren't doing it. It was all on automatic. Life was on automatic. The walls weren't there anyhow, so nothing was going to happen anyhow. So nothing mattered anyway. Do you see?

So you can be tricked sometimes into believing that you have achieved a proper gradient because the person simply has no trouble at this particular point, whereas they don't have any trouble at that point because they have no reality on it either.

A fellow probably, who was unable to see lions and tigers, would undoubtedly have no trouble whatsoever walking through a cage full of lions and tigers. Except, of course, accidentally he gets eaten. But he – it doesn't bother him a bit. He simply walks through the cage because there are no lions or tigers in the cage.

Well, you have to have a fairly good estimate of the degree and steepness of aberration in order to draw up some kind of an estimate of what gradient to apply to it. And now and then you undoubtedly will run across somebody who has no degree of response on the 0 Processes. You'll find somebody – the 0 Processes don't bite, nothing happens. This would be a rare action and you seem to be up against some sort of an impasse where you can't make a Grade 0 Release. Well, the reason you couldn't make a Grade 0 Release is either it is overrun or he isn't up to it. It isn't that you need more processes at Grade 0. If Grade 0 didn't make a Release, well, then he already was one or it's just completely over his head. He has never had any trouble talking to anybody because he has never confronted anybody and he's never said anything, he just talks continually. So he hadn't any trouble at Grade 0. Had no trouble with communications with anybody, because there's nobody there. You see?

You could run into that kind of a circumstance. I think somebody that you took out of a spinbin, this person – undoubtedly you would find among such inmates (and I don't tell you to go process such inmates but I'm just using it as an example) you would find amongst these people a lot of people who did a lot of talking but didn't say anything and weren't confronting anybody and it was quite obvious. Now it's obvious when you know what it is and you look
for it. You know what you're looking for. You're looking for somebody who doesn't have anybody there to talk to so he doesn't have any trouble with Grade 0 Release, see. He doesn't have any trouble with the process and he doesn't make a Grade 0 Release, either. You could find such a circumstance.

Now, this would be quite interesting. How do you undercut that? Well, if you look it over you will find out that communication has an anatomy and that communication only takes place in the presence of some reality, the ARC triangle.

So if you want to raise one corner of the ARC triangle, you can raise either of the other two. If you can't approach communication, you can certainly approach reality, or you could approach affinity. Do you see? It's obvious that there's a whole series of processes that you could go downstairs on, that would raise the person's communication level. You'd have to be thinking on your feet. Actually it's more or less done for you. If you could get some – this person to audit a lock, something like that, why you would find out that you had undercut it already. Dianetic processing does undercut it.

Ordinary auditing of locks and so on, has been applied to psychotics with great success. And it goes way downstairs, because you see there doesn't have to be anybody else there. They come up to finding out there is something else in the world besides their own spin, or their own delusion, or their own hallucination. But they can audit locks and they can audit light materials.

Now, the reason why this was not successful earlier is that estimate on a gradient, you see, that estimate of a gradient was not properly made – the estimate was not made on the basis of "what can he run?" Obviously the fellow in the institution is in a desperate condition, so you must then run something desperate. And that is the mistake that the psychiatrists make. We call that a Q and A: Question is the answer – the question itself is the answer to the question by perfect duplication.

So therefore, a person who is dramatizing this, of course, just does what is being done. And he gets a sort of a communication that he is very satisfied with.

For instance, if somebody is jumping up and down, why if the other fellow jumps up and down, why there is some vestige of communication there. So we take this and instead of condemning it, we find that one of the very, very early entrance point is mimicry. But you don't happen to need a psychotic in order to practice mimicry processes.

Mimicry processes are very interesting. And you can do them on subways and in buses and in stores, and so on. It's very fascinating. You see some little kid and he can be a very, very young kid and you just run some mimicry, see. He smiles, you smile. That's the tiniest point of it, see. But you happen to notice he's wrinkling his nose at you, you know. He's going like this, you know. So you go at him like this and he becomes very interested. A communication has been formed at once. As you get good at that, why you'll find out that a child is very enamored with this. You'll find out, oddly enough, that he likes you. And then you will find out of course that he has a pretty good reality on you if you could plumb that estimate.

For instance, if you were in a whole mob of people, he would pick you out. Now you would say of course, because he knows you. No, no. Because you're real to him and the others
aren't. Knowledge and reality are the same thing. That is what is known is real. That which is, is. You know that philosophers of the ages have stubbed their toes and tripped up over this thing of "What is reality?" until I have gotten more tired eyes, reading their textbooks on that one subject than on any other subject I know anything about.

You take the questions of, "If there was nobody in the forest and a tree fell, would there be a sound if there was nobody there to hear it?" Oh, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Would there be a universe if anybody was in it? If nobody was in it would there be a universe? Could there be a universe with nobody in it? Is the universe you? Is all mind, mind, infinite mind? You know, I mean these preponderated propositions are merely a perpetuation of idiocy. Because reality is very easy. It's merely what is. But of course that doesn't fill up any textbooks. [laughs]

Now the reality of somebody is the point of approach when you cannot attain Communication 0 Grade Release. There is the point. Now, affinity could also be a point of attack, but is usually one which occurs, rather than that. Reality is something you can do something with.

Now, what can you do with reality? Well, I'll tell you what not to do with reality. He says, "This room is full of spiders and they're crawling all over me." Now, the method of handling that which was used, BD – before Dianetics – and those who haven't gotten the word still use this method. They're more barbaric types, they can't read, you know, and they don't know the trend of the times. They're stuck back in the nineteenth century Psychiatrists. These birds have as their sole approach to this problem, "There aren't any spiders on the wall. You're crazy." "Now what you must do is face reality and realize there are no spiders on the wall." Well, they just threw away their first gradient. The guy did have a reality on the wall to the degree that he mentioned there was a wall there.

Now, if you validate his insanity too hard, you're liable to find yourself in trouble because you sort of fix him with a win. He's been telling everybody about these spiders for a very long time and you say, "Of course, I see them, too." That's a lie, isn't the truth and actually gives him an acknowledgment and rather sticks him with the win. And he knows you're crazy, because basically he knows there aren't any spiders on the wall, too.

But, let's pick out of his sentence what he said. "Spiders on the wall and all over me." See? Well, we have two points of reality: we have the wall and me. To hell with the spiders. So if you were to simply ask him, "What kind of a wall wouldn't spiders be on?" or "What kind of a wall do spiders like best?" or "Who would you have to be not to have spiders on you?" And you would shift his R.

Now, admittedly, you have to be clever to do this sort of thing. I remember being clever about these sort of things – and toward the end of the 40s all by myself. And it was almost disastrous, because there were more psychotherapies originated in 1949 than in any other year known to psychoanalysis. Every time I audited anybody while anybody else was watching, it became a school of psychotherapy, because they couldn't integrate it. They couldn't integrate it with what I was doing, which they didn't understand, so it in itself became an approach all by itself, and was therefore not something with which you thought, but simply
something which you totally copied. And we got all kinds of therapies. I've seen textbooks on them and so on.

I'd audit Joe Blow and we would see Gestalt iggerbits therapy by Joe Blow. Promptly and at once. It was the process that was run on him and it would have a derivation something like this, you see. How do we get into communication with this bird or what part of the bank, you know, could we approach? Or what idea would he agree with? And then this idea that you have used as an entrance you see, of course, gave him a terrific change of case, so it was that idea which everybody had to be approached with, you see. So everybody had to be fitted on this same gradient. And I despaired of ever teaching anybody anything.

To this day there is a bit of a tradition that I – I'm terrific as a psychotherapist – there is nothing to Dianetics and Scientology – it's just my touch. What a method of invalidation. I had heard it and heard it and heard it. "Undoubtedly Hubbard has a knack, undoubtedly he is one of these gifted individuals who" something or other. But teach anybody to do that, of course that's impossible. Well, I'm giving you why. They wouldn't know such a thing as a gradient scale or the ARC triangle or any of these other tools of the trade or use those in any way, but would simply totally copy something. That was done for one particular psycho or one particular neurotic, you see. And then they would say that you do that for every neurotic.

Well, everybody didn't believe there were policemen on the wall, you see. They believed that there were policemen camped on the front porch. And if you could have – could have taught them something on this, could have said, "Look, the operative line there is front porch." You see, they may have policemen on the front porch, but they've at least got a front porch. So they got porches. So then they can have a variety of porches. And A = A = A, so he has identification. He's got all porches identified with a porch. If you can introduce differentiation amongst porches on that particular case, therefore and thereby the person will improve casewise and will increase his reality and therefore will have a better communication level and will like people better. Too much.

We're asking somebody to work out the solution to a case by mathematical formula, if you want to know it. Now this planet doesn't have symbolic mathematics. It doesn't understand them, it has nothing to do with them. When they get into symbolic logic, they put words into algebra and call it symbolic logic. Oh, *blah!* Mathematics – these mathematicians that go around and scribble, "X equals the umpty-umph, blash-plunk!" and wind up with an A-bomb. It's no wonder they wind up with A-bombs instead of something that will help things, you know. Their mathematics is so terrible. That's a very definite statement straight from me. Mathematics is in kindergarten on this planet. Symbolic mathematics has nothing to do with doing algebra with symbols instead of numbers the way man thinks it is if you look it up in the dictionary or the encyclopedia.

It is solving a vast number of nonnumerical variables by the use of comparisons – similarities, identities and differences. And you have to be a real whiz-bang, because you can't write it down on a sheet of paper.

Now, man even goes so far as to say geometry is logic. There would be nothing sillier than a fellow who went around all the time using syllogisms. A = B, B = C, C = D. Well, all right, that syllogism might possibly work. It's obvious that B and C being the same, why A
and D would be the same. And that works out fine as long – as long as you're using only one apple. There's where mathematics falls down. Because it applies the suppressive generality of a number to the specific entity which is being calculated.

Two plus two, oh I know that sounded very esoteric but it's very simple: 2 plus 2 equals 4. It hasn't, it doesn't and it never will. Two what?

Now, if you say there is a theoretical formula which has no basis in reality, called addition of 2s you would have pronounced a truth. But they teach a little kid *two plus two equals four, and we mean any two plus any two equals any four.*

Oh, no. Two girls plus two boys equals four orchestra members. [laughter] The – instantly you answer the question "What?" in an inspecific way you have insanity. So man is no higher up than an insane mathematics, so don't blame him too much for never having worked anything out.

Zero is the wildest variable that anybody ever had anything to do with, because it's simply on the basis of zero *what?* No what? That's the elementary question. Well the fellow says, *"Zero zero, of course – zero!"* You say, "Yeah, you idiot, what, what? Zero of what?" And he says, *"Zero of nothing."* [laughter] Well, you say, *"In what interesting universe is this zero of nothing? You locate it or not locate it."* He can't tell you zero of what.

So every time they accidentally enter zero into a mathematical formula they get any kind of an answer you can name, and that is nuclear physics, the mathematics thereof which they use today. And to this day they don't know when one of those confounded things is going to explode. They run their power plants by tickling the tiger's tail. They figure it all out, then they throw that in the waste basket and they walk into the laboratory and they very carefully do it empirically, by experiment. They can make an accurate guess because their formulas now have enough bugger factors in them to represent – that's what they call them – to represent what they have actually found out empirically, so they jostle these things around, so they have entered mathematics and experience close together – so therefore they can now make an estimate of what might happen but they *never follow* it. That's what's interesting. They never follow it.

The guy goes in and he takes the long rod in his hot papa suit with a big lead wall in front of him and he takes the long rod and he adjusts and adjusts and he uses a little micrometer screw of adjustment to find out just how close you can get piece of plutonium A next to piece of plutonium B and to get a current rather than a bang.

Now he knows, as the counter starts going *tick-tick-tick-tick bluh-bluh-blub*, that he's too close, so he backs it off. He didn't figure it out in mathematics at all. And they make my belly tired. They're a bunch of fakes. Somebody can say, *"Listen who's talking – yes sir, listen to who's talking, man."* They've never accomplished anything and we have.

Now, the main point I'm making here is that logic is done by you. And there are various hints that you can have to wind up with a logic. There are various hints you can have. But in the final analysis, it depends on you and *your* concept of reality. And mathematics is actually a very low-grade expression of A, R and C. Now A, R and C combined add up to understanding.
To understand anything, you have to have A: affinity; R: reality; and to be able to communicate with it, C: communication. A, R, C. Affinity, reality and communication are always necessary to understanding, and oddly enough are understanding. As far as mathematics are concerned that's understanding.

But what is doing the understanding? You are. So if the mathematician says there is no such things as a living being and he doesn't exist he has instantly dropped out of his mathematics what is using the mathematics, what asks the question and receives the answer, so he then doesn't have a mathematics. So in actual fact mathematics cannot exist without live interpretation.

Now, the mathematicians – oh, oh that's silly – says you could come along here and figure out a robot. You could figure out a robot and this robot would operate on syllogisms. You know what I mean by syllogism – Aristotelian syllogism. You know, if monkeys are like donkeys, why, then monkeys' heads are like donkeys' heads or something like this. You see, if two things are similar to each other, then two other things that they're similar to are also similar to each other. You've taken geometry, you know. Side, angle, side and all that sort of thing. Syllogism. Invented by Aristotle in a more vicious moment of his career. [laughter]

People will actually… You open up most geometry textbooks that are taught in the high schools of the United States and they say this is logic. Brother, it has nothing to do with logic. It has to do with syllogisms. It was what one thinking being – Aristotle – laid out as a method. So the final ask of the question and receipt of the answer is by a being.

You can talk about UNWACs, ENIACs – they can work on the most weird whirring wheels. They're all very clever. They're all marvelous – I'm not running them down. They're a lot of fun; but notice that something had to give it the question and something had to receive the answer. Now that could have been the most idle action in the world that there could've been use for it. But there is an interpreter. Mathematics does not exist independent of living thought.

So therefore, mathematics could be simply defined as a method of memory used by a living being to make inanimate objects or other things appear to think or appear to act. Do you follow? Now, it's very handy not to have to count the number of bricks in a side wall, but only have to count the number of bricks along the top and the number of bricks up one side and multiply the two together and have the number of bricks in that entire wall. That's great. A very proper use for mathematics. And that's almost as far as it goes. It doesn't go much further than that. You can tell how many square feet in a piece of ground. You can tell how high is a cat, by measuring him and multiplying and averaging cats. And you can do all sorts of interesting things, but remember it is always you who are asking the question and you who receive the answer.

Now, any time you escape that proposition, you immediately have permitted yourself to be overwhelmed by methodology. Now, you will be as good logically as you are Clear. And you will be able to be cause over the whole thing as much as you are OT. Because the more livingness you can exert or employ on any given subject, why, the more logical you can be about it. In fact, you run up to a point where you don't any longer need mathematics.
Now, one of the things – one of the things which has been baffling about Dianetics and Scientology is "How did he figure all this out?"

I can give you a whole lot of formulas. There were a lot of formulas and things used and so on. They find them in such early literature as Dianetics, Evolution of a Science. There are a lot of little rules of thumb which have been used. Those are shortcuts, and so on. But I haven't been at this for two minutes, you know. This is an old line. And I'm very familiar with it.

Now, it's a simple matter, it's a simple matter of A, R and C. Very simple because it's a matter of potential understanding. Now, the A, affinity, you can't stand back and hate men and then find out any reality about men. You can't have a total unreality [reality] about men, sitting in some ivory tower someplace. You know, never go out, never meet anybody, never talk to anybody, never get mixed up with pickpockets, you know, give all bandits a wide berth, never talk to headhunters. See, you can't go about it that way and have a reality on man. It's impossible.

And communication – well, you can't go about it being careful of what you say and careful of what you hear. Anybody who is easily offended had better never go into the business of understanding. Because he winds up only with prejudice. He's so offended by what he hears that of course he can understand nothing. That of course explains in a nutshell somebody who is terribly offended by Scientology. He's so offended by what he hears he can't understand anything in the first place, you see. The whole thing is his C is madly out. He can't read, he can't interpret, he can't duplicate. The whole formula you see would be out.

Now, these are the adjuncts of life and livingness. And the first thing you have to do to tackle any subject like this is to be alive. Not dead or disciplined or approved of. If you worked to be approved of all the time, you would wind up approved of. The most approved of thing I've seen around, the only time I see wogs really en masse as a common denominator gather round and go into affinity and so forth is when somebody's dead. As far as I can tell the most approved of thing in the society is something very dead.

I know the two crimes you can commit in this society is you can be there and you can communicate. Those are the two basic crimes. Notice the police say he had an alibi so he didn't do it. Well that's – they proved that he wasn't there so of course he didn't – he wasn't guilty. Be there and communicate.

Now, therefore the basis of all Scientology and Dianetic research has been understanding. Somebody tries to look for some peculiar way in which this was done, you see. They're liable to run into the answer of nothing. There's just no such answer there. It's just done because of comprehension. Association with man. Communication with him. Communication with life. Reality on existence. What is it? What isn't it? And so on. And not any vast feeling of terrific fear, or mustn't hear that and mustn't say something else. We sometimes get victimized by it. I've said something I have found, there was no particular reason to withhold this. The only thing that I withhold on any of these lines is simply when I have found something that is on the upper road that is going to make a wog awfully sick and maybe put him in a hospital. Why, I don't really care to release that generally to psychiatrists and to people in general. I don't want to see other people ill.
So, when you look over this general situation it was done by awareness, by… so on. But awareness is proportional to how alive you are. Now, I'm not trying to say I'm more alive than others. I just am. [laughs, laughter, applause]

Well, all of this, of course, is not apropos to me but is apropos to you in trying to estimate auditing and cases. The clearer you are the easier it is to do. And the reason for that is, is it's not done by any other than the most fundamental laws. And the most fundamental law in the whole field is A, R and C and this comprises understanding.

But of course you must be capable of understanding before you could start to extrapolate or figure out or develop things to do with somebody which departs from a very standardized procedure. And when you run into somebody who won't go Grade 0 Release and who can't be rehabilitated on Grade 0 Release, even though you rack up the past lives and everything else trying to find out where he went Grade 0 Release, you can't find that. You must conclude that you have a problem here where the reality must be approached rather than communication and even sometimes where it must be approached through affinity. And affinity is lower than reality in its reach down. It can exceed reality. It sounds very peculiar and I have no reason for saying that except the fact that I have had insane people who had such a dim reality that it was almost impossible and had a terrible reality on me, yet feel enough affection to – because I asked them to – go sane.

Well, you'd say that required communication – well, the tiniest fragment of communication that anybody ever heard of. I've actually seen it undercut a question concerning reality.

So that these are the three pins on which you adjust any auditing session. And all auditing sessions go by gradients. And there actually isn't really much more to it than that. If you – there are a great many things, a great many things perfectly true and so forth, I am talking now about the estimate of what you do. The estimate of what you select to do. If you are confronted with such a problem, then that problem has to be resolved in the zone of affinity, reality and communication.

Well, auditing is pretty well wrapped up. You don't have to worry too much about auditing. You're not really going to be called upon to operate on psychotic patients. The number of people that you will find who will not resolve by a little very low-level Dianetic auditing, if they can't get up to Communication Release, are so few as to be nonexistent. Because you can get down below that reality on an unconscious person, you know, just making him feel the bed or the pavement or something. He isn't even aware – not even aware of the command. You just keep touching his hand gently giving him a command touching him to pavement. He'll come out of it, see?

Rather, you don't need any particular reason in application of technology to depart one iota from what you already have laid out. As a matter of fact, as you get into the upper grades it becomes more and more serious to depart from it, because the mind happens to be put together in a certain precise way. And it's been figured out as to how it is, so why bother figuring it out?

But how about this whole zone and area called life? How about the whole zone and area of interpersonal relations? How about the zone between yourself or the organization and the world around you? Well now, we have the problems of gradients. And we have the prob-
lems of affinity, reality and communication. And that's the problems. We have the problem of interfamilial relations. Well, there are two ways to solve interfamilial relations.

The first and most effective way of solving it – the first and most effective way of solving it – is by individual processing to bring the people up to the point where they can understand each other. That doesn't even process them on the idea of being a family or on their family problems. You just process them just on the gradients and don't give it any particular attention, anything except standard processing, and you will get there and that's the best way to approach it.

It is so senior to education that I don't think I would ever give any family members advice. Ethics is there to force them, not to advise them. When they can't solve it, why you say, "Solve it, or off with your head!" you know. Person can't make any progress at all, why, you can give him a hard shove in that direction. But the other way to solve that problem, the other way to solve that problem or figure out what could be done about it, would be in the zone of affinity, reality and communication. But, of course, you're limited if you haven't anybody present to understand. Understanding is composed of affinity, reality and communication and if their affinity is low and their reality is low and their communication is nonexistent, they're not going to understand. So if they don't understand, they're not going to do it. And that's why education is unbenefficial to solve these very, very rough problems.

In handling a problem between the organization, the society around us, we keep desperately looking – or as an auditor and his environment, and so on – we keep desperately looking for some marvelous solution. Some marvelous solution where full-armed we will spring from the brain of Jove and conquer everything. And there will be peace on Earth and goodwill toward men, see? And it's got to be this marvelous solution, by which we do something inside the organization or we say something to the public or something like that. Well, stop straining your brains. Because you're dealing with this factor: There is no solution, at any time, superior to the ability of the person asking for it to understand.

There is no mathematics that could possibly work any such thing out. I don't say that mathematics shouldn't work things out and you shouldn't do things with mathematics. I get a lot of fun out of figuring how much would the propeller have to be pitched in order to make the boat go at eight knots with 161 horsepower. I think that's great. That's great. And after I've worked it all out, I usually guess at it more accurately. But I use mathematics.

And I'm not in the position, you know, of somebody who hasn't studied his mathematics. I've studied them all. Almost got expelled one time for finding a use for a dead mathematics. That was one of the wilder experiences I've ever had. It so enraged that professor he almost turned purple and pink. It was horrible. It was a dead mathematics which was totally useless and I found a use for it. And I went up and I told him very proudly and I showed him there was a use for it in aerial navigation and he almost blew his gasket. He flunked me at the end of the year. And I had to go to the Chair of Mathematics and take an examination in that mathematics that covered every tiny theorem in it. You know, one of those vicious things. I got 99 on it, and this guy – it practically ruined his teaching career – he had to pass me. But I had found a use for a mathematics which was a classical genius thing, you know, classical little thing for which there was no use.
So mathematics, we know, is sacred. But I studied this subject and I don't find it sacred. I find that mathematics is as good as it can be employed with understanding, that it's as good as the understanding of who asks and who receives the answer. And that's as good as mathematics is. And the answer to becoming better at mathematics is become clearer. The answer to any problem is to become more alive and more capable of understanding. That is the answer which pays off.

Now Scientology is a way. It is a road. There is a standard way of getting there. People do get there on that standard way, and there isn't much you have to figure out about it today. But it is a way toward greater understanding.

This world today is not expressing very much affinity or very much reality and I think it says its reality on communication is so faint to make it no communication at all. "Duz-daz-diz – the soap of the future." What they are using their communication media for – dyah! The newspaper for instance. They call it news. Why if a woman were to act like that in a village of 200 years ago they would have put her in the stocks for six months, for a vicious, malicious gossip. Never has anything good to say about anything or anybody, and that is the modern newspaper and that is communication in this society.

All you had to do is read a few stories about yourself to know how the stories on the both columns of – besides the one about you are totally felonious. Not even erroneous – felonious. That wrong.

You can absolutely count that if President Johnson is reported as having gone to Warm Springs and so forth, that he is out at the Space Port in Keokuk, you know. You can count on it. I just never did see quite as many errors made per pica of type as can be made in a modern newspaper. It's gorgeous. And yet the public thinks it's informed about things. You say, "Well, there's some tendency and so forth..." Yes, you become aware of the fact that there's a war going on someplace. They specialize in those things.

But I'll tell you, man, that 100,000 babies could've suddenly been rescued from an epidemic and all been made well miraculously overnight and the newspapers would never even mention it. Too high-toned. So the communication of this society is poor. Reality is poor. And affinity is very poor. Any time a world can be subject to wars you know very well that the affinity is rather poor.

So how do you do all this? Well, you process them. You say, well how can you get them all to stand still to process them? Well, now you're getting into OT stuff. Because you sail very easily outside the understanding and reality of beings. At along about VI you are actually departing from the zone of comprehension of the normal human being – at about Grade VI. It isn't even at – it isn't even as high as Clear. It's low, see. But that I would say would be a very, very high estimate. It's maybe even at Grade 0, see.

But you for sure, I just know for sure, you're right outside the normal reality at Grade VI, much less Clear. And you go around trying to talk to these people and educate them with data from Grade VI and you are going to fall flat on your face and I'm sure many of you have done it. So what can you do from Grade VI? If you can't feed them all data about you've all lived before, and you're this and that, and they haven't got any of the reality on any of this and they're wogged around, you know. They've come out of the night and they've seen you for a
moment and sort of looked at you and thought there might be something there, you know. And then you told them a whole bunch of data and drove them back into the night again, see.

After that cycle has been executed, you should sit down and think for a moment and say, "Wait a minute, is there something I can do from this point that would influence these people or give them better lives or bring them up the line?" And the answer is yes! Yes, there is affinity, reality and communication adding up to understanding. And it's not even difficult.

You see, it's essentially a terribly simple answer. You might say just be. But there—that has—that has value, see. If you are a high state of release and you simply are, you would just be surprised how much value that has in your immediate area. You don't have to hang up advertising signs or sandwich boards on you. People see this rather easily.

So what can you do? Well, affinity: you can feel an affinity. You can have a reality on what's going on, don't kid yourself; you see. Don't let your affinity overwhump your reality, see. You don't say—you don't say, "I've got to feel good toward man so I must not see all of the evil things he does." No, feel good toward him and see the evil things he does—very elementary. And as far as communication is concerned, just never allow him the luxury of cutting you back from communicating. And you've done it. Because out of that combination will come an understanding and you will understand what he is all about. Understanding is a sort of a total solvent. It's the universal solvent. It washes away everything.

So you see, you actually are not in a position as you go up in the line, to educationally reform the society in which you find yourself. You actually err when you tell them any more than—and we commit these errors—but tell them any more than they need in order to know that there is a way there. That there is a way they can travel and there is a road out. Now, that becomes possible. There is a way. Now, when you communicate to them more than that, you've simply so bedazzled their understanding and they've gone blind over the whole thing. Because you actually are deficient in understanding what they can understand.

So the final analysis of "What can an organization do in the society around"—the most fundamental and basic thing that it can do is found in the triangle of affinity, reality and communication. It can have a reality on the world around it. It can have an affinity that will not be alloyed or destroyed because of various acts of men. And it must continue to communicate. But communication, remember, is always within the reality of the person who can hear it.

Now, it is perfectly true that there exist strata so far above the reality of man, and so demonstrable actually directly to him—he couldn't miss seeing a wall fall down, don't you see, or a bowl of fruit move through the air. He couldn't miss this, you know. It would baffle him. Now you run into the possibility of throwing him into awe, worship, religious frenzy. Because you've now overwhumped him and so he assigns his reality—it is some wild assignment and he goes to pieces under it. This has happened many times in the past.

So, if you take that line, you have to be extremely careful not to throw him into a frothing fit. Because, actually, instead of leading him toward greater understanding, you have depressed him into a total unreality.
So how do you handle man and handle a situation? Well, to stand there in a body which is vulnerable to bullets; to have an identity which can be advertised or flaunted; to in various ways go on being intentionally vulnerable; you can check the degree that you can afford to be understanding or to comprehend the situation around.

It's all right to be so understanding. You can see why this guy just got through hooking the beans, but the truth of the matter is as long as you have anything to protect, you must, of course, at the same time while understanding why he hooks the beans and that he is hooking the beans, you also have to prevent him from doing so.

So the net solution to the problem is that you are limited to the degree that you are vulnerable. But you become less and less vulnerable the more and more you are capable of understanding.

Now, of course, vulnerability ceases at the moment when you can't be personally injured. But then that is simply a state of case. You have gotten up to this state of case.

Now, what I am talking to you about might sound like it's very old and you've heard it all before and so on. But you actually at this time are facing a crisis in Scientology. It is right around the corner. It is just over the tip of the hill. And the crossroads is simply: Do we get so tired of them, we just overwhump 'em? Or do we stay true to our own beliefs in continuing to suffer the slings and arrows which are thrown at us, still go on in a high state of ARC? This is a very interesting proposition. And of course there is no arguing with it. The greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics is the optimum solution.

But this is a time in the history of Dianetics and Scientology when this question begins to stir. What are we going to do? With the planet? Not how are we going to fight down a newspaper proprietor. You notice these governments lose. They lose. The questions are not how are we going to prevent bad press, any more than it's how are we going to cure all the insane people in the society simultaneously by dropping a pellet in the water supply system, or some other idiotic thing, you see. That's not the question. The question is what are we going to do. There are various things which we can do. And we're on a very gingerly point here. We're on a point where we could go wrong and a point where we could go right. Because at this particular time our power exceeds our understanding.

Now, it won't exceed it very much or very far, but the reason it does this is very simple. It isn't that people are going to do a lot of things bad. But when you're trying to keep a bridge open and you're trying to keep a way open for a lot of people, and those people are still vulnerable and can be attacked and so on, you tend to take protective measures or you tend to plan protective measures or worry about this type of thing.

If it were just yourself the answer would be very easy, don't you see? So it comes up to a question. And there is no mathematics under the sun that will solve it except those which are inherent in the development of Scientology. And those that are inherent in the development of Scientology, of course are such things as, A, R and C add up to understanding. They are various axioms, they are various data.
So we are at this interesting point in our history – is what are we going to do with the planet? Because the last thing in the world I want is any more administration. I'm awful tired of administration. There's nobody going to get me in on administration.

So, nobody wants the planet. [laughter] But a hurricane is in actual fact a soft summer wind compared to the amount of power which is now becoming available in Scientology. The direction of that power, its utilization and so on, will inevitably work out for the greatest good of the greatest number of dynamics. This is inevitable. The main question then is how does it work out with the minimum number of casualties? But we are right at that point of the road which all of you at one time or another have sensed. What are we going to do if…? What are we going to do when…?

Well, we're at that point of the road and I don't pretend at this particular moment to have any answer to it. There's no figured out answer to it at all. In the first place, I'm too far out of ARC with Victoria state. Joke.

But we are in the interesting position today – the interesting position today of having been yapped at, shouted at, booted around, attacked, reviled, ridiculed and so forth, and holding in the palm of our hand the answer to all the tomorrows this planet will ever have. That's one of the most fantastic situations that anybody ever heard of.

Man is sitting out there without the faintest inkling – or maybe he does have and that's why he is screaming. But the main point of all this is – is we are at that point where we have Clears. They're being achieved, people are moving forward up to OT. The more a person develops, his understanding increases. His affinity, reality – sense of reality – and his communication ability increase. The amount this can be increased is almost infinite.

Now, we have the answer in that our understanding itself will of course pilot the way and all that sort of thing. We can logicize ourselves into a somnolence about this whole thing. But we're at a crossroads. And at this particular crossroads I don't have any really ready answer. No canned answer to suddenly give you, on a silver platter, of exactly what we are going to do. I have already explored various lines and so on for the eventual salvage of Scientology in the event of an international cataclysm before we really got there. I've been working on that for about six months. And I got that pretty well taped. Scientology won't perish because of some convulsion in the northern hemisphere. And our processing and so on is moving along the line. Our results are fabulous. It's a 1, 2, 3 proposition today.

And sitting there auditing a preclear up through the Grades, I suppose in every preclear you are facing this same question. As his power increases, what do we do? Well, probably his good sense will dictate what is to be done and our good sense undoubtedly will go on dictating it. I think we have been fantastically forbearing. Now, it is only hoped that our reality on the situation doesn't degenerate as a point of connection, don't you see, to a point where it no longer matters what happens to the little guy.

But we as a group have achieved an historical point which probably should go down resoundingly in history. We are governmentally, and so forth, very unacceptable and they depend completely and utterly upon our goodwill. It's a fantastic position for any group to be in. Every religious organization of the past, every group of betterment and so forth of the past has flunked this test. I just hope we don't.
Thank you very much.
STATES OF IDENTITY

A lecture given on 8 September 1966

Thank you.
Thank you.
What's the date?

*Audience: Eighth of September 1966.*

Eighth of September AD 16. And what did you say it was? She forgets I have hyper-sonic OT perception now, you know. [laughter, laughs]

Well, it just shows you, it just shows you, this has been quite a rush getting down here. I've put in two research sessions and administration and half a dozen other things. I even had a moment to eat. I'm still eating, unfortunately. I've more or less knocked off sleeping – that seems to be a waste of time. I put the body in bed but nothing happened. [laughs, laughter] But – and here I am ready to give you a lecture without any slightest idea of what to talk to you about. [laughs]

I have some announcements to make, stand up and take a bow. New students to the Special Briefing Course: Lory Wood. Bob Cath. Nick Nickels, Edith Nickels. And new students on the Solo Audit Course who may or may not be present on the room: Eddy Wooderson. And for goodness sick, George Seidler. And then we have some new students on the Dianetics Course: John Mumford. Ted Dunn. Margaret Smith van Gulder and Dwide Battho.

And it's been a very bad week on the Clearing Course, we only made one Clear – not been done in the history of the universe but we did one anyway. Peggy Bengston [applause] There's a clear – looking Clear. [laughs, laughter] Very good, very good, not that the other Clears don't look Clear. [laughter]

Well, I'd better talk to you today about states of – I hesitate to say beingness because we go below that state – states of identity, I suppose. The presence or dim consciousness or wiggleness that passes for a life. [laughter, laughs] I don't know that you've ever had a clarification – had a clarification of these because the truth of the matter is that the – there is a boundary, apparently, when you don't have thetans but have endowment. And there are living wiggles which have endowment without any thetan present, apparently. Now, I wasn't particularly talking about psychiatrists. [laughter, laughs] You know, they aren't even endowed, but anyway…

---
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Now, the amoeba and the monocell and the cellular form is apparently an endowed thing. OT comes along and says, "Let there be chicken," you know. That's about where all that fit. And he endows this and he leaves a sort of a puddle of theta to continue to animate it, you see. Does a few quick tricks with the – you can't say, "fingers" and you get an endowment. And that apparently is the way which you get cells. That isn't factual, from a standpoint of experience or anything like that. I don't mean that there's data available here by which we've suddenly animated matter. But it more or less is a conceptual basis on which bodies are built. And somebody mocks it up and somebody else can keep it running. But there is something to this old gag of they say, they go out and say hello to the flowers, you know, and they grow better. Well, at a very, very low state that would not be possible, of course, a person isn't able to reach that far. But they sort of have a dim idea that they could do it, you see. Because way, way back someplace they probably did. So they go out and say hello to the flowers.

Now, every once in a while you get some gardener who when he says hello to the flowers they really do go boom! You see? A green thetan, you know. [laughter, laughs] But you'll find as one comes down scale that certain abilities tend to be retained and certain fantastic abilities are occasionally exhibited, like poltergeist and such things. And no less a person than Jung was so troubled with poltergeists that he couldn't explain that it got him into psychoanalysis. And then because psychoanalysis couldn't explain why bookcases and so forth went bust in his vicinity, you know, clocks would split down the middle and bureaus would blow up and other weird things would happen in his immediate vicinity. And he knew something was doing it. And psychoanalysis couldn't solve this for him so he squirreled. And you have Jungian analysis and so on. He didn't solve it either.

But he did, by the way, if I remember rightly, go into past lives, but he only went into one strata of past life – druidism, here in England. And he was a great believer in this sort of thing.

But here is an isolated thetan ability, you see, is being able to affect matter in his immediate vicinity, no longer under his control but still manifesting. Now, you'll have somebody, I suppose, who is a gee-whizzer telepathically. He's all gone to pieces and he blubbers soup down his vest, but he's a telepathic gee-whizzer, you know. When he thinks "X" why, boy, they get "X," you know. Then you get – you get various abilities, then, tend to remain intact or not particularly blunted and also you could say that anything that is wrong with a thetan is the lower harmonic of what he can do up at the upper scale. When that goes wrong his ability in it becomes sort of inverse, you know, and/or it goes out of his control and still happens in his vicinity like Jung, and puzzles the living daylights out of him. But it's just a little tiny facet of his ability which has been brought down scale with him. And this one hasn't been eaten up yet.

Every once in a while you see a little kid, he sits down at the piano and plays Brahms. Well, all right, that's very easy to invalidate because the kid doesn't know he's doing it. So you see these boy wonders and that sort of thing tend to fold up in their very, very early life. They are playing with the Chicago Philharmonic and the next thing you know, why, they couldn't play with the local kindergarten ping pan orchestra, see. Because it's not under their control. But it is an ability. He's had a musical ability, he's carried it along with him and it hasn't to-
tally faded out, and he probably has been a very expert and excellent musician in the very near past. But this ability isn't gone. But you start chopping him up on it or asking this burning, suppressive question, "Now, how do you do that?" you know. And he starts maybe taking over his automaticity (that is, unconscious action) and he all of a sudden goes poof; and he doesn't know one end of the piano from the other.

I have personal experience with this when I had a cousin who did just that and was playing his own compositions with the Chicago Philharmonic when he was nine years old. He's gone over the jumps and he studied the hard way and he's now a very good jazz musician. But he managed to sort of take over the automaticity and come through it somehow. Very often, they just go up in smoke.

Now, a closer acquaintance, knowing this, and one of the things when you know data of this particular character you can handle situations like this when they turn up. Diana’s always able to sit down to a piano and sound like a combination of Debussy and Mozart and Paderewski, all wound up in one, you know. Doesn't know what she's playing. Every once in a while she plays – composes one of her own compositions and you sit there and listen to Paderewski, you know. But they were at her to a point where they were forcing her to read music. Well, of course, the music that they were forcing her to learn how to read was not the music she knew how to read; music has changed over a period of the past. And she was very cross about all this. And she refused to learn how to read music, she refused to learn anything about music. And I finally kidded her along and eased her along and said it wasn't important to learn, you see, and took the tension off of the thing and she finally did learn how to read music and play some music. And she can still sound like Paderewski. You get the idea.

So if you know what's happening, if you've got some idea of what's happening – now, you've probably yourself had the experience of accomplishing something rough – rather, "My God, how did I do that?" You know, suddenly surprise yourself by doing something or other and you sort of caught your left hand out of your pocket, you know, and hastily put it back.

But these do not make – that phenomena does not make a state of case because it can occur at any point in the – in state of beingness down to where there is no life at all, there is merely – I mean it's endowed life, no thetan. See, that's liable to occur anyplace. So you can find that in an insane asylum and you can find it amongst normals, the states of beingness, you can find it amongst geniuses and it doesn't necessarily make a genius. You can find it on the upper scale. But when you start into the upper scale it's started to come under somebody's control. And for a little while you're liable not to get it as spectacular. You – if you were a gee-whizzer on – with a longbow, as you go up scale don't be at all surprised if one day you pick up the longbow and you say, "What's this thing?" and point the arrow at your chest, you know, and get all grease-fingered with the whole thing. We had an expert archer do this over in the United States. He was actually, I think, a national or international champion, I've forgotten which. And they were running him on Spotting Spots in Space and all of a sudden – the next time he went out on the archery range all of a sudden he was standing there with six arrows watching six arrows go simultaneously and he couldn't do anything about it at all. But he came through this, they flattened the process and he got back his skill.
But this can happen. This can happen that a skill that you're very fond of but don't know how you've got it can suddenly go up in smoke. And all you have to do – all you have to do if it's in the process of getting Clear, something like that, well, be patient, you will get to a point where you can do it. But this time it is you that can do it.

Now, if we exempt – if we exempt then endowed states of wiggle, if we exempt that, then we get down how far down can a thetan go. Well, someplace in the insect or animal kingdom, someplace in there, below that you have wiggle and above that you have thetans. Now, I every once in a while run into a horse, for instance, who is a being. And you every now and then run into a horse who isn't. You get it? And once in a while I suppose you'd run into a bee who was and a bee who wasn't. You get the idea? There's a boundary there. Now, when nothing much is required of the animal or insect – he doesn't have to be very smart, do you see, but just kind of has to do what he sees other things doing or react in some way – you can get survival as just a piece of automatic machinery. It's unchanging in its habit pattern and so forth. And it actually is a piece of automatic machinery that is some kind, apparently, of a shadow of a thetan because a thetan made it. Do you see? He knows how it ought to work, so he made it. Now, where that boundary is, is again no great interest to us. But you occasionally find it in the human race. And this is a great baffler. You get some vegetables around and, by golly, people worry themselves silly.

Now, once in a while you get a very spectacular change in a vegetable because some thetan without a home picks it up, do you see? A body – a body can live, you see, in the absence of a thetan, that is the test of the thing. Doesn't do well, but it can live. But when it has been totally, totally, guided by a thetan and then the thetan is no longer there, it of course is not on any automatic pattern that it will go on and function. Do you see? So the unknown or involuntary or – I think it's voluntary – actions of the body, the muscular actions and organ functions and that sort of thing – a thetan, in actual fact, doesn't have anything to do with those. That's a built function that is going on and it develops; it's sort of like you build a fire and you make the fire bigger, you know. And it can grow and it goes a certain period of time and it does this and that.

Therefore, it is very remarkable to hear the human race adjudicating whether or not something works as to whether or not it does something for the body. It, frankly, has very little to do with the being, you see. The being can cave a body in and to the degree that a being has caved a body in, then the body will not do well. See, if the being, the thetan, who has got ahold of this body is also caving the body in, then the body won't do well. But it will only get as good as you take away his caving it in.

Now, it's a commentary on the human body that the mammal has a greater life span that is six times the rate of growth – six times the rate of growth is the usual mammal – is the span of its life. In other words, if it took it twenty years to grow up and it attained full growth, why then, it would be 120 years old the time it kicked the bucket. That is the factor which exists in the animal kingdom and it does not exist in man. Well, it takes man – man should go, I think to something like 110 or 120 or 130 years old and he doesn't, he quite commonly kicks the bucket at 50. Of course, we're living in a highly specialized period just now where I think they've got life expectancy on an overall average up to 59 or something of this sort. But – and a lot of it goes to 70 and so on. But that's short.
Now, the reason for that – you see there's good and bad sides to coins, and the reason for that is because the human body is pretty uniformly driven by a thetan, except for the vegetable bits that you see in some institutions and so on. Now, this is a – this is a remarkable thing that as a society becomes more and more aberrated it becomes more sick and then if the – if the thetans running the body become aberrated, why then the body becomes very sick.

Now, quite in addition to that, there is a thing that you could say, disease. There are various things that upset the automatic or endowed cell. There are various other automatic endowments that somebody has put around that will upset and influence the automatic endowments which have been set up. Do you follow? Just as one type of insect is designed to eat another type of insect, so that you can have an endowed cell that is designed to eat other endowed cells. Do you follow? So that it shouldn't worry anybody that you cure up a thetan and the body does not get well. You see, now, you've got a variety of choices here. You've got the illnesses that the body suffers from because it is being messed up by a thetan whose intention and aberration is influencing his physical body. See, but that's only part of the picture. Now, that body will get as well as you relieve the aberration of the thetan in those sectors and quarters where the thetan was causing the body to get sick. Do you understand that? All right. Now, therefore, you should not approach the subject of healing on the idea that all that's wrong with the body is the beingness or the mind, do you see? That isn't all that's wrong with a body. And you can get very, very, very optimistic about what you can do.

But after you see a few miracles, why then you can get optimistic and you begin to believe that you could heal everything from a psychosomatic basis. No, there's this entirely different segment. There is the – you might say, endowed life units which are designedly contrary to the body's life units and we could call that, oh, lots of things, call it disease, they call it germs, we could call it this or we could call it that. And then there is physical – physical injury. You hit a body with a battering ram and it doesn't much matter what state of existence the thetan is in, the body is going to go splash, do you see?

Now, if a body is badly guided you get it getting smashed often. So you can fix up somebody to a point where he doesn't have many accidents. But to say that he isn't going to have any, says he must be therefore living in a totally cleared environment and I haven't noticed that on this planet, do you see? Now, if he were good enough and if he were an OT, after the body went splat, he could mock up another body in its place or repair it. Now, you've got another factor involved, you've got the repairing ability of the being. Now, here's a new element which has entered in. See, this isn't quite the simple picture of all you have to do is run the engram and instantly, why, the guy will grow two heads, you see. That won't happen in all cases. [laughter, laughs] You get – you get a state, then, where somebody is actively knocking apart a body, why, that body is going to be knocked apart. And when you relieve his aberration then the body will come back to battery, you see – it'll come back to the point that it could come back to by itself if somebody stopped knocking it apart. Do you see? That's how well he can get. Now, we'd have to go up scale from that and we'd get somebody who could put a body back together again. So that would be, then, an entirely different proposition than bodies being bodies.

So this divides, then, into three sections of attack upon a body, which is endowed life attacking the endowed life of the body. You know, cell versus cell, you know? And then the
aberration of the thetan who is the driver or the runner of the body, influencing the body and, of course, you get then a thetan who would be in terrifically good shape, able to more or less patch the body back up or affect or directly influence the body. You'd get those three stages with regard to illness. And of course, accident — the more aberrated a person is, well, the more accidents he'll get into. But to expect a zero accident level would be quite impossible.

So there are certain things — again counter-development, you know, endowed life units which can influence endowed life units. And selectively this can be worked out so that you can get something like penicillin which influences a disease germ. See, but you can also get some *cillins* that don't affect the disease germ but just knock the guy off. Every once in a while they find somebody who's allergic to penicillin. Well, what's happened there is the endowed life form of the body is being attacked, not the germ which is attacking it.

Now, here is in actual fact an endowed life form such as a mold from which penicillin is made, attacking an endowed life form which we call a germ, to prevent it from attacking an endowed life form, the cell of the body. Now, that's a sphere of healing. And then there is physical damage and physical injury and that is repaired by surgery. And surgery really isn't able to repair very much very permanently by cutting out endowed life forms that attack the endowed life. But we're getting into a — you know, I mean, they're like a tumor, something like that. They go just so far with these things. They can attack nonmalignant forms but once they start whistling on somebody, you know, they get too enthusiastic, you see. Your guy — your guy with the syringe, he's in there and he tells you that that syringe can cure anything, see. He's on an "all" basis. And the fellow that's going around there sharpening up his knife and whistling, why, I don't know if they use hones in surgeries now, but probably do. Knives must get pretty dull, they're always trying to be sure. Let's take a little more to be sure.

And this — these birds — these birds they're going into neurosurgery and they think that if they cut up somebody's brains he'll cease to be aberrated. You see, they're adrift. They do have a sphere where they can demonstrate their ability, they do have this sphere. They can operate on somebody and take a bullet out; they can operate on somebody, they can reset a leg. They can even cut out a nonmalignant tumor, something like this and salvage somebody. This is no reason why they can cure human aberration or disease germs with a knife. See, but they'll tell you they can.

Now, don't you fall into the error, then, of believing all you've got to do is process out a being's aberration and you will instantly then have a total recovery that doesn't need any surgery and doesn't need any penicillin. Because you'd look just as silly as the neurosurgeon trying to operate on somebody's skull to cure his fear of spiders. When in actual fact — actual fact why he's scared of spiders because he's got an automatic spider mocker-upper and it mocks up spiders for him, that's all. You could run that out, don't you see? So here are in actual fact various zones of operation and as long as you're not able to endow matter with life, then you have to settle for what you've got — which is to say the body with which you are living — or do without one. Both of these, by the way, are not illogical and not difficult. And when I'm shrugging into a jacket and so forth, I generally have a long sigh over the idea of having to put a jacket on me. This seems to be rather peculiar and so on. It's much easier to put a jacket on an effigy, you know, something like that, and let the valet dust off the effigy
and so forth and after a while you've got to go someplace and they come by and pick up the effigy, [laughter] properly dressed for the occasion.

But you see, the fact that there are other states of beingness and other things that can occur, you get a variation of what can be wrong with beings or with bodies and you have to study it out – what are you looking at? And the way to separate it out – are you looking at two endowed life forms countering each other or are you looking at pure mechanical injury, you know, guy broke his leg, or are you looking at something the thetan is doing to the body? And in the last sphere you're just a little bit kingpin, you're just a little bit better off than the other two. They're needed in quick emergencies but the truth of the matter is the thetan is, particularly with a service facsimile in place, is quite capable of preventing a body from recovering.

So you could operate as an adjunct to the befores and afters of these other two facts. In other words, the endowed life form curing it and sorting those out, and accident and injury. You could come in before the fact and fix the fellow up so he wasn't so caved in, he was in pretty healthy condition, so he really didn't get attacked by the counter-endowed form, see. Or you could fix him up so he didn't have accidents. You could better – you could better the percentages on this and you could come along after the fact and take away the traumatic or mental image picture result of having had an accident or an illness and speed up his healing to the degree that he, as a thetan, was preventing it from happening, do you see? So you can come before and after this fact and your only mistake is to come in it. You can make a mistake, you see. This guy is out there bleeding from the femoral artery and you start running the engram of the accident, he's going to run out of blood awful quick and you're not going to be able to get the engram out and get him up to OT before he bleeds to death. Do you see?

Now, the truth of the matter is, if there were no time involved in the thing, yes, injured, you could probably process him all the way up; it would take him a year or two or three, and you get him processed all the way up to OT where he could mock up another body, but you're going to do that anyway. So why not put a tourniquet on him in the first place. You see?

These considerations – these considerations stem from the fact that beings do tend to an allness. They do tend to an allness. They believe that – you'll find somebody, he's sold on some kind of cough medicine, you know, and this medicine will cure anything. He's just the greatest cure-anythinger, man is, that you ever heard of, you know. You give him a sponge and say this has magic properties because once it had holy water squeezed out of it and he goes running around and he says he'll cure anything with it.

You think this is a – you think this is a joke but it isn't a joke. Actually, that was the state of healing on this planet for almost a thousand years. They had a saint's knucklebone and that would cure anything, from fallen arches to wifelessness to anything under the sun. And you'd hear them – you'd hear them in their places wondering how on Earth they could get a relic – how they could get a relic so that they could work enough miracles in the area to make Christians out of people. And it all depended on getting this relic. Well, the allness is associated with the relic. They fully expected that when they got that relic then they would be able to cure everything that happened anywhere in that community. And this would set them up on top. Well, of course, they could cure anything that could be cured by restimulating the cura-
tive abilities of a thetan, if they existed. So if you somehow or other, by showing them a knucklebone could make them suddenly realize that there was greater power available or something that could snap them back to battery, every once in a while you'd have a miracle. You can have the same miracles and you get them about at the same frequency, because it's a mental reaction that is causing the miracle. It's not the intervention of Zeus from Olympus or something.

Now, faith healing has a tendency to restore one, on one part – would have a tendency to restore temporarily or momentarily, the ability of the individual to do something with the body. In other words, you're playing with maybe an OT characteristic, do you see? And every once in a while you get a faith healer who comes walking down the road and he says, "Zingo-bango" or something of the sort and he has not lost the ability to endow things with life or change the life endowment in a form, you see? But this is a two-edge sword, because every once in a while when a body was endowed by Thetan A, when Thetan B comes along and puts some anchor points in it or something like that, it gets sicker. If you don't believe it, take your own body and start stuffing little stars around the eyes in place of the little stars you see there.

You see little tiny gold balls around the eyes if you look. Well, just throw those out and put your own in and you're going to have yourself a ball. And just to complete the thing, why, throw yours away and get the other ones back and it'll work all right.

I'm not now talking weirdly – I mean, that's actually happened. You can, a thetan can do that. But anyway, there are a lot of things that man didn't know about beingness and life. As a consequence, he makes fantastic mistakes and I'm just trying to ask you not to make the same mistakes. There isn't any particular reason why you should feel yourselves bound in any way by the zones and areas of man's healing abilities. You'll exceed those. But where you're thinking along this line, why, for heaven's sake recognize man's limitations with regard to it, recognize that they are not necessarily yours but that they are man's limitations with regard to this.

Now, this means that you have to have some understanding of states of beingness. And when you have a thetan who is very, very, very caved-in he's on a reverse, he's on a reverse. He is – anything which he can do, he's not doing but it is being done. Do you see that? And that is modified by the fact that he's lost some of the abilities to have even that happen. In other words, he is the effect of his own cause totally unknowing, totally gone, see. He wouldn't have a clue. He has a ball of fire hit him in the stomach and he goes out right away and prays to the local tribal god because he's been afflicted. Well, he has to go one awful long way up scale before he actually realizes that he hit himself in the stomach with that ball of fire. And actually he has to go so far up – just don't minimize this distance because it's the distance from wog to Clear, it's a long way.

So by estimating that, reestimate how far down he can go. Well, he can go an awful long way down. He can go down to being the effect of the effect of the effect of the effect of himself. To try to explain it to somebody that he is doing all this himself and expect anything to happen beyond a cave-in, you see – he is just completely beyond his ability to comprehend.
Now, when you get a body which is animated by a thetan as different than a body which is simply endowed and somebody says, "Go on and walk now," you know. Kls-kls-kls. "Hey, it walks. Look it. Pretty cute, Joe. Huh? Bet you can't make one that good." You go into a fringe which is way below being oneself or being conscious, one is sort of automatically awake, you know, and automatically existing, no responsibility for him either being alive, awake, alert or existing. And then just below that it goes into unconsciousness and if you can imagine a fellow going unconsciousness from a fact that he isn't even a clue that he is conscious and recognize there's a state below that where he can be unconscious, why, you're getting down into the very lower dregs and to the upper strata of the human race. Anyway… it's the truth.

Now, that is what you are working with. You are working with somebody who automatically goes unconscious from an automatic consciousness. He hasn't a clue of what he is. He is a removed something, see. He is an identity; he is a Joe Jones. Now, he is a body, he is a body. You read man's textbooks and it says "thinking is done by the brain," you know. It's crazy. He thinks he's the body. He thinks he is no better than endowed life. And he is. He can be picked up from that point quite remarkably. He could be picked up rather rapidly as a matter of fact to a state of Grade 0, and never sneer at that, man, that's quite a distance. Now, his ability to be alert – his ability to be alert at Grade 0 is still not up to causative alertness or causative unalertness. You see, he isn't up to where he's saying, "Now, I'm going to be alert, pang!" You know? "Now, I'm going to be unalert, bong." See? He doesn't do that. He finds himself awake today, you see, and he finds himself groggy today.

Now, what's the difference here? What common denominator is there to his increase of beingness? Well, he is less the effect of cause as he improves and if he were getting worse he would be more the effect of cause. Now, that's not only his own cause, but that's other causes around him. Now, he's less – as he improves he is less the effect of causes. And as he deteriorates and goes downhill, why, he becomes more and more and more the effect of causes. And you will see a person who is having an awful hard time who's getting down around the "I'm a brain," you know, worries himself silly. He hears a pin drop in Keokuk, you see, and that a pin has dropped in Keokuk, of course, means that he is going to have an immediate assault upon his life because, of course, he is the effect of anything so therefore, he is the effect of anything that occurs anyplace. You get a newspaper, it says there is a train wreck in Poughkeepsie, and the fellow's down in South Africa or something, you see. He isn't affected by this train wreck, they don't even have the same companies or use the same equipment or anything else. And he'll sit there and worry about train wrecks, you know. Because he might be the effect of train wrecks.

In other words, he's likely to conceive himself to be the effect of anything that happens. Well, now, to safeguard himself he can go down scale from that point so that he doesn't worry anymore about it. And sort of go into a philosophy that he doesn't exist and isn't worth anything and so therefore it doesn't matter what he is the effect of because he isn't anything anyhow and somehow or another it won't happen maybe.

Now, he can go below that into faith. See, he can get down to a point where, "I have an automatic regulator so I don't have to be alert in any way, shape or form. I have an automatic regulator of my destiny, see. And I don't have to be alert in any way, shape or form.
about anything of any kind because something someplace is taking care of me. And if it weren't, I would be, of course, the effect of all these things, so that's a good thing that I have something someplace taking care of me."

Now, individuals will mock this up for themselves. I wasn't talking about religions particularly, they'll mock up these things for themselves. They'll mock up the god "Throgmagog" that'll give him all kinds of advice and tell them what to do and all that sort of thing. And they don't even know they're mocking up Throgmagog. At this point, however, you have a person who is totally irresponsible. Now, when this person goes down scale, when he goes down scale, why, he's got to release further responsibility for anything that happens to him and just sort of go numb. And this is a horrible place to go to because he now can become the subject of any number of automaticities. And when they turn on then he is what we normally call "insane" see, irresponsible, but any kind of a triggered automaticity might trigger him into almost anything, see. And the average of the human race is about a quarter of an inch above that. And that's why you don't have people in sudden overwhelming comprehension of what you're doing when you try to talk to them. And you'll find out that there are some people that will listen to you and some people won't.

Well, it is the state of beingness of the person that determines whether or not he will listen to you. Now, this odd phenomenon occurs: An individual, asked to look at his mind as causative or even the – even as an effect, gets into a state of such terror or anxiety, rather than to look into himself or recognize himself in any way at all that he instantly goes frenziedly mad, just literally that, see. It's hard to explain by keeping it in that frame of reference.

But supposing we were sitting around in an arena and they let in a hungry man-eating tiger. And you said to Joe, sitting alongside of you who was never noted for his courage – no long political background, you know! – [laughter] and you said to Joe, "Now Joe, jump over the railing there and wrassle with him for a while." Or "Put him back in his cage," or something like this. But "Jump over the railing there and have to do with this tiger" And he would think you were joking at first. But when you start forcing him to jump over the railing and you're going to throw him over the railing, you would have a rather terrified, fighting, snarling, screaming individual who is liable to say most anything. You get that state of mind? All right, when you tell Joe Aloysius Suppressive to look at his mind you're producing exactly the same effect as telling him to jump over the rail and wrassle with a man-eating tiger. It is so terrifying to him to look at breakfast this morning for fear of what he would find. Because he knows what's going to happen to him. He's going to get his block knocked off. See, by accident one time he looked inside and he's never been sane since, something like that, you know.

And he just goes into a nyowwwwwwwww! You have a reporter. You're not – they're not arguing with you as to whether or not Scientology works or doesn't work or is valid or isn't valid. And they're not trying to disprove it; they're not trying to disprove it so that people will think badly of it. There's no doubt in their mind whatsoever but what you could make them do things and it terrifies them. And quite in addition to this – quite in addition to this, why, you're liable to, he knows, trigger him off in some way so that he will go mad. That's what they talk to you all the time: "Isn't it dangerous – isn't it dangerous for people to look at their minds," you know, "isn't it dangerous? Isn't it – it is, isn't it? We have some psychiatrist that says it is. Tell me it doesn't work." And they think they're proving themselves as public bene-
factors by discrediting it so people won't look at it and thus have to look at their minds and look at their beingness and look at their track and look at their yesterdays, you follow?

But that, completely aside from somebody else becoming more powerful, is the thing which spurs that reaction. You talk to somebody sometime, you've had the experience. You say, "Oh well, this thing called Scientology and actually you can communicate better," and so forth, "all you have to do is confront your life a little bit and do something with the mind, improve the mind slightly." Fellow looks at you and he just suddenly goes, "Arghh, well, isn't that that terrible fellow, Hubbard, and isn't that awful. Awful, isn't it pretty awful, I don't see why you do such a thing. Why do you do such things? Isn't it true that you boil babies and eat them alive and so forth and argh-argh-argh-arghh." He's a terrible risk if you just said, "Look at your mind. Look at your mind." [laughter] He'll go into a screaming fit.

Now you see, he is below being able to be the effect of anything, even an automaticity. So that when you bring him up scale the first thing he has to confront that he might possibly be the effect of, a thing called the mind. And right away he goes spin and he actually goes a bit insane. Those people are below the average level and are below the level of insanity. If they came up scale they'd go mad, you see. But they're walking around all right. As long as they're just in a total automaticity as they walk through their daily lives, they know they won't be insane. And they take some tranquilizers, and the doctors, and so forth, and they're depending on somebody else, and somehow or other they'll go through their lives. "No, I didn't go mad today, you know." [laughter, laughs]

Now, that is the being that tries to give you a beating by criticizing you for helping your fellows. You can't criticize anybody for trying to help his fellow man, trying to help himself. Anybody who tries it is insane. Yes, that's right, they're insane. But that's why they're insane. They're well below the level to be the effect of anything, the good effect or bad effect. Anything is a terrible effect, see. So they have to be an automatic thing which has an automatic effect. Actually, they're Qing-and-Aing with an endowed cell along about that point. But because they can come up scale, you in your presence can bring them up scale. And when you're Clear you will notice the phenomenon around you that every once in a while you'll be talking to somebody or just sitting and looking at somebody and a guy's body will start going all twitchy and vrrrrooom, and he'll start looking like a corkscrew and you'll ask your friend after the fellow leaves, "It's too bad he has Saint Vitus' dance," well, he never did that before in all his life. Do you see? Now, you're up to the point where your ability to endow is on automatic. Now, you start going on up toward OT and, of course, that comes under "control."

But what's interesting here is that there was a way up and a road out. But it normally would never have been pursued because philosophers are more or less thoughtful types. And they are noted, some of them, for – messiahs and so on are noted for going and getting themselves killed and martyred for their beliefs and so forth. But very few philosophers actually stand up very strongly when the firing squad starts marching down the streets, you know. Not even Voltaire did. He sort of talked reasonably.

But what you have – when you have a breakthrough like this it's usually a do-or-be-damned sort of a breakthrough; it isn't made in a scholarly fashion, it is made more or less as
a "Well, to hell with it," you know, "here goes nothing," you know. You have to have a guy that will drive a car 190 miles an hour if it'll go that fast, you know, on a rainy night.

The – a person to follow up the line of Scientology would have to be either tremendously reassured in a very quiet environment for a considerable period of time if he was terribly bad off; you see. I'm not now even talking about the insane, I'm talking about more or less what's accepted as normal. He'd have to be calmed down pretty much and be in pretty good shape and then you could probably get him to confront something. You see? That's why you have a failure going out here and selecting people for pcs, you know, but the percentage is not high. But the percentage does exist, and because it isn't high is no reason you shouldn't do it. See? Because it isn't high, why don't let that make you cease to try. You're in actual fact collecting on the planet the upper 10 percent of the upper 10 percent of the planet. You're not collecting anything more than that.

Now, when you've got that, when you've got the upper 10 percent of the upper 10 percent, why, then there's some possibility that you could insert enough influence on the environment – a possibility, but an understatement, horrible understatement – whereby, you could calm the environment down so that people would disenturbulate to a point where they could more easily confront, do you see? And there is the secret.

You never want to treat the insane. The insane should have a nice, quiet courtyard to sit in with a still object in it someplace and be fed regularly with nobody worrying them at all, for quite a period of time. You'd find out that there is no cure for the insane. There is no cure for it. You can, however, get the guy to – down to his level of confront. What can he confront? He can confront being still in a still environment. He can confront one solid, stable object or something like this in his environment. And you can then let him destimulate, disenturbulate and he will go sane on you, see. There's no – not even any reason to work at it, no reason to work at it at all. Now, to throw him through the engram that makes him insane, well, he hasn't got an engram that makes him insane. He can very often run engrams and that sort of thing. But he doesn't have engrams that make him insane, do you understand? He is insane because his ability to confront the environment in his immediate vicinity is so low that he could never possibly take his mind off of his environment long enough to let his mind – too dangerous.

Now, just as your superscreaming suppressive screams when you tell him to confront his mind, the psychotic screams when you tell him to confront the environment. Now, you've had, possibly, successes with cases that were erroneously pronounced insane. Some guy was just a little bit daffy or he was just a little bit tired or he was just screaming slightly more than the average human. And you snapped him back to battery and it was all very miraculous. No reason why processing is any answer to the insane at all. A very, very calm, quiet environment with nobody bothering them at all, particularly psychiatrists not bothering them, where the guy feels totally safe, would undoubtedly permit him to destimulate to a point where he would then be sane. How long he'd be sane, that's something else. How crazy is the environment you move him from there out to? How gradual do you move him? What gradient do you use in taking him from a total stillness to a little bit of motion? No, insanity is a study in environments, not a study in the mind.
Now, when you get the fellow up there so that he passes for sane, now he could confront some tiny little gradient of his mind, possibly, if your gradient was small enough. And then you would get into the field of the mind. Do you understand?

Now, if you look over these fields of beingness you won't get into so many arguments or get your expectancies up or become puzzled about lots of things, if you can just get these various factors more or less sorted out. There's not, then, a big mystery about it. There are certain things which you can do in certain frameworks and certain things which you are equipped to do and certain things which you're not equipped to do. For instance, you're not equipped to handle the insane right now, you don't have a still sanitarium, see, where they'd be totally safe.

But your main line – your main line is the improvement of the being who is willing to be improved. And by improving the being who is willing to be improved, why then, of course, you will eventually get enough improved beings that further improve, that your influence on the society around you is such that then you can handle those problems in the society which must be handled in order to snap the society out of being insane. You got it? This is the gradient. It's not – it's not in actual fact a problem in making one OT. That's interesting. It's not a problem of making one OT. He'd have to be an awfully interested OT. But all you've got to do is talk to some Clears about experience they've had with wogs to recognize how far out and beyond they are – would be as an OT. Now, if they're having trouble as a Clear and they are – therefore – therefore they would have just that greater amount of trouble as an OT. Do you follow?

All right, there'd be nothing wrong with you as an OT fixing up the crippled boy's leg as he hobbles down the street and he stands on the corner sort of stony-eyed and finds out that he doesn't need his crutches. There would be nothing whatsoever wrong with your doing that. If you could do it, you could do it. You see. You're into a problem endowing life. You could probably reendow or you could do something there, see? You'd only go wrong if you tried to explain to him what had happened. Now, possibly he would come up scale to faith.

Right away I notice a magazine reporter over in Canada has got Clear mixed up with saint. Right, right, he thinks he's pulling a gag, but this is – be more and more and more and more and more, see. You won't be able to stop man from doing this. But you can, you can sort of put the brakes on it by not asking for it. You see, it would be possible to throw the whole society into just a total frenzy. They're much more apt to go into a frenzy of terror than they are to go into a frenzy of worship. Who wants them in such a frenzy anyway?

But if they could be lifted up by an idea of faith or belief, why great. But that isn't what you're lifting him up by. You're lifting him up by the bootstraps of hope. A hope that maybe someday they could do something about it, would be a hope that they would come up on. First, a hope that you could do something about it, and then a hope maybe they could do something about it. And then they gradually lead up the line, if they're not in too bad a shape to begin with, to a point where they – their hope, the small hopes materialize and so on.

You notice some people have very mad hopes. They want you to audit them for an hour to OT. That's so that they can go out and cut the throats of all their enemies. Fellow gets a solution to all of his enemies by wanting to become OT instantly. We all have a slight im-
pulse in this direction. We read a story in a newspaper or something like that and we might get a longing to see the newspaper building in rubble. [laughs] But that isn't the reason why we have to arrive at where we have to arrive at.

So that – states of beingness that man will recognize do however include gods, saints, miracle men, messiahs, all kinds of beings. And because man can conceive of such beings – why, you have it even in the comic strips, little kids can conceive of such beings. They have "Batman" and stuff of that character. Yeah, they've always got "Superman." Because man can conceive of this, then he tends to attribute to any forward progress the characteristics which he has formerly associated with it. Our present society they'd probably be the characteristics of "Superman" and in the past society they would have been characteristics of a saint. In a Greek society would have been the characteristics of one of the gods. Do you see?

We don't much care what man's concept along this line is. I'm just saying man is very capable – very capable of conceiving of such beings as long as they're exterior and as long as they're not very real. He can conceive them through a holy book, the Koran, the Pali canons, something like this. That's great. But you actually, could shake somebody rigid, a Mohammedan, if you said, "What if as you were reading that book a disembodied hand reached out and turned the page and pointed to a paragraph you were reading?" The fact of the matter is he would rather go into horror. Although he is professing great belief in such a being and in such beings and so on, his ability to confront them would be very bad indeed.

So what man can conceive and what man can confront are two different things. And similarly, what a being can conceive he can become and what he can confront being actually are a gap. There's a gap between those two things.

Now, on the upper end of the scale, as you roll up through the Gradation Chart and I've talked enough times about the Gradation Chart and the various grades of release, we are running into a strata now which requires further definition. And that is, what's the difference between a Clear and an OT. How come a Clear can still make an E-Meter read or how come he can still find out things about himself and so on. All this is very interesting. Well, a Clear is not an all-knowing being. A Clear is somebody who has lost the mass, energy, space and time connected with the thing called mind. MEST mind. That is – that is what a Clear is, see. That's terrific, see, there's nothing wrong with that. But there is another state.

Now, a Clear moves up through becoming cause over the matter, energy, space and time of his mind. The more he drills on this, why, the more interesting life looks to him, the bigger he feels and so forth. But an Operating Thetan, definition of, is a being who is knowing and willing cause over life, thought, matter, energy, space and time, and it doesn't say a mind. That's the definition of OT. Willing and knowing cause over life, thought, matter, energy, space and time. Now that, of course, when you say, life, that includes other beings. But that's why I've been talking to you about endowed cells. He can handle life. It isn't he can handle – doesn't matter whether he can or can't handle another thetan. He could be heavy cause over another thetan. But that isn't the point. He could handle this commodity known as life. There is a commodity known as life.

Willing and knowing cause over life, thought, matter, energy, space and time. And that would of course, be mind and of course, be universe. That's a pretty large order, isn't it?
So you see there's a terrific gap between a Clear and an OT, there's a big gap between these two things. You want to give a Clear a lose, why go along and say, "Why aren't you doing all these OT tricks?" This Clear must be in terrible shape because he's, he has an awful stomach-ache. Well, he has an awful stomach-ache, he tried to get out of his head and he put his left thetan foot on his stomach [laughter, laughs] and pushed and he's had a stomachache ever since. He's learning how to walk.

And a Clear, now, let's drop back down scale again. Now, a Clear makes a not too aberrated human being just almost fly into small bits and pieces. The guy – the guy becomes terrifically the effect of the Clear. The Clear doesn't have to do a thing, you see, he isn't trying to become the effect of anything. He just has a sufficient zone of beingness that what falls into that zone of beingness is liable to be as-ised or something like this, is liable to go into action. This doesn't happen to everybody. It happens to a minority. But it can become pretty – pretty upsetting. You get – you get some interesting – you get some interesting phenomena.

A Clear, for instance, in a beatnik club would not be a social success at all. Not unless they thought it was a new dance they'd invented. An element of fear sometimes crosses people. They feel – they feel an influence around them which they don't understand. They're talking to Joe and Joe looks human and then they all of a sudden, there's something here which they do not quite understand. They're having to confront something beyond their ken which is somehow or another a little bit within their ken. But you normally will not find them tracing the source of it at all. Now, it isn't bad for them, quite the contrary. If they sat around long enough they'd probably run out all the twitches.

And now you come down scale, you come down scale to, let us say, a Grade IV Release. Now, a Grade IV Release can pour enough balm on the environment and be so measurably calmer than everybody else in the environment, and so measurably more effective than anybody else in the environment that he has a highly, you might say, therapeutic or enlivening effect upon his environment. You can – you can – they stand out rather – rather remarkably. Very remarkably, but they are still a little bit out of reach. They're still a little bit out of reach.

Now, as you go down the Release grades you get closer and closer to an ability to directly, immediately, understandably influence somebody else without causing a mess. Or without upsetting them or without restimulating them or something of that sort. So your Bridge tends to stay in as a gradient of dissemination. Now, a Grade 0 Release is an awful lot higher than a wog. There's an intermediate step that's arising these days, we're getting Dianetic Releases these days that aren't Grade 0s, they're intermediate stages. Of course, I said there were other stages of Release below that, I merely neglected them. But this, these beings when I first saw them were sufficiently distinct and different from their fellow man, that their fellow man almost looked upon them as very, very startling beings indeed. They looked upon them with considerable awe. And that was the Book One Clear, Dianetic Release. How high are we above the Dianetic Release now, see? Hit it.

Do you see? So we have – we have actually been advancing above the most extravagant goal of psychotherapy, mental treatment, religious increase of beingness and so on. We've been – we've been way above this for a very long time. We could still make today, in a very short space of time, the original goal of betterment which was bodhi. And we could
make a bodhi today and he probably is below a Dianetic Release, undoubtedly is below a Dianetic Release. Now, his duration of stability might run anything from two seconds to two minutes to two weeks to two months, it might even be a year or two, do you see? You name it.

Now, this would be quite – quite startling and the ability to produce one of those after a great many years of work and contemplation and meditation and concentration and a whole bunch of other things was sufficient to civilize three-quarters of Asia, just the ability to do that. Occasionally, very occasionally, make a bodhi, or a thetan exterior as we call them. Unaberrated – nothing done to make them less aberrated, nothing done to this, nothing done to that, see. Now, that civilized three-quarters of Asia. Now, that's below Dianetic Release. And you're worried about a newspaper story in the Daily Mail.

You see now, the Scientologist has in actual fact risen far out of his own understanding of the wog and rather tends to compare his state of beingness with other Scientologists and sort of doesn't pay much attention at all to the wog, until all of a sudden he's totally surrounded by wogs and I've noticed that makes him usually rather unhappy. But you get up to a point, you can get up to a point where it does not make you unhappy at all. As you begin to approach Clear you would find out that the phenomena of which I was speaking of human beings becoming twitchy and itchy and jumpy and wandering about – or going dopey or something like this would occur. Friends I had in Rhodesia, all of them wogs, complained about it, they used to complain about it, you know. They had various ways to describing all this. They knew something happened to them in their – in my vicinity only they couldn't quite figure out what it was. Of course, Smith, the sweat ran off of his palms, literally dripping. He was so nervous he couldn't sit. Naah – ahhaah! And he knew what he was doing when he didn't want me in Rhodesia. It was making him uncomfortable. I wasn't Clear at that time. Of course, I'm me. I'm just giving you an idea, see.

Now, you go out amongst the wogs – you go out amongst the wogs as a grade Release, you're going to produce certain phenomena. Now, they can still tolerate it, and consider it very beneficial and that sort of thing. You start moving up toward Clear and that vicinity you're above their level of reactive tolerance, only they tend really kind of not to spot you very closely as to what's causing this. They say, "I have to concentrate so, when you're talking. You have so many big thoughts to tell me." What they sound like. I would have been sitting there for half an hour listening to them. "You've got such a terrific command of the situation, I don't see why people don't do what you say." I haven't told anybody to do anything, see. You run into phenomena of this particular character.

The use of it, one doesn't bother to use it. One just bothers to be himself. And life becomes easier mainly, the main thing that happens, life becomes easier. But you excite certain upsets and antagonisms which you don't quite understand and so forth. Well, perhaps from what I've told you today it might help you understand these to some degree. If your landlady or the bus driver starts going – why, maybe you realize you should not stare at their back, you know. [laughs]

Now, the pity of all of these states of beingness, is there is a limit on the amount one being can do for another. One cannot live another's life for him without being the other. One
can provide a safe environment. One can show a way. One can blaze a trail and demonstrate and hold in place a methodology. One can provide for the ethical application or administration of methodologies. One can give advice. One can sit around and pervade the environment with calmness. One might even be able to mock up a new leg for a crippled boy. These are all great. Man in the past considered these things absolutely miraculous, so that what I'm giving you right now is the understatement of the age, you see. Because this, this is – his religious textbooks are full of just this. This is in all of his tests. But that is the limit. The rest is up to the guy. And unless you've led the individual to increasing his own beingness he in actual fact will never arrive. He will never become any thetan.

You can show him the way, you can provide the environment, you can make it easy for him, you can be yourself expert, you can do various things. Even as I say, exude calm. You can audit, you can get your drills in, you can do this and that. But basically, basically, the final net result depends on the individual himself. And that is the point which has been missed in all past endeavors in self-betterment or the improvement of man or civilization. That is what it boils down to. They have always contained an element that if a state became socialistic enough, if the priests said enough prayers, if there were enough joss burned on the altar, some miraculous intervention would take place that would make this sow's ear into a silk purse. The miraculous intervention has to come from the person himself. That is the miraculous intervention that will get him out of the mud. And the miraculous intervention will actually hand into his hands today with Scientology technology, immortality, a goal which has been man's goal for a very long time. Not a slight gift.

Happiness, power, continuation, continuity, be impossible to say these things. In the final analysis a being has to be led up to a point by a fairly unenturbulated environment, by various approaches has to be led up to a point where he could destimulate enough to somehow or another reach that next rung and to overcome terrors of becoming the effect and therefore himself put his own feet on the road to his own destiny. And in the absence of that he won't make it.

The only thing you can do is to help him somehow or another make those first steps so that he can walk in that direction. But there are limits to the amount of help which he can be given.

And that gives you a very forecast – very great forecast on really how many Clears there will be or how successful clearing will be. How successful the whole thing comes off, how many OT's will there be. A Clear of course is immortal and knowingly so, but how – how – how many – how all? Well, it'll actually be how all to the degree that all of us provide a secure environment in which people can destimulate to a point where they can find there is a way to walk. You couldn't – you ordinarily think that maybe trying to make a family or your house calmer or better or make somebody's life a little easier to live, maybe – maybe it's hardly even – even was not worth doing hardly, it's such a tiny amount. But it actually, just to reverse the whole scale back again, that is the final effort that will let the bulk of humanity out. It's how calm and how decent you can make the environment in which they live.

Thank you.
Thank you. Thank you very much.

We have a lecture here today because I – for the sole reason that I haven't put in an appearance lately. That is the sole reason you're having a lecture. There isn't anything you don't know; there isn't anything at all. Now, there isn't anything you don't know, anything, there isn't anything you need to know. You are all-wise, totally omnipotent, totally omniscient (got to get some misunderstoods in here) [laughter] and the last "O," ornery. I mean, I shouldn't… [laughs]

Yes, well, anyway, I'll define those words for you, you know. "Onmiscient," that's knowing everything, you see, and "omnipotent," that is totally powerful. And although you are all these things, of course, some of you haven't totally made the grade. [laughs]

So, I thought I'd give you a talk today on some changes in organization and as a subject which is as far from most of your interests as an Advisory Council. And I begin with a word of warning that you had, in actual fact, better be interested in what these things are because you're looking at something that is governing your destinies and if you don't have a good government, you don't have a good organization.

In view of the fact there isn't any such thing on the planet as a good government at the moment, that I know anything about, why, we're in the field of total invention here, and this will be a brand-new Scientology first: We walk up to a good government.

Everybody admits, when thoroughly pressed, that a benign monarchy is the best form of government. But in view of the fact that a benign monarchy cannot be succeeded, why, it possibly lacks a great deal in its longevity. Over a long period of time, why, governments that are set up as benign monarchs get unbenign monarchs sooner or later, and they develop themselves a Nero or something, and everything goes appetite over tin cup.

Well, man is so afraid of a vicious turn in a benign monarchy that he actually can't have one, and he says then that he has to have other governmental forms. But the highest governmental form is a benign monarchy. I've had royalists – even in this day and age there is such a thing as a royalist – anarchists, communists, Republicans, Democrats, Laborites, Tories, all sitting wound in the same room and the only kind of government I could get them all to mutually agree upon was a benign monarchy. That was the form of government on which they would agree, with this single proviso, that there was no way to succeed it. Once the be-
nign monarch kicks the bucket, why then, what happens? Well, catastrophe occurs because you get unbenign monarchs, and he inherits all this power and he starts suppressing people.

In other words, sooner or later, any government which is set up on a one-man proposition, and so forth, by inheritance, runs the risk of having a suppressive fill that role.

So, man is attempting to prevent suppressives, and in his effort to prevent suppressives he also prevents decent government. Now, in the first place we can say that a benign monarchy is the finest form of government but there is one thing wrong with it, is no benign monarch can wear all of his hats. And by the very fact of being unable to wear his hats he, of course, can become so exhausted that he cannot govern effectively. Or, on the other hand, he gets so disgusted that he doesn't.

Having been through all such cycles – not just on this track but on earlier tracks – I speak with some authority along this line. I'm not saying I was always a king; I remember one time vividly being a garbage man. [laughter, laughs]

But the main thing in which you should be interested in this field is the fact that you have, if you keep it in operation, the mechanism which prevents governments from becoming unbenign. If you go ahead and remedy hors de combat – give you another misunderstood word. It's what used to happen to you when you were a knight. That is, pardon me, it's what happened – always happened to the other fellow. And when you let go of this data concerning suppressives and potential trouble sources – if you let go of that technology, if that technology goes out of control and that technology is not understood – then you inevitably will have bad organizations and will eventually have an organization which will be no better than the best of the Earth governments, which is pretty bad.

Now, the thing which makes a government bad, of course, is it gets a suppressive amongst it. And one suppressive breeds another suppressive. You'll find out that a suppressive wants nothing around him but suppressives, and you eventually get your red-tab generals who are advocating wars of attrition.

If you want to know the type of government with which you are dealing, look at the type of war it fights, and if it only fights wars of attrition – which is to say, grind away each other against each other – then you know that nobody's – nobody wants any victory. Victory is not being envisioned. What they are looking for is simply a method of knocking off as many troops as possible. Now, once in a while you rail against a general, or something like this, you see, and say he's not a good general. Well, actually what you're objecting to is he normally doesn't care whose troops he knocks off – his or the enemy's.

I've been taught very harshly along this line, and the best military training is to do the most in the least time at the least expense and keep your own people from getting banged up. You severely outlaw the fact that you bang up your own people; your objective is to bang up the enemy. And what you – what you are – your objective is, is to win. That's the objectives of war and a proper conduct of war. I haven't stated it à la textbook, but that's it.

Your objective is to win and you wish to win at – in the least time at the least cost and at the least number of casualties amongst your own people, and also, if the problem of rehabilitation comes up into it, actually with the least damage to the enemy. Because you always
have to put the enemy back together again anyhow, you see, if you – if you win. This then is a proper war. And I'm not talking to you about war; war being good, bad or indifferent.

Conflict is conflict and it does exist. But I want to point out to you that the last four wars, and the one that is running currently are all wars of attrition. They have no goal to win, to actually conquer and absorb territory, and it didn't matter in any one of those wars how many of your own troops got killed, and there was no strategy based on this, but a tremendous amount of sacrifice strategy.

You want to know what kind of government you're dealing with, look at the kind of wars they fight. Tells you at once how many – direct index – how many suppressives are in that government.

Now, all governments are a body of beings against the individual. Now, they can be less against and more for the individual, the better they are. And when they're totally bad, why, then they're totally against the individual and totally for the group.

Now, I wouldn't name any names or designate any specific government, but a government is suppressive to the degree that it is (quote) "benefiting the group" and is antagonistic toward the individual, until the individual is totally out and the group is totally in. That is the reductio to total suppression. Now, it can go in total reverse for which the philosophy is anarchy, where the individual is everything and the government is nothing. And you'll find out that doesn't work either.

So these are the two extremes: where the individual is everything and the government is nothing, and where the body corporate is everything and the individual is nothing. Those are the two extremes of the pendulum, and as it swings between these two, we find, oddly enough, that both ends of it can be totally suppressive. When only the individual has any value and no corporate body or no organized body of any kind has any rights in the face of the individual, you find then that any bully, any bum, any suppressive is then totally at liberty to knock anybody in the head. There is no restraint of any kind against any individual suppression of any kind whatsoever. And on the other side you have the organized suppressives who are making very; very sure that their suppressive organization completely crushes the individual.

When you organize something, remember there are two extremes. Remember there is no such thing as a perfect government and that the individual is about as close as you will get to a perfect entity or unit. So therefore, why any government at all? Well, we have historical precedences and we find out that any body, any group that existed without internal understandings and organizations and so on, succumbed to any group that did so organize.

And that fact alone is actually why you have to have a government, why you have to have a body corporate, why you have to have an organization. You got where you are today because you, on the long-ago backtrack, did not organize together with your fellow thetan as a free being, and you let any bunch of clunks that wanted to do people in form up into any kind of an organized body that could then overwhump the living daylights out of you, one by one. Do you see that? This is the missing item on the track. The missing item on the track was organizations amongst decent people. Because they themselves have perfectly good intentions and because they themselves had no idea of suppressing anybody else, they of course didn't
organize at all; they felt totally omniscient, omnipotent, able to handle anything and everything all on their own two feet.

Now, I want to give you this one point: This one point is, you didn't handle it on your own feet. You faced up and ran into organized groups. And when you as an individual collided with the organized group, whether they were well organized or badly organized, you came a cropper. It is very interesting that any group of organized humanoids can defeat any individual thetan. Organized humanoids! Well, of course, any – any – given enough ants, they can tear down a mountain if they go at it in an organized fashion.

So, an organized body and organized beings can accomplish more and continue further than the individual. Now, this doesn't necessarily hang one with a compromise, this hangs one with a necessity of discovering something about the laws of organization. And if one has discovered something about the laws of organization and if one then practices those laws of organization, why, then we've got a chance to keep the road open and wrap it up. But if it's not organized, we haven't got a dog's prayer. Do you understand?

Now, you say, "Well, one Operating Thetan can defeat..." Oh yes, it's true – in one battle, in one instance. But then one day he's doped off. He didn't win that day, and that was the only battle he had to lose. See? He won a thousand, he lost one and that was one too many. Well now, if each one of you wanted to live as an armed camp or if each one of you live - want to live in total hiding, why, all right, all right. But as organized beings you don't have to be that – that alert, you can relax. You can relax as long as the organization functions and as long as the organization itself does not become totally suppressive of the individual.

Well now, the only thing you're trying to prevent is harm to the individual. You're not really even trying to prevent an individual being deprived of rights. I notice these days we talk a lot about rights. I notice also that only dishonest people have rights; honest men don't have any rights anymore. If you get knocked over the head and robbed, why, you spend the next three days being interrogated by the police. They never go out and find the guy who knocked you over the head. "Why were you standing there?"

The laws that are growing up these days: If you leave your keys in the car you are liable to arrest. Why? Well, you've put temptation in the road of somebody, is the charge.

I don't know, a police body ought to be able to pick up these people that can't resist temptation; I think that's what they're being paid for. But, therefore, our problem is simply to have an organization that can function, that is minimally suppressive of the individual, minimally restrictive but maximally effective.

How you work that out... Well, there's I don't know how many policy letters written through 1965 and into 1966 which cover the basic patterns of organizations. I think it's the first time the whole subject has ever been reviewed. I think many of those laws – the first time they've ever been brought forward and brought into view, and the data is all there. Its final forms and so on are not necessarily in concrete as an organization is.

Now, there are certain things that an organization has to do. An organization under a benign monarch who is pretty, pretty good, does not have to have much say – the individual does not have to have much say. Why? Because nothing is being done which is contrary to,
you see, his long-range good benefit. Nobody is suppressing him. If it comes to such a person's attention, and so forth, he normally takes care of that sort of thing. So minimal say, you see, is necessary.

But when you start to turn over things to a body corporate or a governing group and so on, this confidence in a benign monarchy and so on is likely to get shattered because various things happen. You do get little zones of suppression and so on, and then it is safest for the individual to have a say. So, you would say normally – you would say normally – that in the absence of a terrific whizbang of a leader, see, that the individual should have a say.

This is where democracy in its basic philosophy enters the scene. Now, to expect the individuals by their individual opinion, and that alone, to guide the destinies of a group or state is pure idiocy. It makes every single individual anywhere involved in nothing but government, and to hang around the neck of every citizen even the idea that he is responsible for all the rules, laws and actions of government, and that he must keep up his intelligence lines – having no more to work with than the dirty stuff they call newspapers these days – that he's to keep open his intelligence lines so as to be brilliantly informed on every issue which comes forward.

Boy, you're going to get a government which is just a clown government – it's a totally clown government. Now, democracy is, of course, an absolute form. It's an attempted absolute form. And there isn't any democracy practiced on the planet today and as far as I know there never has been any and there was no democracy in ancient Greece.

Those were about fifty land owners, when it was first kicked together, that a dictator or tyrant (Pericles, I think his name was) was trying to tell them they ought to take responsibility for the state. He was either too busy or he'd gotten disgusted, see. And he told these fifty jokers that they ought to form something called a senate and ought to debate the affairs of state and decide them by majority rule. As near as I remember, that was the way it was. Boy, if that sounds like a democracy, you name it! They didn't even represent anybody in the state, so they weren't even a republican – they weren't even republican, you see.

I don't know how they say the Greeks invented democracy. But anyhow that's the way it is. I'm sure later on they had something where the mob stood around and when they said, "Hang him!" why, a guy got hanged, you see.

Now, if you've ever had very much to do with mobs, you won't want to be governed by one. In the first place, if you had to go around and collect the individual opinion of everyone you were governing before you could act, it would be so many years between the incident and the action that no government would occur.

Now, one needn't go so far as another Greek institution whipped up by Plato, called communism. Oh, you think I've got things reversed. No, Plato invented communism with commissars at the head of it. Read it some time and you'll be very interested.

You see, the purist is the Russian; he's the purist in government, and he – the type of government of Sparta and so on was tried for a while. And I notice Sparta isn't there anymore and so on. But Platonian government is what exactly you have today in the Kremlin. Very interesting. Now, his type of government – although Aristotle talked about the pendulum that
swung between the two extremes – his type of government is an extreme and at the other end of the extreme politically there's anarchy.

So you have the total body corporate and the individual just a poor nut who is stepped on, under the Platonian forms, and between those two you have something called republicanism. Now, republicanism is representation of subgroups by an individual, and there we're coming somewhere into the mean.

Now, if you limit the type of person that can be chosen to represent that group, if you limit the number or types, if you would make it necessary for him to have certain accomplishments in other words – in your case you would say, well, he had to have a certain IQ and he had to have a certain Grade, or something like this, you know. You'd say, "Well, nobody below Grade IV can stand for assemblyman," do you see? And you had a right to examine his auditing reports and credentials, you see. Well, you'd be fairly safe, you see.

Then that individual grouped together with other individuals, making a body corporate of some kind or another like a senate or an assembly or something like that – that individual, then, being a specialist in the issues at stake, and not having also to carry on another job, could then become sufficiently informed of what was going on and have enough time to think about it, to actually govern. Do you see?

Now, this – this then is probably the direction government will go under Scientology, if Scientology has much influence upon government. Probably be a representative form of government which is really republican government. When they say this is a republic or that is a republic, they're talking through their hat. They don't know their governmental forms. There's never been a planet as politically illiterate as this one. Economics are politics, you know. There is no subject called "economics," really; there's communist economics, and democratic economics, and other kinds of… They're a bunch of mixed up kids.

But a republic is where people are governed by their – by representative beings. There is a being chosen by the people to govern them or be part of the government, you see, and then that person governs without any further yikyak back and forth amongst the people, do you follow? But if some weighty issue which is going to change the form of government comes along, why, a republican form of government is supposed to place it to referendum, but that's simply to change the status quo. We're going to change the form of government; we're now going to have one representative for a hundred thousand people instead of one representative for ten thousand people. Well, they'd better have that to referendum because they're shifting the form of government on which it had been agreed. But this is essentially government by representation.

Now, there was a country one time, which got into a lot of trouble with another country. That isn't a very informative fact, is it, because it could be said about any two countries that have ever existed. But the first country was England, and it got into a lot of trouble with America. And it was simply America at that time; it was the Colonies. And they made a fatal mistake, they had taxation without representation. And for England, even up – at this late date, to be talking about being a democratic form of government is somewhat funny because England does not permit the representation of her Commonwealth in Parliament up there in London. Tells the Commonwealth, don't you see, that it must have representative forms of
government but it itself is not representative. Do you understand? The Commonwealth, for instance, is not part of the Parliament in London, which governs its destinies.

And it was that omission which caused the American Revolution. There wasn't anybody, part of the American scene, who came over and sat with a say and a vote in Parliament in London. And the resentment of that was so extreme that they dreamed up a whole bunch of other excessive this and that, and eventually poor old George III lost his American colonies.

It's an error. It's not a mistake by men, it's an error in technology. Now let me point this out, that there can be errors in technology which cause great political rifts.

For instance, America would have been probably enormously better off if it'd never cut loose from England. You talk about a bunch of inexperienced goons who took over the government at that time and laughingly carried on what was – what was government, kee-ripes! One of the first things they passed after they revolted for the rights of man and everything else – you know, they revolted to make the individual free – the first thing they passed, I think, were the Acts of Sedition by which if you put the slightest criticism of anybody that were friends of theirs in the paper, you could be clapped in jail forevermore. And I don't know how many years that was law. So they certainly were not fighting for individual freedom, because their first action was to pass the Acts of Sedition. Do you understand?

They were not actually fighting because of excessive taxation, because when they got in power, they really went to town. They were fighting for representation. They felt they could not be heard and that causes an ARC break, and it is simply in the field of your technology right down the board.

When a group feels it cannot be heard, it ARC breaks. Just like the individual, who feels he cannot be heard, ARC breaks. Do you follow? It is an ARC break which also always precedes a war You will find some time or another when Hitler – just to take the most recent and most savage conflict; although there have been a lot of brush fires since – Hitler must have, at one time or another, probably very early in his career, said something which wasn't acknowledged. He said something he considered very important and that wasn't acknowledged, and it wasn't acknowledged by a lot of countries or just one country, do you see, and that gave him an ARC break. And then they later on said things which he didn't acknowledge and by piling up the ARC breaks they eventually killed something like thirty million men, and I think that's too many people to knock off because of an ARC break. They needed an E-Meter.

But governmentally – governmentally, then – as long as you are dealing with emergency situations, the best government to have around is a benign monarchy, if you have total confidence and trust in the benign monarch. Because it's all emergency anyhow, see, and there's no time to consult anybody anyway. Well, that is not really, then, a type of government which can continue long because the benign monarch, as an individual, running a body corporate, of course, can get tired. He can get disgusted. He can get overworked. He can get this. And he certainly cannot acknowledge everybody who speaks. He hasn't got that many hours in the day. Do you see?
So, this form of government is all right for a very, very tight operating period. But unless it is backed up by a body which is representative of the people being governed, then you will get a dissolution of the organization. Do you see?

Now, the nominal head of the state could back off to practically figure-head or emergency, heavy-cavalry-type action. In other words, if things went too wrong, why, they could whistle him up. Do you see? But ordinarily the thing would run along by a – some representative body corporate and then you would have a workable government.

Now, why a body corporate? Well, a body corporate has great liabilities. Once you share the responsibility amongst a number of individuals, none of those individuals feel a total responsibility for the situation, so they really don't think fast enough, they really don't think and act fast enough.

So you have to be careful never to have a generalized body corporate. They must be terribly specific in its representation. The individuals in it must be representative of very definite, specific zones or spheres. We can't have… Well, we could have a senator from a state. That's all right because he, of course, can be heard by the – through him the state is heard. But remember he's a senator for a state.

There's a horrible blunder that they pull in businesses – and I don't know how businesses live, and many of them don't – and that is, to have a board of directors. Now, you can get a great big board of directors, each one of whom nebulously represents the stockholders. Each one of whom represents…? Wait a minute. Whoa! You've got cross-representation here, so that nobody actually has any representation.

You'd have to say, "This board member represents stockholders 1-100, and this board member represents stockholders 100-200," do you see? Then you would have a representative form of government. Because that is a body corporate representing. And if it goes along that way, is nothing more idiotic than a body corporate doing a representing. For instance, all the commissars in Russia, I think, represent the Russian people. Everything they say, "The Russian people! The Russian people!" There aren't any "Russian people." There's no such thing.

I don't know how many Russians there are in Russia. I think it's about one two-hundredth of the number of people in Siberia in that part of the geography. The rest of them are Tartars and Mongols and Slavs and "God-help-us's"! Now, these nuts, they all run around "The people! The people!" Creeps!

Jurisprudence goes appetite over tin cup when it says, "The People versus John Doe!" Oh, creep! I never heard of the guy; I'm one of the people. [laughter] That is just generality that goes into suppression.

Now, the primary characteristic of a suppressive is generality; he speaks in generalities. "Everybody says you are a bum." You know? "They are against you." And you get off into that "The People versus John Doe." It's totally a suppressive mechanism. Well, maybe – maybe somebody's mad at John Doe, but let's hear who is mad at John Doe. I don't care if it's 150 people, let's get them by name. Do you see? We could even say the police chief is mad at John Doe because he killed Richard Roe, see. Police chief's funny; he doesn't like dead bod-
ies, you know, something like that. But that would be the truth of it. The people are never against John Doe.

Similarly, "the people" can never be represented by John Doe or Richard Roe or anybody else. If they are represented, they could only be represented by one person, which is why a benign monarchy is the ideal form of government. There's no cross-representation. They know who their representative is, if they hold him in power simply by verbal support. It's the guy in charge, do you see? So it's this, aside from its ability to act rapidly, that makes a single-man government look very efficient, because, in actual fact, the people are represented by one person whose name they know, do you see.

But the second he gets a body of advisers – the second he gets a body of advisers – we cannot then say that that body of advisers represents the people, because the people don't know them. Now, we would have to segment off the entire governed group into segments, if we had more than one representative, then that representative would have to represent exact, precise segments. Now, maybe he represented them by appointment; maybe he represented them by election; maybe they – he was nominated by the – by some governing body and afterwards, with somebody else, voted upon by that section of the people, but they know when they finish up who represents them.

Now, when too many of them are represented by one person, then the distance becomes a bit great and they feel that they are not represented. Do you see? So again, they're not represented. Now, he is their voice to be heard, and they know that when they have a bone to chew, why, they can write or speak to this representative. And they know – regardless how clumsily – that he will say something about it or do something about it. They have confidence in this, and therefore they feel that the hat which they're wearing – government – has been deputized and is being cared for.

But, now communications go two ways. So supposing we had a body corporate which was composed of representatives. Each representative representing exactly some geographical area and, you know, the people of that geographical area, and supposing... I'll show you where modern government violates the living daylights out of the – out of the formula and again re-ARC breaks everybody. Well, let's take – let's take for – just for fun, the state of Colorado, see.

Notice the United States in its great wisdom has two senators for the state of Colorado – instantly violates representation. Doesn't have a senator for northern Colorado and a senator for southern Colorado; it has two senators for Colorado. Pff! Silly! Violation. Now, it has various electoral districts, so they really tend to count on their representative because they do have a representative for that electoral district. Now, that's a direct representation.

But let's take this thing, and the state of Colorado, now, happens to be governed on a somewhat autonomous basis by another corporate body. Now, that corporate body can receive orders from the central corporate body called the United States government. So there's a state government can receive orders from the Federal government.

Do you know that there is nobody in the legislative Colorado assembly hall who has a sign on him saying, "The United States government." The United States government has no representative in that state legislature.
They got a bunch of covert agencies that sit around, all around the state of Colorado, see, and get more and more numerous.

But the truth of the matter is the assembly itself does not feel that it can address the United States government because it isn't sitting there. Do you see that? Some assemblyman, no matter how well he represents an exact section of the population – and they have one representative in that assemblyman. He can spit and fume and damn and curse, "What's happening to the United States government," but he really damn's it and curses it much harder because he knows the United States government is never going to have an inkling of anything he is saying. He knows he's never going to be heard, even though they have a senator, because the senator actually doesn't represent the assembly and wouldn't in any event.

The assembly doesn't send a package to the senator saying, "This is what we feel about the situation. Why don't you go into the Senate and straighten this out?" There is no direct line from the legislative assembly of the state through to the national legislative assembly.

In other words, the communication lines are messed up and the communication lines don't repeat back. Now, those are technical flaws in government. There is a subject called government. There's a subject. And it is as precise as you can get. But before you can do anything about the subject of government you have to have the technology of Scientology in order to improve and detect the abilities of people, and you have to have the entirety of our ethics technology in order to detect suppressives. And if you don't have those things you couldn't form a government anyway.

Now, you also need the communication formula; you need to know about ARC breaks. And, of course, nobody knew anything about that, so don't be too hard on them. They had none of the technology necessary to form a government. So they've been making do somehow.

Now the proper way to have formed this up in Colorado, let us say, is if they had to have two senators, why, he was North and South Colorado – see, one for North and one for South Colorado. They'd had to have divided the place in half. People would have to have a very accurate idea of who their representative was, but if they've got a senator, why have they got a representative? Now, you've divided people's attention, and their attention really doesn't divide well. They shouldn't have a senior and a junior and a representative and a senator and dhrhrhw! You know? Let's get them all confused, see!

No, a certain section of Colorado could be represented in the state – it could be represented in two different places, you see? It could be represented in the state of Colorado, the State Legislature, and it could be represented in the corporate body as far as that goes. That's perfectly all right, as long as then those people so represented could be heard in the places which were making the laws which affected them – a line of protest existed, a line of ideas existed. Do you see? Be perfectly all right. There's two zones and bodies making laws which affect them, so therefore they had better be heard in those.

Now, how about the state of Colorado? Well, you'll notice the Federal government and the States are – in the United States – you might not know this, but they're at each other's throats all the time. They talk about States' rights, they even fought a great war called the Re-
bellion but the Yankees call it a Civil War. (I have to be careful, you know, Mary Sue's from Texas. I have to use these properly.)

So we had a great war occur in the United States over States' rights and Federal rights. Well, how did it come about? Well, the war came about because of the ARC break occasioned by the fact that the state legislature could not be heard in the national body, and the national body had no representative in the state legislature, so there was no two-way communication formula. So of course they got to war.

So, then the study of government parallels the study of what breaks down governments.

Now, when an individual has no way to speak to this huge sprawling thing called a government, and when he's just a dog, why, what is the final frame of mind? He goes into apathy about it. He becomes inactive about it, and you can no longer then have any kind of representative government because he's just off the subject.

So, what does it do? It goes into a dictatorship at either end of the extremes. It either goes into a dictatorship by being a total people-versus-the-individual, as Plato, Russia, so on. Or on the other side it goes into a total dictatorship where the dictatorship is not agreed to, supported or anything else but is just every man is that dictator. It goes one way or the other: dog eat dog; every man for himself, don't you see? It'll go one way or the other.

Now, what – what do we find here, then, as a middle road? We find a representative form of government as a workable middle road, providing the representation is specific and exact and isn't so large and so overwhelmingly huge that it cannot – the representation cannot be appealed to by the individual. That can be pretty big, because every individual isn't appealing simultaneously, and when they all start appealing simultaneously, why, the representative knows he's got to do something in a hurry.

So, now do you get a little better grip on how these things should be organized?

Well, the cause of war is incompetent government. The cause of breakdowns between a group and the society which surrounds it can also be incompetent government. Incompetent government. But the group that surrounds it may be so incompetently governed that the inner group has to be almost perfectly governed to work its way forward.

We happen to be in that peculiar condition. It's not that we don't have flaws. We have lots of flaws. But I assure you of something, that we are actually operating far, far, far, far better than most bodies operate. We're pretty good. We're pretty good. Now, the main thing to know is that we keep trying to be better. We're very far from self-satisfied about the whole thing. And what you see happening right now is an effort of betterment, not an effort of failure, but an effort of betterment.

You only better, of course, when you have a down statistic or when you have too much work or too much this, that or the other thing. You don't bother to better those things which are already soaring into affluence. In fact you better not try to better them, if they're already awfully good. The more you tamper with them the worst off you're liable to be. But
you can reinforce an affluence by finding out what made it an affluence, but you damn well jolly better be awfully, awfully right before you move anything.

Now, the main thing here in – we get in representation is you have certain people who represent you. Now, because you have a qualification system (persons have been with the org or they haven't been with the org for a long time), you have a system, a statistical system (person is known to have high statistics or always has low statistics), you have a grade system of state of case, and you've got the entire Ethics technology of weeding out suppressives; and you tend, then, not to desperately need an elective action. Do you follow? Things run well or they don't run well. And as long as somebody is actively taking care of it, why, those of you who are doing other things aren't necessarily interested along this line. But this can be bettered; this can definitely be bettered.

Now, somewhere up the line you will run into actual representation – actual elective representation where probably certain nominees will be submitted for an elective action, do you follow? That sort of thing. Because as we get bigger it'll be necessary to do this. Actually we're pretty small today; we all know each other. But as we go forward, as we go forward and get larger, this will require refinement.

Just at the moment it doesn't particularly require balloting and all that sort of thing because we're all wearing this hat or that hat or the other hat. And we already have a system which tends to inhibit and does correct mismanagement where it occurs.

Now, you could get too safe with this system, so therefore, somewhere up the line, very exact representation will have to occur. As I say, we're not big enough yet to do much about that. But we'll move it this far; we'll move it this far: we'll fix it up so that no junior body – no junior governing body – may be ordered by a senior body on which it is not represented. And reversely, that very senior governing bodies should not order junior governing bodies on which they do not have a representative. See, now that gives us a two-way comm situation.

Now, what we've done just now is totally reform the Advisory Council, but totally, sweep bang! Works like this: The International Advisory Council would be made up of representatives of continental parts of the world and executives who represent types of divisions of organization. Big! It's about a fifteen-man Advisory Council. Now you say, "Well, how in the name of God can you ever get any government done with that many people?" Well, if you handle it exactly this way you will be in: that nobody may bring up or make a motion which has not been – he cannot initiate, you might say, a motion unless that motion has been formed into an issuable directive. If he wants a policy letter passed then he jolly well had better written the whole thing up. He wants a directive passed, he jolly well better have written the whole thing up.

Now, we give the chairman of that body – whichever is the chairman – we give that chairman of the body the power of absolute veto. The chairman says, "That is enough of that," and that is enough of that, unless three-quarters of those present vote to have it continued. Takes three-quarters to vote to continue this nonsense about whether or not Distribution should do its own info packets or not. Get the idea?
The main trouble with these bodies is, is they get some guy who keeps running on and on and on, on some hobbyhorse and keeps discussing or reporting to such an endless degree that no other business can occur, and it becomes very tedious, you see. So, if he is offering something, which on first glance does not seem to be germane to the situation and so forth, and is going to take up the corporate body's study too long… To study it, it could be referred for special study to somebody else for a report at the next Ad Council meeting. After all, they're meeting once a week, you see. Now – then that could be referred back when refined down, do you see? Or it could be taken up and fixed up right there as it is, or it could simply be shut off and cut off and thrown in the wastebasket and that is that. Unless he can get three-quarters of the members present interested in his info packets, he's had it! Do you understand?

Now, this makes for some of the efficiency of absolute dictatorship. Because absolute dictators can always get something done. Well, in this particular case you can get something done and it doesn't leave the Ad Council afterwards with somebody, some nebulous somebody, having to write up all the bills or resolutions or directives that were passed. Because look-a-here: if they were wrote up afterwards those weren't the ones that were passed, were they? Do you see? And that's what they have trouble doing: getting something passed in Ad Council and then getting it written up and issued.

So, we'll just put this more on a legislative basis. And this is the way, by the way, it's done in the United States Senate. They don't do all things bad. But therefore, if somebody wants a directive, let's say that Ad Council is composed of continental representatives; now these are representatives which represent the continental areas. In other words, they represent every organization and all the Scientologists on that continent, in that continental area. They represent the lot, see. They're specifically a representative of the continental Ad Council. But more importantly, they represent all of the other orgs and they represent all of those people, too.

So, therefore somebody from part of that continental area, some individual who feels he has been done in and he feels he's being done in by the local org or something like that – well, he in actual fact could write to his representative there, in the international body. Now, more important than this, as this expands out he would find out by election that he had a representative also in his local continental body, and that would be the person to whom he would appeal. Do you see?

But we're not that refined and it doesn't have to be that big. So in this case I imagine that whoever's continental representative for Western United States and so on will probably get himself quite a – quite a bundle of correspondence.

Now, he eventually sees there's some abuses out there or something like that, or something should be taken up, and so he'll probably get something done.

Now, if you have to wait for an Advisory Council… This is where the United States senator goes around the bend and up the pole; he's not in charge of anything in the first place. He's just in charge of somebody as a corporate body but he himself can really do nothing, and this makes him so stupidly helpless that he's silly.

Now, if an emergency situations develops, any member of that Ad Council could issue what is called an Urgent Directive. It'd be an urgent bill, really, if you were talking about it
governmentally. But it's an Urgent Directive. It's something that's got to be done right now, right now; it can't wait till tomorrow. All he's got to do is get a majority set of signatures. He's just got to tear around to the various members and say, "Hey, can you sign this, Joe?" You know?

And he can get his directive out promptly and at once, providing of course that the Ad Council then appoints a Board of Investigation to investigate the situation to find out if that was the right answer or the wrong answer, or if some other answer is needed, or whether no answer was required at all, so as to wipe out that directive so that we'd – or modify the directive, so we don't keep introducing arbitrary laws in from every quarter, see. His directive is only good until a Board of Investigation has investigated it and written a right directive. Do you see?

So, that these emergency directions then have a tendency to be wiped out; they have to be wiped out. These laws don't go forever. Furthermore, unless a policy change occurs, an Ad Council law is only good for a year anyway. That's been into force for a long time. They all expire at the end of the year; very often some very important things expire and nobody notices; they've become customary in the meantime.

Now, the Ad Council, then, would be composed inter… on the international basis – it'd be composed of the continental representatives from each continental district and – of which there are five, and probably one from Saint Hill, since it really isn't part of a continental district. And then to these are added a bloke called a Divisional Organizer. Now, this fellow is the representative of every divisional secretary of that type of division in the whole world. Now, this divisional secretary has the job that you always expect Mary Sue and I to do, which is compile, down to the last comma, all of the materials and specifications.

Well, in the first place, it's gotten to be too big a job. One can't possibly do that and wear his hat, too. And these things are transient and the type of division requires certain things. And it requires its policy letters. It requires supplies. It requires know-how of various kinds. It requires material. It requires some kind of an internal training program to get things in, and these things also change and are transient, don't you see.

Well, take the Distribution Division, man, it can't go on with the same info packet forever. It requires info packets, and requires this and requires that and requires a field staff member program. Well, that field staff member program has to be changing all the time, to keep it whizzing along. And then congress programs – this guy's also responsible for all the congress programs there are. Do you see? And dating them and so forth. In other words, for that type of division, he's responsible for every piece of its organizational materials and everything that applies to that type of division.

So if some secretary of that type of division in Poughkeepsie or Keokuk hasn't got any policy letters that cover so-and-so and so-and-so, well, they would write to this fellow to find it out. If an org can't get its books, it knows who to write to. It writes to the Divisional Organizer Dissem, Worldwide, see. And he would catalyze it and go ahead and do that and he would know exactly where orgs stand.

Now, he is judged by the statistics, the composite gross divisional statistics of that type of division in the world, so if his statistic is down, why, he obviously then would get into
a field of authority. He'd say, "And there's this org and that org and that org." And let us say he's a Tech Sec – he's the Divisional Organizer Tech – and he would say, "Boy, those three orgs are just pulling my statistic right out down through the bottom, and that is finishing me. And therefore, I demand a change of secretaries in those orgs, and I actually think you ought to change the Org Exec Sec in those orgs and I think…" Oh, you know, he'd start getting very militant, you see. Well, he's a member of the Ad Council; that's the place for him to get militant. He can give all the suggestions he wants to give, but he can't give an order unless it's okayed by the Ad Council. It must have been passed by the Ad Council. He must write it up in advance, and it must be passed as a bill. And it's actually issued on the divisional color flash of that division. It applies only to those divisions.

He can get an order. Yes, he can get an – he can get a Board of Investigation on Keokuk and – and all of this. Yes, he can do all these things, but only by getting it passed by the Ad Council. Do you understand?

So he actually is not directly running that type of organization, so then he doesn't operate as a bypass of the Org Exec Secs of those organizations and HCO Exec Secs of those organizations, and so he can function. Do you see?

Now, reversely, we will have it fixed up so that aside from the continental representatives in Continental Advisory Councils and so on, there we will put in a Saint Hill representative – that is a WW representative. Right at the moment it will simply be the LRH Communicator. He is considered to be the representative. So, he could be talked right at, right directly, because he is the representative of the body which is the governing body, don't you see. He doesn't have any authority there. Guy will probably – his ears will probably be pinned back most gorgeously many, many times. But nevertheless the governing body can be talked to.

And, of course, they've got their own representative, and they can pass things through to their own representative and get that squared away. So the governing body can also explain to the lesser governing body what the score is. In other words, various communication lines take place.

All right. Well, how about representation between the Continental Org and these little orgs? And what about their Advisory Councils? Now, these are independent and individual orgs. This would be the pattern which will be adopted for Saint Hill and we simply abolish Ad Comms and we make every divisional secretary a member of the Advisory Council. All the divisional secretaries and the LRH Communicator; otherwise HCO gets left out without a proper vote. See, it's only got three divisions whereas Org has got four.

So therefore, you get an eight-man Advisory Council operating in much the same way, so that the personnel of the organization is surely represented on the Advisory Council because their secretary is a member of it. So therefore, that communication goes sideways. And now we don't have reverse representations into these divisions. But then we're not up to a size where it's required, but sooner or later there will have to be one. There'll have to be a representative of the Advisory Council in that division.

All right. In this particular way, then, you can see that a Continental Organization which has three organizations and itself – which is quite common – it has three other organizations and it has itself. Well, that makes four Advisory Councils composed of secretaries and
executive secretaries. That gives them nine-man Advisory Councils, see, ten-man with the LRH Communicator.

Now, what – what is its relationship, then, with its junior orgs? Well, of course, in the case of Johannesburg, why, Durban would have to have a representative in Johannesburg. So would Cape Town, and as they develop up the line they'll have to have this. They are going to get into ARC breaks, and they're not going to amount to a hill of beans until they can get into a position where they can do this. Do you see?

So, what are we dealing with here when we're dealing with organization? Just to give you an insight into the matter, we're dealing with the basic formulas of technology, we're dealing with basic ethics technology.

Now, if you've got that many people – if you've got that many people coming up the line – you've got that many people with a say and a vote, you have, of course, minimized the possibility of something going wrong on the suppression line, do you see. You've minimized that.

Now, the whole thing being cross-policed by statistics, gives everybody a look right straight in on the plate of the officer operating because statistics are statistics. You can't argue with a statistic. You never explain a statistic. And the reason statistics go bad, of course, are some of the lousiest reasons you ever heard of under the sun. It's incredible.

You'd have to be running an organization for quite a while before you finally fell wise to this very interesting point: that a statistic doesn't ever happen. It's always made. Good or bad, it is always made. And although somebody sitting right here right now won't believe this, maybe…

See, if you've had trouble with a statistic, stop going at it on the basis that it happened. It isn't something that occurred, it was something that was manufactured – down or up – and you've got to find out what is manufacturing that statistic. It has a source. It isn't sourceless.

You never walked down there fifty feet and found out that the thing was locked! You couldn't have a book statistic; there was nobody on post! And by far the greatest source of down statistics is no personnel on the post at all! It's not even subtle, you know. They just didn't – didn't appoint a D of T. Or if they appointed one, for the Day org, he also had a day
job so he was doing his work in the evening! It's gorgeous! It really is. It's incredible! So that I often wonder how anybody can stand around and let one of these statistics go down, see, because the truth of the matter is, it is a minimal amount of alertness required.

Now, when an org's gross income starts down and stays down and starts going out of the bottom, you immediately say, "They need to be more ambitious. There's too much entheta in the area. The newspapers are bad..." Tzaaa! Blaaah! Well, nuts! You know what I found it was in Cape Town once? They hadn't opened their mail box in three months! That wasn't very mysterious, was it? Found out about it because it'd gotten full and had slopped over on the window ledge [laughter] and it was running all over the floor, and one of the people going in said that they had gotten one of my bulletins because they'd found it there and so on. It was very horrible because they were a member of the public that wasn't supposed to get the bulletin! So you can talk all you want to about clever management. I'm a very clever manager I have a very, very good statistic as a manager, as I think you'll admit. Totally aside from research or anything of the sort, just pure management statistic is good. All right.

Now, where does it break down? It just breaks down because I don't go down and find out if the bookstore is open. See, by the time I've looked into the bookstore to find out if the bookstore is open amongst twenty some orgs. Obviously. Now, when you multiply this factor by another hundred factors that could also cause down statistics, why, you immediately see that it isn't feasible to have a one-man government. He'd have to have eyes in the back of his thetan. He'd have to have one of these thousand-eye eyeballs like a fly.

People don't do these things willfully. They just don't notice. And you can get a framework, a form of attitude going in an organization if you get too long a stuck flow. If your orders are going this way, this way, this way, this way, you get a stuck flow of order, and you tend to produce an apathy at the other end, a lack of initiative, if nobody can ever talk up.

Let's say the Ad Council keeps ordering the Dist Division, the Ad Council keeps ordering the Dist Division, the Ad Council keeps ordering the Dist Division, and the Dist Division at – doesn't have any Distribution Secretary. I mean, it'll happen many times just that way, you see. And eventually everybody in the Distribution Division is just kind of in total apathy and they don't come to work. And when they come to work they just sit blankly and look at the paper in front of them, and they don't quite know what's wrong. Everybody seems to be mad at them. Actually nobody's mad at them, don't you see? Communication line is totally broken down. They got a stuck flow.

But if they were simply on the receiving end and there was no representation of – on the Ad Council of the Distribution Secretary, this could happen in any corporate body or in any area. It doesn't have to be anything like a backflow. It has to be an existing channel for one, do you understand? And if one exists for one, every once in a while somebody'll come along and test it, see: "Is the line open?" And then they find it open so they're perfectly happy.

A lot of people want to talk to me, and I know why they want to talk to me. They want to talk to me for only one reason: they want to find out if I am there and they can talk to me. And they haven't got anything to talk to me about. [laugh] It's very remarkable. I've had – I've had I don't know how many people... One time I interviewed thirty-five people after a four
day congress where I'd lectured day and night. I was absolutely dead tired, falling to pieces, and I actually interviewed thirty-five people. There wasn't one single one of them anything to say to me at all. They took up a lot of time but they didn't have anything to say to me. So, after that I didn't interview people after a congress.

What – what is, then, the primary problem of government? And what have you got to solve in all such things? What's the primary problem which if it isn't solved will cause revolt, revolution, upset, tear-apart, bad morale, and that sort of thing? There's only one problem in the problem of government, because there is no such thing as a corporate body except as a postulated thing. They're only individuals.

So the problem is to obtain an equable, not-too-oppressive (notice how that's phrased) relationship between the individual and the governing body, and between the governing body and the individual. And that's the problem you're trying to solve with government. How are you – how can you achieve this relationship with the minimum amount of uproar and upset? And it's just the – the relationship between the individual and the corporate body, and the corporate body and the individual.

It's two ways: a corporate body which has insufficient authority and cannot act swiftly enough will make horrible mistakes and do lots of individuals in, and a setup where any individual can clobber the corporate body with total impunity will cause a tremendous amount of upset and suppression, because they'll also go around and clobber other individuals if they're able to clobber the corporate body.

So the problem is trying to set up something that resolves these two things: the corporate body, the individual. Now, the individual must be able to get some semblance of justice from the corporate body, and he's entitled to a certain amount of bright management – doesn't have to be very brilliant, but he's entitled to it – and the corporate body is entitled to expect a certain contribution and compliance on the part of the individual. And between these two things, if those are solved fairly well, then you'll find out you have a working organization. That's actually all it takes to make an organization is just resolutions to these problems.

If you want to find where any organization on this planet is falling to pieces – and I wouldn't go so far as to say that they're all falling to pieces; I'm sure in some bush tribe somewhere there is some organization on the planet that isn't incipiently violating this so wildly that it is falling to pieces. I know of no civilized government that has a very, very high statistical certainty of future. I don't know of any.

Empires on this planet have a tendency to last very brief periods. It's fantastic that the British Empire has lasted 350 or 50 years. It has. It's gone on quite a while. One would ordinarily have expected it to fall to pieces long ago. The Roman Empire is supposed to have lasted a thousand years and so on, and they bragged about it and talked about it and yapped about it and so forth. And that doesn't count right in my history books. I don't know how many years the Roman Empire lasted but it was no thousand years, man. But it's one of the longest lived of recent empires. But all these other empires are dust. And why are they dust? It's they didn't equitably solve the problems related to that relationship which I just described to you.
One can never solve it perfectly, but he can try very well. And when you get consent of the governed by representation in the government, and when you get respect for the governed on the part of the corporate body — when you get those two relationships pretty well functioning, why, the thing will go on and on.

There is no reason why, theoretically, they could not be balanced to go on for a very, very long time. There is no reason why an empire couldn't go on for a very, very, very long time. There are empires which — not on this planet — which have gone on for a very long time and that was — that's one of the reasons. They were not necessarily elective empires even. They weren't, weren't elective, they — but there was a big consent.

But the odd part of it is, they were based on state of case. If a guy couldn't pick up his telephone with a beam, why, he wasn't a fit guy to govern. If a guy was in that good a state of case, why, of course, he was pretty good as a governor. You know. I mean it was — it was a caste system based on ability, so you got a — you got a selection, you got an immediate selection. Of course, anybody who saw that somebody like that was strong or clever or something like that — he was perfectly willing to say, "That guy represents me," and would tend to fall into line, you see. That was great as far as he was concerned. You get the idea.

Well, I thought I would tell you about this change. I don't say that that won't be changed again, but these things are necessary to adjust from time to time. The governing body which can govern ten thousand people is not the governing body which can govern a hundred thousand. Various problems arise and these things need adjustment.

But when you put in an arbitrary such as a government, you must put in a review of the arbitrary. A postulated form of government is an arbitrary. So having postulated that governmental form, why, for heaven's sakes, put a Board of Investigation in a few months or a few years later to find out how it's running in order to make any adjustments necessary.

And people will do this in any event. In the United States they passed their Bill of Rights. Ages after they passed their Constitution, they found out they had to have these Bill of Rights. And they sort of looked it over and they changed the status of the president and they changed this and they changed that. And they've changed it along the line from time to time with amendments to the Constitution.

But in actual fact, nobody was reporting back to the body that organized it in the first place — the body or the person who organized it in the first place — so they've never given it a thorough overhaul and it's getting pretty messy. Just at the present time, it's getting pretty messy.

For instance, it used to be all Congress and now it's all executive. Talk about a total shift of authority. Well, of course, you can't have it all executive, but the reason it's shifting all executive is Congress did not represent the people. But they could — they could say, "Well, we voted for Joe Blow and he's president, so therefore, he's representative of us." Do you understand? So in the absence of representation you get people trying to assert a single-man representation. They're sure he represents them.

Well, these are the things which you try to solve. But a governed people who do not understand the ramifications of its government or the theories or postulates or other things...
which go back of government, or the laws which underlie the systems of government and so on, can be pretty dismayed. They can be led around and confused and get upset at the wrong places and so on and become very uncomfortable. Because they individually are afraid that the relationship between the governing body and the individual, and the individual and the governing body – they're afraid that those relationships have not been resolved and will not be safeguarded by the government or the action which they are protesting against.

And maybe – maybe the thing is set up to represent them but nobody's let them in on it, and so they tend to break down. You will have a lot to do with this in the future, it isn't really a dry subject. Anything is a dry subject about which nothing is known. I imagine government and so forth has been one of the driest subjects anybody ever heard of. But its very – very fact that it is a dry subject has caused its history to be written in solid red. And nobody has dug it so a lot of people have killed a lot of people trying to prove things they didn't know in the first place. So I wish us far more success with regard to this.

Thank you.
Thank you.
Thank you.
I like you, too.

Well, I thought I'd better show me face. For any Americans that hear that tape, that's "face." [laughter] But over here in England, we're down in the south country, you know, and they have peculiar accents. The accent of Sussex now is getting more and more American. [laughter]

Well, what's the date?

Audience: Twenty-nine November, AD 16.

Twenty-nine Nov. AD 16, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and a lecture.

One of the things that's very interesting is, do you know that we now have a majority of the major executives of Scientology Clear? [applause] Pretty good, huh? Boy, that took some doing, too. [laughter]

In the first place these people, you know, are the busiest of the people. We just had a swarm in here from Washington. And I made a crack in a bulletin or a cable or something of the sort. I think it was a public statement, wasn't it? And it said to the effect that, well, it was no wonder Washington was doing so badly because so far we hadn't heard of any enthusiasm for getting Clear in their top bracket and so forth.

Well, quite a few of them were on the Clearing Course and they promptly went and got their E-Meters and audited literally day and night, day and night, day and night. And a couple of them showed up the other day, three of them as a matter of fact, and they were Clear. But it's pretty remarkable for somebody who is working twenty-four hours a day to audit five more or something like that. But that's very good.

So the trend I first noticed was the statistics of divisions which were headed by executives were in just about the same state as the state of the executive who was in charge of that division. This was quite interesting; it was a rough coordination, but it nevertheless was a factual one. So the executives who were worse off you see, further on down – not worse off
but further on down the Release list, they would have the lower statistics; and those who were more progressed on up the line would have the better statistic. It was quite interesting. There was a coordination between these two.

And since this feat of the major executives of Scientology are now Clear and so forth, statistics are starting to take off and are starting to do very, very well. And this shows a tremendous forecast for the general future of Scientology. And further than that and beyond that, it shows a tremendous forecast for a different future for this planet, actually. Of course, I don't say that we will have to work at it and do it all by next year and neither do I say it will take the fifteen hundred years to fail taken by some organizations. I didn't mention any names at all.

Okay. Now, this lecture begins a series of lectures. And I see the D of T – where is the Exec Sec, so we can file an ethics chit – actually didn't get the word out fast enough to the students, because I expected a stack of cards up here that high. But next lecture we'll have them.

All right. No. I won't – I'm not giving any ethics chits, just public announcements. [laughter]

Now, we have many times tried to put together a dictionary for Scientology, and although we make some progress in doing it, it all requires a certain amount of effort and action from myself. (That's all right. Come up tone again.) And the… (And next time get an announcement out faster.) [laughter] So the – every time we try to do this dictionary project it requires some work from me because the words are not always totally defined in books and so on.

So I sit down with a tremendous administrative backlog – or, my administration is seldom backlogged, so that would be a fib – but a tremendous administrative line to get through, my research to do, with everything else to do and so on, and I just don't do it. So we don't have our major dictionary. But anyway, we will have, one of these days.

But we have certain words which perhaps students fall across; common as well as esoteric words. And if for the next few lectures, if you get out a stack of cards… Cards – don't write them all on a list of paper – legibly. That's the biggest GAE there is, is an illegible auditor. Poor old Case Supervisor sitting there. I – you know, I finally s… I finally solved all this. I've got a very powerful magnifying glass that has a built-in crystal ball. [laughter, laughs]

But if you will legibly write these words, particularly those you honestly are curious about, or you think other people have been curious about, and hand them in to the LRH Communicator Saint Hill – LRH Communicator Saint Hill will collect these things and he will pass them over to the LRH Aide and you can give me fistfuls of them. And we will try to get through all of these things. And probably not very exciting going over a lot of words of this particular character. The truth of the matter is, the definitions and meanings of Scientology have not, from the most basic values on up, ever completely been covered. So you might get an entirely new insight into the whole thing.

So anyway, I will try to make it exciting, I'll try to tell jokes – get me a Joe Miller joke book – and try not to make it too dull. But we will go over this and maybe amongst us we can dig up all the basic simple words. You know, I don't want the complicated words. We can
forget those. We can just draw a line through them in the text, you know? But it's the basic, simple words. There's probably – I don't know what the vocabulary of Scientology is, but it probably doesn't exceed five hundred words or it's about the same as basic English.

But there are a lot of fringe words which you possibly think are Scientology which aren't, you know. Like "esoteric," you know? [laughter] Merely means "exotically strange." But I probably also, in doing this exercise, should get myself my historical dictionary and I probably ought to sit up here and go through the thing somewhat exhaustively for clarification of these things. I got an historical dictionary; I got a child's dictionary. I've got an Oxford Abridged Dictionary.

Now, the Oxford Abridged Dictionary couldn't be carried across the room by a strong porter, so God help us if we ever got hold of their full edition. [laughter] I probably should get hold of a Skeat's. I think – that's not something you trap-shoot, that's something that gives the derivation of words and how they got that way. But regardless of all of that, I think it might be very beneficial as a run-over – a general run-over of Scientology.

See, I'm doing so much research on things I can't talk about, that I had to find something, you see, that I could talk about. And the something I can talk about is, in actual fact, words and definitions.

And I see, staring me in the face, the first word to be defined, which I will take up with you now without further preamble or prelude – that means something that goes before. [laughter, laughs] A preamble is that part of the Constitution which the people found most desirable in the United States and which is not part of the enforceable law of the Constitution. I always got a big kick out of that, you know? They told everybody that the preamble of the Constitution… And people more or less think it's law. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and the Declaration of Independence and all of this sort of thing – all of the things that were good, you know, in the Constitution and really were hot and so forth. One of the first actions of the Supreme Court was to say they weren't part of law. Not enforceable.

The government cannot be forced to deliver the pursuit of happiness or the happiness of anybody. And boy, do they carry that out.

It isn't that the US government is worse than the English government. It's that we're in England and the English government, you see, would be insulted and the US government can't get at me. Now, if I were lecturing in Washington at this particular time, I would have to take the English government, you see, over the rolly coasters.

I will give a lecture sometime on the subject of "Can One Get Along with Government?" You know, they used to say, "You can do business with Hitler" and then, "You can't do business with Hitler." Well, can you do business with a government? Interesting and a challenging question. Of course, we all know the answer. [laughter, laughs] And that brings us up to word number one, as I said, and that is OT.

Now, why that is the first word on the list, I don't know, since it's the toppest word that would have to be defined: Operating Thetan. Now, I have to write an essay on that subject for Auditor 19, which is almost ready to go to press but has one little column missing and so forth. So if I defined that now, I would spend all my enthusiasm for defining it in that Auditor.
So, **operating**: *Operating* simply means to operate or manipulate or handle. You operate an E-Meter; you operate a car; you operate a steam engine, a railway locomotive, a ship, you see? Operate. And that is that one also oneself can operate. He can fly around and do this and that. He himself is operative. In other words, he is able to operate.

The word has been appropriated by the medical profession as a method of torture under law, but that is not part of the definition. In psychiatry, it's legalized euthanasia, which means "mercy killing." Only I don't think you can even call that "mercy killing" – prefrontal lobotomies and transorbital leukotomies, and that sort of thing that they do in psychiatry. It's just outright murder.

Anyway, this word *operating*: it merely means to manipulate, handle, operate.

And *thetan*, of course, is the Greek word *theta*. The Greek word *theta* traditionally amongst the Greek philosophers, unless my memory fails me, was the symbol, the letter of the alphabet, which was used to determine thought. It was their letter of the alphabet for thought. That is not original with us, the word *theta*. But under ordinary… It's like in a mathematical equation you've got \(x\); \(c\) always means a constant in a mathematical equation. Well, a Greek philosopher, when he was talking and he included the idea or live thought or something like that, then he used this word *theta*, which is a circle with a bar across it.

Now in entering, a lot of Scientology terminology is engineering in derivation or manipulation or handling. And the modern way of making something into a noun would be to add an *n* to it. You make an adjective with an – *ic* – *i-c*, something like that – but you add an *n* to something and you have a noun. The trouble in Scientology has been that we did not dare use – mostly because the phenomena themselves didn't exist in other mental studies and other religious studies – actually there was no phenomenon, they didn't know the phenomenon, so of course they could have no name for what they didn't know. So there was a whole field there where you had to have nomenclature. Well, it isn't in human experience and it isn't in the traditional fields.

But in this particular case this letter *theta* is in the traditional field and it's in the traditional field of Greek philosophy. And by it, however, we have altered its meaning. We mean a life unit; we mean a being, an individual who is alive and who is capable of thinking. And I think you may find that some of the Greek philosophers also gave it that designation. When they said "thought" – that was the thought in a person as opposed to his body.

The idea, by the way, that there is a spirit inhabiting the body is the oldest traditional concept of man, not the newest. The Johnny-come-lately one is that "all men are rats." And perhaps that was based on experience with other psychologists. [laughter]

Yeah, you don't need a Joe Miller's joke book; I can – I can get these in. But you better get one, I might slip up one day.

So we have *thetan*, which means the being. Now, the being or life unit is the individual who inhabits the clay. I wouldn't call it common clay, because look at Marilyn Monroe, you know? Who inherits the – the being inherits this stuff and mushes, moves it around. In other words, it gets a body and moves it around.
Now, to that degree, anybody who can move is really – is really operating as a thetan. See, anybody who can move is doing that. But that isn't what we mean. We mean somebody who can operate without a body. And that means somebody who can not only operate bodies, who can operate without a body. And that was its original meaning. Now, the definition of an Operating Thetan is a being – and this gives us our extreme specialized definition – and that means a being who is cause over thought, life, matter, energy, space and time; cause over it. By cause in this effect we mean the communication formula of cause, distance, effect. An individual who is cause is being a source of action or impulse and so on. Now, therefore, we mean by this somebody who can operate without the encumbrances of the common clay.

Now, this is different than Clear, as we will go into when we get to Clear, but it's quite different than Clear because actually there are degrees, not of OT, but degrees of condition of a thetan. As I've just said, every thetan is, unless he's knocked flat out – you know, unless he's been eating some of the recent food preservatives – this fellow is operating to some degree, even if he's just an effect. You see, he's – he still can put out an impulse. See, he's mostly effect, but he can put out a little bit of an impulse, see?

Well, actually that would be an interiorized thetan who was very wog. And the word wog, of course, is in essence a "worthy oriental gentleman" as been defined by the Royal Air Force. There's nothing derogatory in being called a wog. As a matter of fact, that was the source of a general order issued in Egypt on the complaint of the Egyptian government. The air force officers were calling Egyptians wogs. So the commanding officer defined it. And he said, "Well, wog, that means 'worthy oriental gentleman'," and insisted his officers use it. Those were in the days when the Empire wasn't dead!

Anyway, this means a common, ordinary, run-of-the-mill, garden-variety humanoid. And a garden-variety humanoid means a person who has human characteristics. By which we define – not that he is human in his treatment of things – he isn't. It's simply that he is a body – he is a body. When you get way downhill, you get a person who is a body; he isn't there as a spirit at all. Spirit is dead into the MEST of the – you know, the – it's dead into the matter, energy, space and time, and it itself isn't alive. The matter, energy, space and time is animate, do you see? He isn't there at all. He doesn't know he's there, you see? Nothing. He's, you know, wog. All right. Naturally, he'll develop a philosophy that says everything is matter, including himself, see?

Now, that isn't the bottom end of the scale; I couldn't really tell you where the bottom end of the scale is. Haven't been down there – lately, at least. The bottom end of the scale, however, would have in it as scale – there would be psychotic, neurotic, the person who was just totally motionless all the time, didn't even know they were MEST, you know? Psychiatrist, [laughter] commissar, other undesirable things. Insect is above those. [laughter] That's way upscale.

Now, where we've got the idea of gradients – a little more of something, a little more of something – or when we see that something can be more and more and higher and higher and so on up a scale, we'd see that in measuring this scale, we get the top end of it there is – at the top end, why, we have actually not OT; that is not the top end of the scale. And boy, that baffled you, didn't it? [laughter]
No, at the top end of the scale would be the lower harmonic of the bot... I mean, on the lower harmonic you'd have the bottom of the scale. And that's always true. By harmonic, we mean it repeats characteristic. Top end of the scale would be a thetan who didn't have to operate. See, he didn't have to at all. He'd be in a total, almost unattainable absolute, don't you see? But he theoretically would be in a state where he was so serene, calm, disassociated with the physical universe, that he wasn't even in it; he wasn't even in the time stream; he had nothing to do with anything and so forth. Now, that would be the theoretical top of the scale and that would be a thetan who did not have to operate.

Now, as you see a person with a present time problem is not over the present time problem as long as he has to do something about it. Have you — did you ever notice that, by the way? When a person has a problem, you think you've gotten rid of the problem, but he says, "Well, no, I can take care of that now. I can go out and see..." You know, you haven't gotten rid of the problem yet. He's got to do something about it, do you see?

Very often preclears of very inexperienced auditors go springing out of the chair after having had a problem handled to go handle the problem. And you notice that the preclear doesn't — has to still handle the problem, you have not handled it as a problem. That's pretty remarkable, but that lays in a stricture on it of fantastically thorough handling of the problem. It's almost unimaginably thorough handling of the problem not to have him — not to have a severe problem. If a guy has a severe problem that's actually in the universe, it's in present time right now, and the handling of that problem would have to be so good on the auditor's part that he didn't have to do anything about it. And what do you know: if he — if the auditor does this, it's a strange phenomenon that the problem thereafter cannot affect the pc.

This is one of the goofinesses. In other words, man makes himself the subject of effect. You know, he actually elects to get his brains blown out. In some way or another he does. Even if it was only being there and communicating, see? He was there and visible, so he got his brains blown out, do you see? Well, to that degree, why, he was the effect of something.

Now, an individual at the bottom of this scale that leads up to OT and through OT, of course, is the effect of everything. He can cause nothing. Now, the individual at the total top of the scale would be potentially able to cause everything and anything — life, thought, matter, energy, space and time — and would not have to cause anything; would be under no compulsion of causing anything. He would, however, be in a no-games condition. And one of the characteristics of the thetan, the idiot, is he likes to have a game going.

So just below this point of theoretical absolute of a thetan who didn't have to operate, you would have an Operating Thetan. And he could operate and would operate, do you understand? Even if it was only building his own universe and doing something, he'll mess around, see.

It's one of those characteristics, basic and native characteristics of a thetan — he messes around. He can actually not do it, but he gets bored. After you've sat around a while being totally serene and totally benign, and totally, you consider that you're being much too absolute. And you decide to go out and put a strange and unfamiliar mock-up in the middle of somebody else's universe, you know? You go out and see what will happen.
But today – today we have a different being than the theoretical state of the individual who existed at the beginning of the universe. That individual was totally potential and had no experience. He could totally, potentially have all experience, but he didn't have any. He potentially could know everything, but he did – stupid as a... Well, I wouldn't go on. Do you understand? So he'd soak himself down scale, and he finally got to a state where he couldn't regulate his own state, and then he was in trouble and he went right on down the scale and he fell out the bottom.

Now, when you put somebody back to the level of Operating Thetan, you're putting somebody back there who is different than any being who has ever been on the track. Where there is never really been one on the track – because he's operating with experience. Now, before, there has never been in the history of the universe anything more than a released OT. So we must get the difference between a Clear OT and a released OT. So there are two different types of OT.

Now, a fellow who's a released OT is just temporarily up and feeling high and great, but he can fall on his head. A Clear OT, particularly because of experience and so forth, it would be very, very difficult indeed – if at all possible – to make him fall on his head. So the way we use OT is we really mean Clear OT. That's what we really mean when we say, "We're going for OT." All right, we mean Clear OT. And so, therefore, you must always be careful to use the word release ahead of an OT who is simply an exterior.

So you see, you'd say, "Oh, well, I..." Don't let somebody jump out of a – out of a Level III session or something where they've all of a sudden gone and find themselves as tall as the Empire State Building and are walking around with their feet in the Atlantic being lord of all they survey and so forth. This person is not an OT; this person is a released OT. The funny part of it is, he may stay that way for centuries; he may stay that way for five minutes. But do not send to find for whom the bell tolls; the rest of his bank, sooner or later, is going to catch up with him.

Now, therefore, when you make a person who is exterior and conceives himself to be powerful on the lower levels – which you very often will do – you are making a released OT. And the definition is of course, somebody who is exterior; he is temporarily exterior.

Now, there is a whole line which parallels the line of clearing, so there are two lines involved here. There's the line of how much less bank does a fellow have? See, it's less and less bank – the person is going clearer and clearer – and how much is he out of his bank? So you can release a person out of his bank. The bank still exists, you see, and that is a Release; but the individual, actually, with less and less bank eventually becomes Clear, which is no bank and no compulsion to make a bank. And that is a Clear. Do you follow?

Well, these states are actually not as absolute as you would imagine but the whole subject of exterior is another line – the subject of exterior. You know, you can take almost any human being with some techniques that we had back in 1952, you can bang almost anybody out of his head. And he at that moment will exhibit the characteristics of a Thetan Exterior – a being not influenced by a body. So when we say "a Thetan Exterior," we simply mean a being who is not influenced by a body; that's all we mean. He's out of his body.
It's an interesting side commentary on some past mental studies, and so forth, that they considered this an insane condition. I've conducted research across this line. As a matter of fact, by taking an insane person and exteriorizing him you instantly have a sane person. So that a real exteriorization is quite phenomenal. The only trouble is, it's very temporary. And if you do it very often to the individual, or if he bangs back into the body – some of them last three days, some of them last three months, you know, some of them last three hundred years, but – as I've got some evidence – but the point I'm making here is that it's simply an exterior being, you know. The change of state is the lack of influence of the body. That is what brings about the change of state.

Now, a body can influence a person so much that an individual exhibiting neurotic circumstances or characteristics in a body will not exhibit them out of a body. But at the same time, he occasionally, because they are his aberrations, not the aberrations of the body… You exteriorize somebody and he will still have his aberrations. He'll still have some aberrations when he gets outside. He'll be able to handle them better, but he still has some aberrations, particularly physical ones.

You say, "Well, what is he doing outside with a physical aberration?" Well, it's hilarious when you try to cure somebody's cough by curing his body ailments, that when you exteriorize him, you find out that it is the thetan who's coughing! He'll be out there twelve feet back of his head going "Cough! Cough! Cough! Cough!" He'll be the first one that recognizes it. He'll say, "Oh, I always thought it was the body coughing. It's me! Ho-ho!" [laughs]

But it would have been very, very, very careless observation, if not criminal misreporting, to say that a person ext… that exteriorization only exists amongst the insane. You recognize that as a suppressive statement to prevent people from exteriorizing. That they knew about it and didn't investigate it any better than that is also a very bad commentary. But of course they had no technology by which it could be done.

Now, actually, Gautama Siddhartha in 523 B.C. was exteriorizing people and he was banging them out of their head left and right. And they were making a state called bodhi, from which you get the word *buddha*. Now, anybody who exteriorizes is a buddha. In Scientology we can make a buddha in thirty seconds. See, our technology on this is better, which is quite startling in itself. The lamas, a further extension of Buddhism, tried to develop practices which assisted exteriorization. And those developments did exist and they did assist exteriorization, and that is the basic goal of the lama also.

Now, when he doesn't make it and can't get out of his head, then he talks about benign conduct. Do you understand? He wasn't able, in actual fact, to attain bodhi, which is exteriorization, so he redefines the word *bodhi* as somebody who is calm and benign and serene.

I'm not now talking now out of a knowledge of the current texts of Buddhism. I'm telling you the hot dope. Very, very difficult to exteriorize some people – so difficult to exteriorize them that they think they are a body. Now, some people who don't think they are a body are also difficult to exteriorize because of the mental masses and so forth which pin them into the body. (You can cheer up now. [laughs] Golly, I didn't know my postulates were getting that bad, you know?) And this is a very uncertain procedure – exteriorizing somebody. But
Buddha worked on it a long while, and it's uncertain and difficult to do. Some people can't do it at all, and so on.

Well, what prevents a person from exteriorizing is the mental mass called a mind. And this is the composite of his own pictures and aberrations. And these pin him to the body. Do you see? So, some people have more in restimulation than others, and so they're much harder to exteriorize than others; and because they're still able to develop this and it can still come in contact with the body, they snap back in with the greatest of ease and they can't operate outside. You get this difference? They can't operate outside. They need a body to drive a car.

Now, a Thetan Exterior, then, is a lower state and a perfectly valid Scientology state – Thetan Exterior – and that is below the level of Operating Thetan. And this what gives the word Operating Thetan its substance and definition. A Thetan Exterior is in actual fact somebody who's simply outside his body. Now, it doesn't matter whether he has a body or not; if he's outside of a body, he's a Thetan Exterior. So that everybody sooner or later is a Thetan Exterior. He kicks the bucket and he has to be a Thetan Exterior to go pick up another body, do you see? It doesn't matter whether he was knowing or unknowing or otherwise.

You'll find out that it's mostly the worry about getting a body that makes those periods very, very unhappy. As a matter of fact, a person is quite often very well off during those periods, except he's so worried. He isn't talking to anybody and things are – you know. He doesn't really get a chance to find out if he can go very long without food, you know. And no Kool cigarettes\(^\text{11}\) or Coca-Colas, you know?

But – so then, this state is common to mankind, but he has a very low reality on it. And he doesn't think he's ever lived before because he identifies himself thoroughly with the body he is in. He identifies himself so thoroughly with it that he says he himself doesn't exist. Well, this is the total of suppression and invalidation, isn't it? Fellow must have been suppressed and invalidated to the last nth to believe he didn't exist but the body did. Right?

Now, an Operating Thetan is a Thetan Exterior who can have but doesn't have to have a body in order to control or operate thought, life, matter, energy, space and time. So it's okay for him to be exterior.

Now, it's – it's almost, in the past, the state of Release made this very complex. So that somebody would bang out of his head suddenly – you know, somebody would knock the body off or something like that – and he'd be out of his head, bang, you see? There he'd be. See, "out of his head" also in English, you know, is a suppressive definition of a cliché, means somebody who is crazy. Not accidental. That was knowing suppression.

So this fellow finds himself outside, see? And he can't do a thing. He can just about, you know, reactively go around and find the maternity ward of another hospital, you know? Terrible, you know. He can barely get from the accident ward to the maternity ward, you know? Total state of unknowing-ness, no power of choice, you know? Chooses any child at random, doesn't do a Security Check on the parents. [laughter] All he can do is crawl down the hall and get to the maternity ward, you know, and find out, "Nyeaaaal!" "Well, that's good, then." [laughter]

\(^{11}\) Editor's note: "Kool" was the brand of cigarettes LRH used to smoke.
Now, through some change or experience or some factor in life, why, a few hundred years later – you know, he's been many times exterior, but just – oh, one day, why, he – bang! And he's out of his body. And he (quote) "brings his fist" (you know, he hasn't got one now, you know) down on the nearest table and says, "Damn it! That was a mistake." His fist doesn't go through the table.

And all of a sudden with great mysteriousness he finds out that he has somehow or other regained, through some way he doesn't quite know how… He gets quite excited about it, by the way. He can write… The only operating textbook that he has had has been ghost stories, so he quite commonly goes and haunts a castle; that's what he thinks he's supposed to do now, or something like that. He hasn't had any games manual, you see? It's a fact.

See, he – well, now, he's an Operating Thetan, just like that! You know, he could pick up an automobile and pack it down the street. Well, this happens very rarely indeed! It's every few trillenia. But this it can happen. Sometimes it scares him so thoroughly that he promptly drops the ability before he hurts himself you see? But he does it.

And he knows he's like this. He knows he's like this. And maybe he'll go along for several hundred years in this kind of a state of operation. He gets into a duel. Somebody kills the body and he gets outside the body and he picks up the sword and just cuts the other fellow into small mincemeat. [laughter] And you have these periods when witchcraft and that sort of thing are so well advertised, you know? Then Roman Catholic Churches, not to name any organizations, rise up in order to put it down. Funny things happen. Funny things.

Well, these are sufficiently rare and far apart and the people who observe them are usually so frightened that nobody credits them, and so on, because that is a very rare state. Now, you get the idea?

There are even two states of being more or less aware of yourself exterior. A fellow can be very aware of himself; he can go running around and try talking to his friends and so forth and to hang around for two or three years and admire things, and so forth. Whereas he actually, in actual fact, can't move anything and can't talk to anybody.

Now, you get an incident of this character: Fellow is swarming up a scaling ladder – attack on a castle, see? Now, according to his reality, he gets up to the top of the ladder, he dodges a bunch of Greek fire that hits him in the teeth, see. And he throws that aside and he goes up the ladder and he gets to the top of the ladder and he gets onto the battlement and he's got his broadsword and he's just hewing about him left and right, till all of a sudden he realizes that this thing he sees as a broadsword is going through everybody, but they're not paying any attention to it. And he looks over the battlement and he looks down into the moat, and there was his recent body. He's been dead for several minutes. But in the enthusiasm of carrying on, he hasn't noticed. [laughter]

Now, most anybody sooner or later has had an experience of that… It's terribly embarrassing! [laughter] One feels very silly. You know, it's like the girl doesn't know her slip is showing; he hasn't noticed he's lost his body. So, that would be a Thetan Exterior. And this fellow might stay exterior for some time in a very knowing state. But this is only a knowing state, and he can't operate and he can't move anything, and this makes him very upset indeed. So he gets upset after a while with the state of being exterior and goes and finds another body.
Now, Buddha was interested in curing the death-birth cycle. Why did you keep having to come back and pick up a body? Why did you keep having to come back and pick up a body? What was all this about? And he was trying to knock that out and some other people added the idea of nirvana and you became nothing, and so forth, afterwards. That was added by – with trimmings. But it was just to knock off this thing of having to pick up another body and another identity all the time and mess it up like that. That was the aim and goal of Buddhism. It didn't have the aim and goal that the fellow ought to be able to operate. To that degree we have enormously exceeded any limits ever put in this direction before.

Now, Suleiman is one of the characters of Arab fame – not Solomon (only he might be, for all I know) – you read about him in the *Arabian Nights*. And he put all the jinns in bottles and threw them – with brass stoppers – and threw them in the ocean. Well, I don't know what he did – probably ran an implant station – but he and the Catholic church have had, actually, periods of being extremely active in knocking out any possibility that any thetan would ever come uphill far enough to be an Operating Thetan. People become terrified of these beings. Your biggest forward menace in Scientology is that the world becomes too terrified of an Operating Thetan.

Man is basically good. An aberrated Operating Thetan can exist, just by the accidental combination of being outside and find out that he could move MEST, that he could make sound, that he could do things. Do you understand? Just by that alone. But this character is very aberrated; very, very, very aberrated in that condition. And he's liable to do most anything, because he in actual fact is operating automatically. He can do these things without knowing how he does them; he's not able to control them. Do you understand? It's like some characters, see, around them things move. That's poltergeist, known to some students of this. It means simply the ability to – the spiritual movement of things, you know? Poltergeist phenomena. It's very automatic. And he takes this on, he loses it. He's in an unknowing state, so he really is not an Operating Thetan at all. He's just a released OT. You got it? Accidentally, momentarily released OT.

Now, those beings can be upsetting, because they're doing what they're doing without knowing what they're doing, you know? They're sort of a higher-scale wog amongst thetans, you know.

Well, our definition of an Operating Thetan, I wish to bring again to your attention, is that of a *Clear* Operating Thetan. He would know what he was doing, he would know why he was doing it and he would be able to do that. Now, he, being basically good, responds to fairly decent impulses and never destroys cities unless an Ethics Order has been issued against them. One of the rules.

Now, previously, individuals who got into a released state of Operating Thetan had no one with whom to associate with. Anybody who went Thetan Exterior, he didn't have any hope of anything else and it was a pretty shut track. So the game of "be a body" became an extremely active and functional game. And this became all.

Actually, there's no reason to believe that an Operating Thetan couldn't mock up a body whole cloth, because how else do you think you've got a body, see? So that gives you
some kind of an essay and definition – a cyclopedic look at the subject of OT which probably is very pertinent to it.

And I'd rather have a classification on this. I can tell you now and describe to you the definition of Clear, because this is another state. You understand this one about OT now, don't you? He's a Clear who can operate like billy-o. And so let's define this word Clear, so that we've got these two words at least adjacent in the lineup.

A Clear – a Clear is a thetan without a bank. Now, he doesn't have to be in a body or out of a body – there are no such conditions imposed on it – just has to be without a bank. And the source of the bank is the being himself. He is making himself the unknowing and unwilling effect of his own bank, and he is causing himself to receive, unwillingly and unknowingly, the effect of his own bank, all of which is very complex. And you can state that theoretically, and maybe one person in every eight million would say, "Oh, is that what I'm doing?" and would promptly cease to do it, but I'm afraid the rest of them have to go through the course. Anyway…

The individual compulsively makes up pictures, and that's pretty well covered in Dianetics. And any severe experience an individual has had is covered with pictures. Now, when an individual gets very, very bad off he no longer has pictures. All he has is a blanked-off picture. That is to say, he has a black mass which covers up the picture or he has some action of pressure which crowds the picture back into oblivion. You see, it's really there but it's not there. Do you understand? And he can't have pictures.

Now, down below that an individual will just have pictures on automatic and they're so automatic that they go flickity-flick-flick. You actually can't audit him through an engram at all, because he couldn't stay in one point of time long enough to regard the situation.

He's – he'd be sort of looking at a motion picture screen gone mad, you see, which is showing everything and anything to him. And it goes thrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr and brrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr and they change. And you try to tell him to look at something, and so on: "What's that?" and he gets twenty more like them. You get the idea? And he can't even explain to you what he's looking at, but he knows he's looking at something.

Well, now, we'd normally call that a bank. And that is taken from an electronic computer, the word "bank." An electronic computer has bank. And cards have been made up and they normally are put into a file system and this file system is called the "bank." And then the machine itself pulls out of this card system certain data cards and puts them into operation or computation in the machine in order to solve problems, and so on.

For instance, a data bank on insurance policies: You feed the name John Doe into it, or you feed a number into it that will give you John Doe, and it all of a sudden goes whirr-clank and gives you all the John Does which are in the bank – meaning the data bank. And it'll feed you all of those and it'll actually go ahead and do things with those for you. But mainly it feeds you something from the bank: a datum, or it feeds you a picture or it feeds you a card or it feeds you something.

Now, the body-bound thetan, particularly, is peculiarly affected in this direction, and he operates very thoroughly on bank. Now, there is no such thing as a crazy thetan. There is
really no such thing as a crazy thetan. There is a thetan who is mocking up craziness that he is the effect of. Now, that opens the door very hopefully. If it weren't this way, why, there would be no hope at all. And when people try to tell you that there is such a thing as insanity or disease or predisposition or something like this, entirely independent of any cause — "The being is just that way," see? Well, of course, that's a stupid, suppressive statement, anyhow. It means the person making it himself cannot conceive — he's so low on the scale that he can't even conceive the idea that something is cause.

So if there is anything wrong with a thetan, it's the fact he does this. But he does this automatically; he does not know how he is doing it, he does not know what he is doing, usually, and he does not see the things which are affecting him. It's a very strange experience to somebody to say, "Look around you and what..." We got some old process, "Look around you..." "Shut your eyes," you know, "Look around you, what do you see?" Some guy merely sees his pink eyelids. But if you keep it up for a while, why, he eventually, "Oh, that's what you're talking about!" You know, if he's rather bad off, you'll have to go on and on and on with this and so forth.

You say, "Well, shut your eyes. Well, look out in front of you. What do you see?"

"Well, I don't see anything," so forth. "Of course, there's nothing there."

And that is, of course, what he is saying all the time to himself about it! And he just hands you the dramatization, see?

"Nothing there. I don't see anything. There's nothing different than the usual. And what are you talking about?"

And you say, "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wu-wu, wu-wu, wu-wu-wu! You said 'nothing different than the usual.' What is usually there?"

"Oh, well!" This is probably the first time he himself has ever recognized it, see? "Oh, yeah. Well, there's a window."

"Well, what about this window?"

"Well, there's a window. I always have a window out in front." He never really realized it before. "But you know, it's always there, you know; there's a window out in front of me. Yeah, always there! Huh, what do you know? So that's what you were talking about. Why didn't you say?"

You could tell him, "Well, I didn't know that you had a window."

"Oh, is that so? Everybody doesn't have a window? What do you..." [laughter]

You can get in the most marvelous conversations with this if somebody is unable to see a picture, conceive of the idea of pictures or masses in the mind and so on. And you box it around, however, he'll always come up with it after a while.

And if you were to run a process, if you wanted to get his bank rolling, you can do the weirdest things. You can say, "Well, all right, now what part of the window could you be responsible for?" And you run a little process on him. You can do this to some engineer that comes in to fix the TV set. He doesn't even have to be in-session. You'll get all kinds of re-
markable things. I ran it one day on somebody who wanted an explanation: "What do you mean by bank? What do you mean by mind?" He was being rather challenging about the whole thing, and so forth.

And I said, "Well," I said, "what are you looking at?" you know? "Oh, well, I'm looking at you."

And I said, "No, no." I said, "You know, in your mind, what do you look at?"

"Nothing! Never look at a thing," and so on, [laughter] and so on, and so on – "Except that ball of smoke." [laughter]

And I said, "What ball of smoke?"

"Well, the one I always see out there and so forth, naturally."

Well, I didn't bridge him over into an explanation or anything like that. I just merely gave him the auditing command. "What part of that ball of smoke could you be responsible for?" knowing very well what was going to happen. The ball of smoke promptly went off, became an atomic explosion. First time there had ever been any variation in this that he could ever remember. He had an atomic explosion stop dead. He was on a lookout station somewhere up on a mountain, and that atomic explosion was his city. And so just by this, well, he sees a car and he sees this and he sees that, and all of a sudden he got the full physical response of being in an automobile and going over a swerving road. And he topped the rise and got down out of sight of the thing and seemed to be a little bit calmer, so I knocked it off. I'd moved his position. He was always different after that; he was in a different part of the track of course, and he'd erased a little bit of it, and he knew a little bit more about himself. And he said, "That's what you mean about a mind. That's what you mean about pictures?" so forth.

"Yes, sir."

"Boy," he said, "that sure was real." He said, "You know," he says, "I've been looking at that thing." He said, "I've got an idea I've been looking at that thing for thousands of years," and this guy knew nothing about anything. And there was a guy who in actual fact couldn't see pictures, didn't have pictures, didn't have a mind or anything of the sort – "Oh, you mean that ball of smoke?"

Well, now, an individual can have everything so not-ised and be so blind that he doesn't even know he's got a mind, and that is actually below being able to see one. But he can come up to the level of being able to see it, and he not only can come up to the level of being able to see, he can come up to the level of not having it at all. And its value is exactly zero, because all the masses do is not furnish you with data as they seem to do, but charge the area of the data up so that you can't directly recall it. So you try to recall it and you get hit in the teeth by the picture. And you think the picture is giving you the data, so therefore you mustn't get rid of the picture, because if you got rid of the picture then you wouldn't have the data. Well, of course, this is silly, because if you didn't have the picture, you could recall it all. You could recall it very easily without consequences.

A Clear is not then – doesn't have a mind, in that he is not the effect of this picture mechanism. He doesn't have masses and pictures knocking him about. Now, this doesn't say
that a Clear in a body won't get sick, because there's such things as bacteria, "viri" (word I invented, just now.) Doctors call it *virus*, but I don't know. I don't think they're singular. If they exist at all, they're viri.

So the whole upshot of the situation is that there *are* influences. Because in – a Clear is – if you ever noticed… I don't know if you've ever looked around and noticed but there are some walls and a floor and ceiling and rain and a body. And these things are still around. And if you try to pick up a ten-ton safe with a body, I think you'd probably get a rupture. It's not a very strong instrument. And furthermore, it's made out of cells that are susceptible to various things. And it's probably not very well built anyhow and it probably has got all of its cog-wheels out of gear over the period of years.

So, to measure a Clear by his health of course is plain idiocy, see, because we're talking about the individual. Nevertheless, Clears are far more healthy. And there's a lot of things on a health side of the picture as far as body health is concerned: All their chronic psychosomatic illnesses have vanished and their various aberrations about this, that and the other thing have gone. In other words, it's – what you're talking about is the absence of mind.

Now, in view of the fact that the mind does more than its share of pinning somebody down inside of a body, it follows that when an individual is Clear, he can more easily become exterior. And when he becomes exterior, he's a Clear Exterior.

Now, he may be only a Clear Exterior – that would be another type of or state of beingness, you see? He may only be a Clear Exterior, but as a Clear Exterior he would not be able to talk. You know, babies have to learn how to walk, if you ever noticed that, see? So this guy is Clear, and he gets rather – great, you know? Now, he starts diffidently trying to walk, and now what he's actually trying to do is walk up scale towards OT. But not having a bank or an impulse to make a bank, and that sort of thing, then he doesn't go snapping in all the time and you have a stable state – and this is a stable state.

Now, the task of moving a person from Clear to OT is proofing him up, getting him into such a state that he, even if he made a bank, he wouldn't be affected by it. So in actual, sober fact – in actual, sober fact, when you say a Clear OT, you're saying something else. You're saying a proofed-up being who won't hit the banana peel. Because that's the way we hit the action of OT. We don't just say, "Oh, well, wheeee-eee, he just got through picking up the Empire State Building so, all right, he's OT."

No, we're concerned with his interrelationship between matter, energy, space and time and thought, life and so forth – his relationships with these things. Because after a guy is exterior in the physical universe, he looks around and what do you know? What does he see? What's the first thing he starts looking at? Physical universe, of course. Well, what's he doing in something?

So you see, in actual fact, exteriorization could probably be practiced that you could probably exteriorize a Clear Exterior – you know, a person who is Clear and who slides out of his skull – and you could probably fix him up so that he could exteriorize from the universe. And you probably even could get an auditing command that would probably do it. And I probably can tell you what the auditing command is. As a matter of fact, I see no reason not to
tell you, since nobody is interested in it or would use it, and so forth. [laughter] And it's not part of the OT course, see?

It would be just like 1952, the command that puts people exterior. \textit{Bang!} It would be the same command exactly, which would be: "Try not to be outside the physical universe," you know? So you could probably move somebody out of the physical universe as an exterior; you could probably take a Clear Exterior and you could probably exteriorize him from the universe, too. But again, this would be a situation where you were just merely making an exterior, and it would undoubtedly be completely unstable. Because in actual fact, this person is not at cause over life, thought, matter, energy, space and time. He's not at cause over this stuff. He is still very much the effect of this stuff. And as long as he is thoroughly the effect of this stuff all the way up the line, why, of course he cannot exteriorize from the stuff.

There's a lot to know about this. It's very complex. It looks – sounds awfully, awfully simple when I tell it to you this straight, and actually would \textit{seem} to be very simple, and \textit{seem} to be straightforward. But it's something like saying to somebody, "You can come back in the universe now." [laughs]

An individual – an individual who is cause over something, or can be cause over something, is not necessarily total and absolute effect of it. Don't you see? That doesn't mean he doesn't have to have anything to do with it. Just because you can fix a car is no reason why you can't enjoy a car. Do you follow?

As far as the technology is concerned though, you say to this fellow (he's a knight; he's going out in the jousting and there's the big lists down there), and you say, "Now, Joe" – Sir Joe – [laughter] "Now, Joe, all you've got to do, Sir Joe, is go down there and just take that stick and just shove the champion of Europe out of his saddle, and you'll be champion of Europe. Now, you go do that, Joe."

You see, that's apparently a very simple action. There's apparently nothing much to this. And it'd only be a damn fool, though, who would do just that, because he might accomplish it once but the next time he would probably get the other fellow's stick through him. There's a lot to know about jousting. Terrific amount to know about it. It's a very complex subject indeed.

And whereas all you have to do is stick your spear in the certain strategic spot so as to... Not – no, just all you have to do is hit the other fellow with your spear so as to knock him out of the saddle and you win. See? Well, all right. But now your trouble begins. He's been trained not to be hit; he is also trying to hit you. And between these two factors, the action of trying to do something to him can become very, very dicey indeed. And if any of you have ever seen a gout of dust going up on either side of your ears, seen through small slits [laughter] with occasionally the columnous leg of a horse acting as a bar across your field of vision, you will know what I mean.

Now, man, previously, in his previous philosophic studies, simply said – it wasn't that he didn't know that you could be exterior – but he simply said, "Well, I'm going into a state of total serenity and benignity and withdraw up to the top of the mountain and abandon the body, and so forth, and meditate. There's nothing to this." Then he sees that dust coming up on either side of his head! He says, "My God! What happened?"
Well, the adversary in this case is all of the complexity of wisdom of the ages, carefully suppressed and combined to keep somebody from doing it. Truth of the matter is, it's absolutely impossible to make a Clear, it's absolutely impossible to make an OT. We've now made a hundred and forty Clears and we're well on the way to making a tremendous number of OTs. But there's a lot of blood, sweat and tears goes into it, see? It's not a mild operation as the Clearing Course Supervisors can tell you.

There are probably people lying out right now, watching that dust curl up into the air around, and thinking, "My God! I will never make it." Because life is quite an adversary; and the bank is quite an adversary, and you shouldn't ever underevaluate these things. And therefore, you can't really overvalue the state of Clear. It has never been achieved before.

Now, a fellow accidentally one fine day would shift in his bank, or differently handle his bank or something like this, and he would find himself temporarily or momentarily without a bank just like that – while exterior – and momentarily be without those things which prevented him from making himself visible and handling himself and momentarily then he would be an OT. He would be a Clear OT but he's actually only a released OT. You understand?

So he's a Clear, he thinks. He has got all the abilities of a Clear OT see? All of a sudden he – he's getting out of the coffin, you know, and he throws the lid open. Mourners scatter in all directions.

He's never read an employment handbook for this particular thing, so he goes and finds himself a castle and slams the doors endlessly. He has a ball. He doesn't know what to do with himself. And one day he slams the door on his beam, and it hurts like the mischief. And suddenly, mysteriously he's not a Clear OT, he's a released OT; he's just a Thetan Exterior; he's crawling down to the maternity ward to pick up a body. [laughter, laughs]

A man gets very suspicious of these states. Well, the reason he's suspicious of them – any state which occurs suddenly, accidentally and miraculously is a state that the individual doesn't understand in the least. Do you see? Therefore, he's the effect of the state.

Now, the individual starts walking uphill, and he takes this by gradients, and there's probably a greater distance between Clear and OT than there actually is between wog and Clear. There's probably a greater distance. It isn't necessarily that the distance is huge or enormous or anything like that. I say there's a great distance in it. Because what he's doing is walking upstairs and he's integrating all of his experience against this thing.

We're getting this strange being who isn't just suddenly all-powerful or something of the sort. We're getting this being who is all-powerful and still can fix the kid's electric train, do you see? And who still knows that if you make entries in ink for a Jewish employer, you get in trouble in the field of accounting, you see? And he knows all about life, you know? He knows this whole pattern out here of the causes and effects of various things and how they're interwoven and what happens and what doesn't happen – he knows all these things by experience. Without suffering from the experience, he yet has the experience.

So he experiences everything that he wants to experience and doesn't have to experience things that he doesn't want to have experience. He is in actual fact a walking miracle
who is himself comprehending all the miracles. So, it's quite remarkable. And these states have existed, so therefore it's very possible for you to read some place or another about somebody who's been an exterior and so forth, and say, "Oh, well, yes, Scientology existed before." No, no. You yourself have been exterior.

I'd say in the not-too-distant future, at some time or another, you will know by the count and number, the number of times you've been released. You just lost a body and you were on a mountainside, and thunder and lightning opened up, and you hadn't had time to pick another body. And you got hit in the skull by lightning and you suddenly found it didn't hurt. And you said, "I didn't like that," so you threw an equally large shaft of lightning back at the lightning. You say, "I did that? What am I doing? Goodness, I can do that." And like a prizefighter that knows not his own strength, goes out and starts knocking out every man that comes along, see? And then with that equal speed, one day one is getting the lightning coming down from the sky and in a fit he throws back the lightning and nothing happens. He's been perfectly able to talk to Joe... You see, something that came on unknowingly went off unknowingly.

So knowing and willing cause is part of the definition of OT, and total absence of bank is the definition of Clear. So as you move from Clear to OT, why, all additional automaticities and miraculous changes of state and that sort of thing, these come under your control and position, one right after the other. And you gradually get to a point where you could turn these things on and off you see? You could be the storm or the sunset, you know? You would know what you were doing. It wouldn't all be an accidental action.

Now, anyway, that's – gives you some kind of an insight, perhaps – I hope – into these various states and how they happen and how they don't happen and how they go upside down and backwards and all that. And I think they look so sad, that you had better probably get two of those Joe Miller joke books. [laughter]

Now, you expected to hear a tremendous number of words defined, but you actually were asking me one definition there which follows the other definition there. It's actually the highest target at which one is shooting, so it actually has never been completely discussed or defined before for general public issue. So I thought I had better tell you something about it. I hope it's been of some slight value. If it crosses up your own reality in any way, shape or form, by all means don't change your own reality on the matter. Just run your auditing sessions. [laughter, laughs]

Okay. Well, I hope you'll find that of some benefit. Thank you very much.

Thank you.
Thank you. Thank you.
Well, we have today what date?

*Audience*: 6 December AD 16.
The what?

*Audience*: 6 December AD 16.
Six December…

*Audience member*: AD 16.
AD 16. What planet?

*Audience*: Earth.
That's very interesting.

This Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture… And I have just heard that Scientology is very bad. The minister of health said so in Parliament. But he isn't going to do anything. But we are. [laughter, laughs]

They shouldn't do it. But it's typical of suppressives that they elect executioners. That doesn't mean that any assassination attempt is going to be made upon anybody. It isn't necessary! But you find out that down through the ages that SPs have had a ball. Now, for the first time in known history, there's a thing called ethics. You can't lie in order to do people in; that is the motto of ethics.

Very interesting. Somebody looks at ethics and they say, "That's terrible, you know? Who's selecting out who's a suppressive?" It's perfectly simple – the suppressed. [laughs] And then they say, "Who's to determine who is suppressive?" Well, I'm afraid the suppressive determines that because if anybody had exact characteristics, it's a suppressive. You've got them in bulletins. But there are no more exact case statistics. It'd be very hard to find out whether or not somebody was sane, but it's very easy to find out who is suppressive: case doesn't change; they speak in nothing but generalities; they take posts like minister of health. [laughter] It's very positive.
But this universe began to go to pieces and got formed actually on suppression and nothing else but. And all these ages we all been waiting around and ruing the day that we didn't act when we could act. And we're not going to spoil that chance, once you get another chance.

Could be a perfectly good universe. It didn't have to be a suppressive-formed universe. It could be a perfectly happy, good universe.

But ethics would have had to have gone in very early. And because every thetan was an individual acting on his own and suppression was organized, all we have to do is reverse it so that thetans, without foregoing their independence, yet operate on their own and organize the other side just a little bit, because actually it's very easy to beat a suppressive organization.

They're being – you see, they're busier because their percentages are out. There's 80 percent who aren't. So that at once gives you numerical superiority. Furthermore, they can't think straight. And you can just go down the list on the number of counts with which they'd win. And I'd put my money any day of the week on the game that is now moving up to knock out the game that wasn't a game – any day of the week – because the majority usually has an advantage over the minority. On that principle you'll find out many fights get resolved very suddenly.

It doesn't matter how good a swordsman is. He maybe handles two swordsmen, three, four, standing in front of him, five maybe, maybe six: He won't handle twenty. He's going to get it, that's for sure.

Now, an organized minority is all that has been making this universe a mess. So why not an organized decent majority? So when they play fast and loose with Scientology, all they're doing is running up their range flag. They think they're running up a battle flag, they're not. They're just running up a range flag. "Our range is 2,600 miles. If hit even faintly with dried peas, we would sink. Code flags flying at the yard."

Now, of course, a suppressive always hits the wrong target. He never can complete a cycle of action. So it wasn't even a well-organized minority. They don't even know who they're fighting. You see, basically a suppressive is stuck somewhere on the track fighting the Martians. And when you walk along, you're a Martian so you have to be suppressed, you see? You automatically are a Martian, even when you come from Venus. [laughter]

Give you an idea of identification: It doesn't matter how often you tell these Ministry of Health – you'd only have to clip it out of the tape, so I just won't say it – it doesn't matter how often you tell them you're not in the healing business, they're very sure that you are. So they attack our healing activities. Well, we don't have any. That's a very simple battle, isn't it?

So anyway, never forget that you were very lonely on the track for a very, very long time, and the opposition seemed fantastically hard to dent; seemed very, very rough. And it's been a very rough universe, that's for sure. But the weather vane has turned and the wind is blowing in the opposite direction, and the opposition don't like it. They are not sending for whom to find the bell tolls – they know it's for them! [laughter] We actually have no overt intentions toward them whatsoever.
I was taught a punch by a judo instructor one time whereby you simply stood there and held your fist out. Need I describe it more? But we are not fighting a revolutionary activity, we're just trying to go about our own business. But we do have a thing called ethics, and ethics happens to be out in this universe. And if you were to go into a mental institution and count noses, you would find only PTSes – one, two or three totally insane suppressives, perhaps, but the vast majority merely their victims.

I think they've had a ball. And it isn't that they're just now caved in enough to take over or handle. That's not true. They've been that caved in all along, only we didn't notice.

So, we at the moment are numerically in the universe, a minority, that is for sure. We are a minority. But we intend to live decent lives and forward decent programs and go ahead along our way as straight as possible without getting knocked out of line by suppressives. And that will eventually result in, I'm afraid, an organized majority.

Now, I didn't get through any words – this is some more dictionary lecture – and I didn't get through any words to amount to anything with you the other day, because all I wanted to do was to give you a basic look at the two big words on the line, which was OT and Clear. And I hope that itself clarified something. Now, there are, however, a great many other words, and they needn't be described that long, and they're probably in this stack of cards that I'm holding in my hand right now of words submitted by students and very nicely printed indeed. When I said legibly it – they interpreted it as gorgeously.

So your cards look very nice. But there are things here possibly that we will encounter, that in an evolving science, something named early before total information on it is present, may leave something a little ragged around the edges. And the first one I'm looking at right now is of that character: Want a definition of the analytical mind as opposed to a thetan. Well, now, that's not asking for a definition; that's asking for a dissertation.

But we could ask for an analytical mind as a definition. And an analytical mind would be anything that a thetan set up; it could even be a computer which collected data and used it to resolve problems. And the basic purpose of the (quote) mind (unquote) is the resolution of problems relating to survival. That's Original Thesis. And that's what a mind is. It's something that does this. Now, if a thetan does this, you could say he is a mind.

But let me give you an idea of what an analytical mind would consist of: One, it cannot exist independently of a thetan. That is not possible. Man has been so caved in on the subject of the reactive mind, which was a mind which was working which he knew not what of – see, it was a mind of which he was not aware – that he then discredits the whole idea of a mind. Mustn't be any such thing as a mind at all. I'll just do it all myself! You get it?

Now, the difference between a reactive mind and an analytical mind would have to be discussed to answer this question. A reactive mind is an unknowing, unwanted series of aberrated computations which bring about an effect upon the individual and those around him. In other words, it's got some aberrated computation that "all horses sleep in beds," and therefore, in any attempt to build a stable, equips it with beds. Do you see? But the fellow doesn't know why he this this way. He does not know why he has to do this.
So you would say that the reactive mind is an obsessive strata of unknown, unseen, uninspected data which are forcing solutions unknown and unsuspected on the individual. It's a subawareness activity. And you can see that's very bad if the definition of Operating Thetan is knowing and willing cause over thought, life, matter, energy, space and time – knowing and willing. Well, the analytical mind would be perfectly usable and could exist if it was a knowing and willing mechanism.

For instance, much of Dianetics and Scientology was resolved by the construction – I use that word advisedly since it was diagrammatic and so on, on graphs and things like this – much of it was by what you might call a philosophic machine. Now, a philosophic machine would be something you would draw up which gave some data which you could then combine with some other data and get some sort of an answer. But you're setting down the data and you're aligning it all up, and all you're doing is doing a think which is recorded. In other words, you're doing a recorded think so that you can knowingly observe a relationship of data and get an answer. So an analytical mind would be the knowing and willing resolution of problems related to survival.

Now, thetans sometimes set up things that do this, and that somewhat gets them in trouble because they make these things of lasting duration. And the only time that an analytical mind ever gets in trouble is when it's set up to run forever without inspection or observation. So an analytical mind cannot exist without inspection and observation. See, by definition, a mind which is running without observation is reactive; so a mind which is running with observation, and so forth, is analytical.

So if you had a big computer – let's get two differences here – you got a big computer and we feed data to this computer – an operator feeds data to the computer and he gets answers out of the computer. He knows where the moon is going to be at such and such an o'clock on such and such a date, and two minutes later he knows where the moon is going to be and two minutes later he knows what… This is typical astronomical calculation; they have computers like this all the time.

Now, he's there feeding the data to the machine, and the machine is simply tallying what it's fed and cross-relating it in such a way that he can inspect it. And then he knows what answers he's getting. If he doesn't know what answers he's getting, he'd shut the machine off. But then he can make these tabulations, and they can turn out a thing called an air almanac or a nautical almanac if – or an astronomical almanac – where the moon is going to be for any given minute during the next twelve months, see. Which is useful to know. And then somebody can consult this table which has been drawn up by this computer. And he's flying along in an airplane and he hasn't got time to figure out – because he needs his sight right away – he hasn't got time to figure out where the moon is going to be in every minute and where the moon is this minute. Now, if he knew where the moon was this minute, he would know where he was right this minute, and therefore he wouldn't need to do this at all. Do you see? But he has to know the exact position of the moon so that he can get his relationship to the moon, and then he can get his position in relationship to the Earth. Do you follow?
So he is in actual fact using an analytical mind. He is inspecting the moon and then inspecting the table which was drawn up, and then he gets an answer which is his position. Do you see?

All right, now let's take a gobbledygook affair whereby... Oh, this is the superscientist's special, see? It's a machine that, uninspected, picks up the data to resolve problems that had not been suspected and turns out answers uninspected which then, by law, become a total effect upon the population. Do you see? I mean that's silly.

And yet they dream about such machines, and they even write science-fiction stories about such machines as though this would be a great thing.

All right. Now, we take a ship – now, let's take a little air car, see, or something like that, that runs on trolleys or something – we set this thing up to know when it's loaded with passengers, know when to start, know when to stop, when to turn around, when to come back and what course to follow. And we set up this air car to run from A to B, to B to A, to A to B, to B to A, to A to B, to B to A, forevermore.

Now, the question is, is this thing reactive? No, as a matter of fact, it isn't reactive. There isn't a passenger that gets aboard it that doesn't inspect it. And you can just hear the angry catcalls which come from the passengers whenever the machine does not get to B or back to A. It's an inspected machine. Automatic elevators – same way. If you ever want to hear a ruckus in a big office building, the automatic elevator stops halfway between floors.

No, that's inspected. Reason it usually breaks down is it hasn't been inspected lately.

No, people know what that thing is supposed to do, don't you see? They know what its purpose is and what it's supposed to do, and it gets inspected and so forth. So it nevertheless has a sort of a mind. It knows it's supposed to depart every time the weights on it become umpteen kilos, it knows it's supposed to shut its doors and travel to the other end of the track. And when it arrives at the other end of the track by some gimmickry or other it knows it's supposed to stop.

But it knows. We're not interested in what it knows and what it doesn't know. If it were totally independent of life, of course, the machine could run from A to B, to B to A, to A to B, to B to A, and it could even load things and run them from A to B, to B to A, and back and forth, and there'd be nobody around and no life was served and nobody ever got the product that came to B, and we have the kind of world that a science-fiction writer very often dreams up as the ideal. There's nobody there at all. [laughs]

Well, I point out that somebody had to be there to begin with and sooner or later something is going to happen along such a line that this thing will become aberrative.

Supposing you inherited a civilization that you knew nothing about how it worked at all and it was all on automatic. This is another science-fiction dream, see? You walk into this universe – and you walk into this planet and all the doors open and close and the thing's crowded and so forth, but everything is just going on. And the machines are there – John W. Campbell special. He's one of these characters. Boy, he loves it.
I'm going to get him to write a science-fiction story someday: "I Was a Robot." [laughs, laughter] Everybody else writes confessions, why shouldn't he? [laughs, laughter]

But the machines repair the machines, you see, and the machines wait on the machines and the machines, the machines, the machines, the machines. Now, that very thought and that idea that a universe can exist entirely of machines that would be of any benefit of any kind whatsoever is of course complete nonsense, because it'd just be a child's toy. And the one who built it would be the one who built it, and if it broke down eventually, he'd have to come back and fix it up again. Do you follow?

But a population which inherited one of these things and didn't know how it ran and so on would be very mystified along the whole line, and so forth. It's reactive! It's reactive.

The human body falls under the character of a machine which one does not know the directions of. He doesn't know how or why it operates as it operates. And therefore we have the medical doctor. I might go so far as to say, therefore, we tolerate the medical doctor. The body is so unknown that we don't know he doesn't know either.

But you get the difference. Now, you find that a body is fairly aberrative; does unexpected things; gets sick at unexpected moments and so on. It's got somebody there but that somebody can't keep it inspected because it has reactions and effects upon him which he cannot predict. He does not know the construction of it, he really does not know how it got there in the first place, and he doesn't know at what moment the thing is going to stop and have to be buried at vast profit to the undertakers. Do you see?

Now therefore, speaking of machines, that would be an aberrative machine. Now, the body line is apparently running uninspected. It is. It's running uninspected. Nobody inspects it and therefore you get ministers of health and all kinds of aberrative things. That's correct.

Now, if you at this moment were going to mock up a body which you, out of courtesy, were going to display to people and have talk, and you put it on the drawing board and you drew it up, both as to how it should look and how it's to function, I'm sure you would leave more parts out and consider them unnecessary than the body has. I don't think you would put it together this way at all. You would probably put together a very simple, functional body. You would probably also put together a disposable body in case the paint got scratched.

But you see, then you would be knowing and willing cause. Now, you didn't have to be the one who built it, but let us say that you could buy bodies down at the store. Well, beware of buying bodies which don't include any directions in them. [laughter] And that's essentially what you've been doing for some time.

And it just shows how idiotic a fellow can get that he picks up a machine with no instruction book. [laughter] And you think of the trial and error you had to learn how to run the body you're pushing right this minute, it's quite remarkable. The number of chairs you fell into and the number of times you bumped its nose. Well, that's trial and error. You had some familiarity with it, and you somehow or other...

But it was a great surprise to man that the heart beat and circulated the blood – just about 300 years ago he found out that his heart beat and circulated blood. Up to that time he thought he kind of existed by the ocean tides or something: the blood tided out to the extremi-
ties of the body and untidied back. [laughter] That was the theory of Galen. And Harvey came
along and says it goes pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. And there was a great row over this, because
the medical profession thought that it might lead – this piece of knowledge – into not having
heart trouble, which constitutes 50 percent of their income. Actually, there are treatments for
heart trouble right now which are not being used because heart trouble is 50 percent of medi-
cal income. That's a statement made, by the way, by the Shute Institute of Canada.

Now, the difference then between an analytical mind and a reactive mind would be a
mind that was running without inspection. It's a – unwilling to have it run. Get it? And you
don't know it's there and so on. Now that, when you try to disseminate to people about Scien-
tology, is what you run into. You are talking about the reactive mind and they don't know it's
there. You have to actually show them it's there before they sort of understand what you're
talking about. And it's very funny to see somebody who is very green sit down and start to run
his analytical thoughts and computations when you're trying to get him to run his reactive
mind.

I could see there are – more auditing time gets burned up just on that basis only. The
fellow is busy supposedly running an engram. Well, the fellow is running an engram and the
engram is yesterday when he walked from office A to office B. Now, he knew he was at offi-
cice A and he knew he arrived at office B. He also knew why he was going there, and so forth,
and I'm afraid the whole operation was completely unaberrative. But he will sit there and he
will run that with the greatest of enthusiasm and the greatest, greatest thoroughness. But if
he's too absorbed in it, you can then realize that any living moment to him is a reactive mo-
ment, that it was an engram containing pain and unconsciousness to eat his Wheaties. [laugh-
ter, laughs]

And there you would get where the fellow was so overwhelmed he was aware of noth-
ing. Now, the way you handle a reactive mind and attain up to an analytical mind status, the
way you handle this, is simply to increase the thetan's awareness.

This is the difference, actually, between Dianetics and Scientology. The reactive mind
is handled by increasing the thetan's awareness. Now, by increasing his awareness he be-
comes aware of this thing, so it's now under inspection. And as he goes along he can then
handle this thing and so it is under his control and it ceases then to be reactive no matter
what's in it. But you – all you have to do is increase the awareness of a thetan to overcome the
reactive mind. By merely destroying the machine, you really don't accomplish much.

You could probably get some kind of a pill called LSD Robinson – you'll have to take
that out of the tape because those are not his initials. They are the initials of the fellow who
invented all the crazy machinery in England. You know, in America you have Rube Gold-
berg, you know? The Rube Goldberg machines. Well, actually, in England, isn't it Keith Rob-
inson? And isn't that the minister of health now? Anyway… [laughter]

Now therefore, as his awareness increases of what is going on, he can handle it. But if
you had a syringe that you shot him in the gluteus maximus, which you're sitting on at the
moment… This restimulates my medical degrees. Matter of great shame, I have to confess to
the fact on the backtrack that I was contaminated to that degree for a while.
Anyway, if you shot him in the gluteus maximus with some kind of a fluid which simply wrecked the reactive mind, you would find the individual would not get well or anything else. You might find some physical characteristics change, but he wouldn't know they'd changed and he wouldn't know they'd not changed. And once in a blue moon, you can run a heavy engram on a preclear and have the preclear's arthritis or lumbosis or something disappear utterly and the preclear be in this fascinating state: not to have known he had lumbosis or arthritis to begin with and not to know it's gone when you have finished.

Now, what are you handling there? You're handling somebody who had no awareness of any part of the machinery, so the man was very unaware, so therefore everything was reactive.

Now, as an individual disappears down the Awareness Scale, he could get into a position where the whole world was reactive. So when you're talking about analytical or when you're talking about reactive, and so forth, you're actually talking about the Awareness Scale of the individual.

Now, an individual who doesn't occasionally set up an analytical mind – not to run for him and work for him and so forth, but who does not use an analytical mental process – is having a rough time. For instance, I'm fairly good at guessing products of two multiplied numbers. But I would rather multiply them. Do you see? I'd rather multiply them and get an exact answer – particularly when I'm paying my bills. Well now, that operation is an analytical mental operation. The machine in that particular character is the arithmetic tables. That's a sort of a philosophic machine, and the various tables of multiplication and so forth and the rules of addition and subtraction – this is an arithmetic machine. And of course most kids in school consider this a totally reactive mind. So you see the difference between these two things.

Now, there is no analytical mind opposed to the thetan, only the reactive mind is. Because the question of – is what is the analytical mind as opposed to the thetan – the definitions of these two things. Well, the joke in this case is that the reactive mind opposes a thetan, the analytical mind doesn't.

So you – do you see the difference between these two things? And it simply comes when you're asked for a very rapid-fire definition of the thing. An analytical mind would be a mind that is temporarily set up willingly and knowingly by a thetan to assist in the resolution of problems – problems inevitably relate to survival – and anything that he set up to do this which – of which he was aware and which was inspected. And that would be an analytical mind.

A committee set up to get data and coordinate the activities of another area or body – of a factory or something like that – would be the mind of that factory, even though they are thetans doing it. But there would have to be thetans doing it to be analytical.

Now, that's one of the reasons why, for instance, in an organization you should know policy because otherwise the solutions and combinations and so forth, unknown to you, make it have an effect on you because it's somewhat reactive. Do you see? If you don't know about it, and if you're – and then if policy isn't inspected, and if it isn't reformed to meet the conditions – you see, it's very set but it gets reformed to meet the conditions of operation as you go.
along – if these things don't happen, why, then it too could become a reactive mind. But it would become reactive just to the degree that one wasn't aware of it. Do you see?

So therefore, it's a very, very good thing that if you're operating on a set of data of some kind or another to make them known. Now, Scientology is a somewhat reactive mind to the society, particularly health ministers. In the first place, their awareness level would have to be; it would have to exist somewhere on the Awareness Scale. But if they didn't have an awareness level, you could talk at them and talk at them and talk at them and talk at them and give them data, data, data, data, data. And if they were still not aware, they would simply be acted on the way a reactive mind acts.

If we didn't disseminate and yell so hard, do you know that the societies of the world would never really become aware of our existence at all, any more than they are aware of the existence of a thetan. And if we really had something up our sleeves, we would simply continue to operate in that framework. It would be a totally reactive action as far as the planet was concerned, and it wouldn't be very good for man.

Now, we have a tendency to go out in this particular direction, because as our awareness of individuals come up they fail to be aware of how unaware the populace at large is. And when you get into OT operations, you will find very often that you run across this factor. I wouldn't bother to solve it. If the solution got in the road of it, I wouldn't bother to solve it, because they've already got so many reactive minds that one more area of reactivity to them wouldn't matter much.

Now, when you have to explain all of your motives to somebody you realize that you really shouldn't bother. Because if their – your motives are not visible to them when you don't intend to hide your motives, then an explanation of your motives are not very likely to do very much to them because their level of awareness of you already doesn't exist. Do you see?

It almost comes down to it that he – a thetan could make a hard and fast rule – only he never should make hard and fast rules – but it's a good one to observe, is never explain. Be as obvious as you please and be as plain as you please and as straightforward as you can be. And if the ordinary evidences which lie around then don't justify your actions, and so forth, there's no sense in explaining it to the person who is challenging them, for the good reason that he wouldn't be able to understand them anyway.

So reactivity and analytical are relative to the awareness potential of the individual. Any analytical mind can become a reactive mind and therefore such minds, when they're set up, are just a little bit dangerous. Do you follow?

I don't think there's any reason to define *thetan*. After all, you're sitting there.

Now, *power*: *power* just has a physical definition, and I could give you, I suppose, if I thought hard, the textbook physical definition. It's the amount of work which can be accomplished in a unit of time or the amount of force which can be applied in a unit of time. It contains within it the idea of a potential.

Power is not something which is being exerted, whereas force tends to be. Do you follow? Power has the connotation of being potential. Therefore, a person is *powerful* when he is able to use power, not when he is necessarily not using power or using power. He is simply...
powerful. In other words, it's potential that he could be – he could use force. Do you see? So therefore he is powerful. But you would say he is forceful, you would get the immediate action that he was using force. He's using force right now.

So we use the word power because power does not necessarily mean application of it – use or application of it. And the smarter a fellow gets, why, the less – the less force he in actual fact employs in order to accomplish a difference or change of opinion on the part of others.

And the – there's a limit to this when somebody is tearing up your mockups faster than you can put them up, and so forth, why, you can change from being powerful to, for a moment, being forceful. And it was your failure to do this very early on the track which got you in trouble.

Now, when somebody says implants, he means an unwilling and unknowing receipt of a "think." The most ordinary example of an implant… Now, there's a difference between an implant and an engram. An engram is simply those perceptions unknowingly contained in the force, duress, pain and unconsciousness, you see, of an incident. Now, a fellow gets hit in the head with an ax – it's – intent is the difference, see. A fellow gets hit in the head with an ax and at that moment there is a mill wheel going and somebody says, "Look out." Now, he'll have the sound of a mill wheel and "look out" and the texture of the ax and the general scenery so cluttered up and generalized and impressed upon him that he will have – a wog will – a stuck picture. Not only a wog. But he will have a stuck picture of this. He will make a mental image picture.

Now, he makes a mental image picture by reaction of resistance. He goes wruhh with energy, see? Out! You know. Stop it! And at that moment he goes unconscious, and he's made a sort of a stuck wave because, of course, he didn't prevent it. And actually, just as you sort of would make an embossed impression of something, he sort of embosses the environment. Do you see how he'd do that? You know.

For instance, if you put your hand up against a brick and pushed it very hard and then looked at your hand, you would, oddly enough, for a split instant you would have almost an exact picture of the brick, and a moment or so later, why, you would have the indentations of the brick, you see? Well, that was because you pushed on the brick. You pushed something at the brick. Well, a thetan is potential – well, he is able to exert energy. He can make and exert energy, so when he tries to fend something off, he rather reactively pushes back against what is pushing against him or he pulls in against what is leaving him.

Now, if he does this, why, then he's left with not just a picture but a series of pictures. But he certainly has got one of those pictures stuck harder than the other pictures, and it was at a moment when he resisted hardest against the force which was influencing upon him or pulled back hardest against the departing force. Do you see? So it sort of automatically took a picture.

Now, let's get the difference between that and an implant. An implant, he is put under duress – he is resisting – and somebody is intentionally giving him fixed perceptions and ideas. It is an intentional wreck of somebody's ability to make pictures, perceive and remember. It's intentional. Now, we could have an implant on the basis: somebody hit Joe over the
head with an ax and knowing, now, that Joe was going to resist at this moment, at the moment he does this he also says, "You are a fool, you gibber and drool." Now, that's intentional. That was an intention to aberrate him. And what do you know, it actually will work out that Joe after that will at least be afraid of gibbering and drooling, because it's part of the impression, it overwhelmed him, so therefore the thought is overwhelming.

Now, implants are of very different kinds and types and so forth, but they all contain this in common: They are an intentional installation of fixed ideas, contrasurvival to the thetan. Some people make an impression of it. Psychiatrists. Now, that's not just a dirty statement. They do this today. They will give a – they will pour the whole powerhouse full of juice into somebody's skull and they never bother to tell him that he's going to f... that afterwards that they have told him he's – they're going to take care of him, you're going to feel all right and you're going to want another one of these. And they have never bothered to inform even the public that they do that. But they quite commonly implant and they use implantings.

Now, you could definitely take a shock machine, any shock machine in any psychiatrist's office – by which they tell the person they're going to be better and so forth (they gave him an implant in other words; make it reactive, fixed idea). You could take an implant machine, you could clamp it on the head of some guy who was pretty loopy and give it the works, and say at the same time, "You are going to go to the statehouse and get a job as a page. And on such and such a date you are going to take a knife and kill Dr. Vervordt. You will do this, but forget you have ever been told" and turn the shock machine off and he would possibly do it.

Any use of duress against the insane delivers into the hands of those who are legally practicing it or practicing it without legal check the power to accomplish any criminal act in the society. It's worth knowing, isn't it?

But if man does not know that there is even such a thing as a reactive mind, if he does not know there is such a thing as a potential implanting – see, I don't say that is what happened. This is a technical subject, you see? And if man is not aware of anybody having a reactive mind, he's not aware of implanting or how you can implant a suggestion, if his closest awareness of it is hypnotism and if he considers, at large, hypnotism a fake and if he is also told carefully by all the hypnotists that only some people can be hypnotized, then people think they've got hypnotism mixed up with it. Well, actually all hypnotism is, is a restimulation of past implants. [noise; laughter] Stop that! [laughter]

Now, our next one is GPM. And GPM are the initials of Goals Problem Mass. And it was named that arbitrarily because when an individual has an intention and something else has another intention or when there are two intentions counter-opposed he has a problem, for the definition of a problem is intention-counter-intention, purpose-counter-purpose, goal-counter-goal, and that is a problem. For instance, our trouble with such dissident elements and suppressives in the society is: we have a goal of making people well; they have a goal of holding people down.

Now, those two things get together and they're counter-intentions, so therefore they make a problem.
Now, there can be two or more intentions in conflict, and when those two things are in conflict, one with the other, they tend to produce mass. Now, the Russian statement of this is called dialectic materialism – that all ideas are born out of the meeting of two forces. They've got it actually backwards. When two ideas oppose they create force. They say two forces create ideas. If you hit a guy hard enough, he'll think. Funny part of it is, I've seen an awful lot of schoolboys taught that way that didn't actually succeed very well in life.

Goals Problem Mass: It's simply a statement that when you have two opposed ideas, there will be a resulting mass, or a mass is held by two opposed ideas. Now, the reason the mass holds is because a thetan cannot as-is either side. In other words, he can't see which side is which.

Now, pan-determinism, which we'll get around to, is the ability to see both sides of something or as-is both sides of something. When one is totally pan-determined, he has no mental mass, because he's seen both sides of everything. He can see two ideas at once even though they are opposed. Self-determinism is very laudable since it is very rare, but nevertheless is below pan-determinism, because the individual can only determine something from his own viewpoint.

So when you talk to somebody and he justifies what he does, you know immediately that he is self-determined, not pan-determined. That's the quickest test there is. See, that's the quickest test there is. Little boy; you says, "You spat at Johnny." He says, "He hit me."

Well, the reason he's in trouble with you is because he's self-determined. Well, he didn't determine you, did he? He didn't handle the other little boy from his point of view so the other little boy wouldn't hit him, so therefore he had to react to the other little boy's having hit him. Well, you always get into conflicts one with the other way in life – they're sort of inevitable. Life is a sort of a conflict of some kind or another. But it needn't be a total conflict and it doesn't mean that one opposes every idea that comes along.

Now, you take somebody who's totally reactive: He will inevitably oppose any idea put to him. We normally call such a person a conservative or a reactionary or a Tory or something – it's sort of that. He's "agin it," see. And it's very funny handling such people, to start putting his own ideas to him, because his first impulse is to be "agin 'em," because you're putting them to him. And this foxes him up most horribly. And normally that is such a horrible trick that it's usually looked on as fight talk. "You think you're pretty good, don't you?" Now, that makes the guy resist his own idea. "You think you're right but you are wrong," you see? That foxes him up, see, because although it's a low scale thing, it's the low scale mockery of pan-determinism – take both sides of the argument.

And sometimes you can see one of these low scale mockeries of somebody taking both sides of the argument. They're just rattling on at a mad rate. When they're giving all of the questions, all of the challenges and all of the answers, and the other person is saying absolutely nothing. And this is one of the wildest things to watch which you've ever watched, and I'm sure you have seen it. Somebody is standing there with the whole dialogue!

"Now, you've got it all figured out that…" You know? Starts that sort of thing. "And now you're going to say, 'But…'" But the other fellow hasn't said anything. [laughs] And that's sort of a lower-scale harmonic.
There is no ability of a thetan, in actual fact, which does not have a lower-scale mockery or a lower-scale exaggeration, you know? If you can see, up on the upper scale, if you can see, then, somewhere down on the lower scale below blindness, the individual sees things. See, that's the lower-scale harmonic. He sees things that aren't there, of course, but still that's an exaggeration, do you see, of the upper-scale ability.

And so do all abilities. A person begins to single out only one ability out of all of his abilities and then this becomes exaggerated – becomes aberrated and then exaggerated, and then this is all he can do, but he does that far too well. See, you could see a dragon if it walked in. But he doesn't have to have one walk in. He can become so bad off that he sees a Scientologist under every chair. [laughter] (The guy is right. We are after him. We're after him.) The guy who believes that you're a Martian – he's seeing, but he's seeing in a very aberrated way, don't you see?

So anyhow, a Goals Problem Mass is simply the problem created by two or more opposing ideas which, being opposed, balanced and unresolved, makes a mass. So it's a peculiar kind of a mass. It's a mental energy mass but actually can exist in the physical universe. If you have tractor A being driven north and tractor B being driven south, they cease to be tractors and merely become mass.

Now here's one: The difference between – it should be amongst because there are three things, you see; you can't have two things – you have three things with a between – the difference amongst affinity, emotion and intention.

Well, I should think anybody should know that. An emotion: An emotion is a response by wavelength affecting an individual or another, which produces a sensation and a state of mind. And an intention is something that one wishes to do. He intends to do it. It's an impulse toward something. It's an idea that one is going to accomplish something. It's intentional, which means he meant to do it, he means to do it. And affinity has nothing to do with the other two at all – has nothing to do with the other two. Because affinity is the ability to occupy the space of or be like or similar to, or to express a willingness to be something. You say, "I like you," you're immediately saying, "Well, I'd just as soon be you." Do you see?

"I like you," would also say, "I'd just as soon occupy your space." And affinity carried forward in ne plus ultra, I suppose, between two thetans, you could mock up the conversation of "Let's occupy the same space!" [laughs, laughter]

Now, when two individuals – there is a scale of affinity which doesn't just include "like" – but when two individuals do not like each other, it means they won't occupy each other's space, they won't occupy each other's viewpoint, they don't want to be like the other person and so forth. The dissimilarity must exist. If one wears blue, the other has got to wear green. It's expressed dissimilarities. And when this becomes sufficiently strong, then they enforcedly become like the other fellow, which is an overwhelm.

Now, when you say home universe you've asked… Here is a question, what is a home universe? Well, it's the universe a thetan made for himself.

And here is the Rock. And the Rock was something which we audited for and assessed out – meaning a shape of something which we could then run a process on – and we at that
time were running on the theory that it was the first object that the fellow had made on the track. And that's what we were researching for. And when we found that, we could run Help on that in a 5-way bracket, and you can make a very, very stable, fast release with the process. It produced, I don't know, some large percentage of Releases – we called them Clears in those days – of a very high order in one ACC. It doesn't take long to find it and research it, but now that we have actual clearing, there is no point in doing it.

**Religion:** Now, that is something that has had many definitions, but it means basically the search for truth.

**DED-DEDEX:** The DED-DEDEX sequence. Now, I've forgotten exactly what those two words exactly mean, but it's a deduced something-or-other. But what it is, it's a very necessary phrase. It's a very necessary title. And it's almost impossible to get a decent word for it, but it means that the overt-motivator sequence went backwards. So a DED-DEDEX is an overt-motivator sequence that is the wrong way to. So that you hit Joe and – you hit Joe and then he hits you. Well, that's really a DED-DEDEX. In other words, that is the straight line of it.

Now, the actual, original connotation was, although it went this way you had it figured out that he must have hit you first, so you invented something that he did to you to motivate your hitting him. And that's a DED-DEDEX. It's a phony. It's a phony overt-motivator sequence, do you see?

Now, theoretically, a thetan would say, "I was hit in the chops, so I hit him in the chops." Now, that's just totally reactive, you see? And that's a perfectly ordinary, easy – to - understand overt-motivator sequence, see? He ran into you, you ran into him, see? Well, the reason why you ran into him is perfectly well explained – he ran into you.

But how about when you are the fellow who did the first running into? Now, you can't say, "He ran into me because I ran into him." That's too honest and makes you wrong. So, therefore, the common human error is when you've run into Joe and then he's run into you, or regardless of whether he ran into you or not, but when you'd committed the first action all out of your own – off your own bat, and so forth, is to invent what he did to you that made you run into him.

And it's sometimes very hard to do. Sometimes you've never met the chap before. And that was a DED-DEDEX. And what it means, actual fact, is the overt act explained. The ex, I remember is "explained." It's "the action is explained" – the reason why you did it and so forth. But it's simply explained, and it really doesn't carry in its title enough connotation of "explained phonily."

Now, you'll get more data on this if you look up in the book where it occurs and so on. But that is the original idea: is how did you explain your having hit first without provocation? And that explanation and hitting him is, both in combination, called a DED-DEDEX.

The somatic mind was something that was added to the first book by Mr. uh…… I've forgotten the name of the publisher. And I remember discussing all this and then I found it in the glossary. So there it is. It's the mind that runs the body, independent of. It would be a physical-coordination switchboard system that ran the human body. In view of the fact we
don't really know how the human body runs, we've really got no business declaring a mind we don't know where it exists. Do you see?

So there were diagrams put in about this somatic mind and so forth. You get the idea that I didn't write all that book. Well, actually, I wrote all that book except its – *Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health* – except its introduction. I wrote the basic introduction, but the real early introduction that describes the book and says what kind of a book it is, and the wheel and the arch and all that sort of thing, was actually originally written by – the first lines of it were written by Walter Winchell, who was very excited about the subject. And then the rest of it was written by the publisher. And then there were some addenda which were written by some other people.

Now, somebody wants to know what *buttered all over the universe* means, and it probably is more technical than most of you realize. When you set an individual who is very badly disoriented and dispersed, you can get a type of case that is very dispersed. They don't know whether they're here or in Christmas, see? And when you get them to point spots in space as to where they are – where they *are*, not where they are not, which is the proper process – but when you get them to point around in space as to where they are, they will point all over the universe. If you run that auditing question on them, they will do that. And it is the reaction of this very dispersed case in response to the question that gives us this colloquialism or this technical term "buttered all over the universe." Well, they are. They think they're everywhere. They don't know anyplace. And the last place they look...

Now, the person who tells you – when you exteriorize them or they're exteriorized or something like that – "I'm over there," that's great, you know. They say, "I am over *there.*" Now, how could I be over *there*? You see, that's impossible. That person might be, also, buttered all over the universe. They think they're everywhere at once.

I don't know how they get this way. I suppose it's leaving anchor points all over the universe and appearing in one anchor point and another anchor point and doing that sort of thing. Anchor point would be something he put out to make space. So that's an old-time process – about 1954, I think it was.

*Tiger Drill:* That's one of the drills which are run and is adequately covered in a bulletin. And it's simply a drill that has to do with the fact that we use the word *tiger* in it to keep from using a reactive word, because I'm sure that nobody has ever anything to do with tigers.

*Somatic mind* again.

*Computation:* There's supposed to be a comp... well, I – there's another connotation to this in Dianetics and Scientology. There's such a thing as a computing psychotic and a dramatizing psychotic. There are two types of psychosis: a psychotic who, from his reactivity, figure-figures, so his – he's inconstant in his conduct. He's compuitive. In other words, he figures it all out. He's got explanations, *rat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat-a-tat-tat.* And his psychosis is derived because these are crazy explanations. And these are all crazy and they have nothing to do with where he is or what he's doing or showing a result or anything else.
And the other type of insanity is dramatizing, so that the individual has one pattern action which is insane. He might do that continuously, but it is just one pattern action. And it's like playing off the same strip of film over and over and over. It's like he runs through the same thing. He sits down in the chair, pulls his hair out, gets up, runs over to the window and breaks the glass and jumps outside and, actually, when he's not doing that particular one, is remarkably sane. Now, that would be a dramatizing. In other words, he goes through a drama.

And a computing psychotic would be one whose variations of the situation are fabulously weird. The reason why you have just spilled tea all over him are... And the only thing wrong with the statement is, you haven't spilled tea, you haven't given him any tea and the subject had nothing to do with tea. And a few minutes later he will figure it all out on some other basis – and that is, he's obsessively solving a problem which does not exist.

As far as computation is concerned, it means to figure out. A computation in its purest sense is two times two equals four.

Arbitrary: It means something which is introduced into the situation without regard to the data of the situation. It means it is arbitrary. Arbitrary means "stand alone," and I suppose comes from a tree which sits on a hill or something like that, in Skeat's. But it's something which is introduced into the situation without regard to the data of the situation.

You know, you've probably had a nursemaid or somebody in your raising that gave you consistent arbitrary situations, you know? You had drunk your milk and you were ordered to drink your milk. Well, that's the introduction of an arbitrary into the situation because it didn't have anything to do with the data, see? But similarly, somebody says in so many words that such and such is the case, or such and such – it doesn't have to be an order – such and such must be done, or such and such is true. If that's introduced without observation and arbitrarily or without any refutation into a formula, a situation, administrative action or line, will begin to cause a ripple around it. And this ripple has now got to be solved, so somebody else will give an arbitrary solution to the introduced arbitrary.

For instance, if you had a law that two had to be introduced to every mathematical equation, you had to say "times two" arbitrarily by the arithmetic book and what they had told you to do, without any sense and it doesn't have anything to do with the problem, but you're supposed to at this moment add a "times two," – so you would have a "two times two," and now you've got to multiply it by two. So that would give you eight equals four. Two times sixteen – but now, of course, by arbitrary, we have to introduce "times two" – two times sixteen equals sixty-four.

Now, if you had an adding machine which had a piece of stuck solder in it, or something like that, that always added five into anything, you'd get four times five equals twenty-five; two times six equals seventeen. When you introduce arbitraries, you get wrong answers. You have to be careful about introducing an arbitrary.

Now, an order which is given which seeks to remedy a situation which may be quite urgent, might also be an arbitrary order. That's our new system of urgent directives, to get around arbitraries, so that any Exec Sec or any member of an Advisory Council, by getting a majority of signatures, can very quickly issue an urgent directive to remedy some kind of a
situation. Very pervasive – it doesn't much matter what it's about, but it stays in force only until data can be collected on it.

There are various ways in which you get rid of the urgent directive, but the urgent directive must be gotten rid of. It must be replaced by something which is based on observed fact – just on the off-chance that an arbitrary might be introduced into the situation.

An arbitrary would be an education that the boy never understood. It's arbitrary – he has to be educated. That's a very arbitrary statements by the way. "He has to be educated" – not in what or anything like that or "so he can" or something like that.

**Harmonics:** Harmonics is the fact that the musical scale – and any wavelength action – it means that if you struck the note of vibration one hundred, even though you only struck one hundred, you will also get two hundred and four hundred to some tiny degree. It is very hard to take any scale, particularly a vibrational scale, and not get reverberations up and down by doubles or halves. That's where the word comes from. Actually, in the field of art, it means agreement with. But what we mean by harmonics – it means – in Scientology it's possibly slightly different – it means the upper harmonics or the lower harmonics we use in relationship to well-off cases – upper harmonics and lower harmonics – bad-off cases. And when we say that the thing is a lower harmonic, we mean that it is a lower similarity which is nutty, which is actually based on something like it higher on the scale which isn't.

But it is all the tendency of a wavelength to repeat itself. And insanity: the lower you go in terms of awareness, why, the more weird the repetition is. But in music, if you strike one note in music, why, that note unstruck in the piano which is double and the note unstruck which is half will also both hum. So it means a co-action or similar action, and so on.

So we just take the word similar. We say this fellow is going along fine, this fellow is going along fine and he's able to figure out a mathematical table and so forth. Then somehow or another somebody can get a lower harmonic of this ability to figure out the mathematical table, and he doodles. Do you see? It's a similar action, but which would be less aware. So harmonic actually applies to the Awareness Scale. I don't mean it to be too arbitrary, because it actually is not much in use and is not very valuable. What you really use in a term like this, you say "a lower-scale mockery." And that expresses it, doesn't it?

So some fellow dresses in a very good way, and a comedian comes out on the stage and dresses overdone with the same characteristics. That would be a lower-scale mockery of a person dressing well. And you very often – the only reason the word is important to you is you very often can be made to feel somewhat foolish in the presence of this sort of thing. You could be made to feel somewhat foolish by having, yourself, some intention and then having a spinner tell you you've got that as an intention. And it makes you kind of think like you're maybe nuts to have this intention, see?

I'll give you an example. One day as a mental exercise, and so on, I was trying to figure out… You see it's necessary when you're running organizations such as ours, and so forth, to figure out what to do with the locations of organization or future planning or prediction – for instance, of whether or not money exchanges are going to remain the same and so forth. Well, I was trying to figure out what England would do by trying to figure out what she should do, politically, in order to straighten things out, to find out which way this was going
to go, so I could predict a curve whether or not to expand the organization, you see, or whether or not to enter dollars into the country or hold them at the border. Do you understand?

So I had been spending some little time sitting there trying to figure out "What should England do now? And what she could do..." And I was going on like this, and I ran into a fellow just outside the door, and he told me he was Disraeli and he was – had been Disraeli and he was going to help England and I had to therefore clear him so that he could save England. See?

Well, now the fact that I had been thinking about what England should do or would do, you see, sort of put me on the same level as this, you know. But made me feel so weird, you know? This guy telling me, you know, "And they should get the Brooklyn Bridge rebuilt," you know, and... He did have one good idea: to throw Westminster in the Thames. But I had to fix him up "Because England had met her hour of peril and unless he was in the saddle, why, it was all going to go to hell." I agree – whether he was in the saddle or not, he was right.

But it made me feel very, very peculiar because I had just been having some similar, some similar thoughts – what England should do and what England is doing. Do you get the idea? That was to get some kind of an idea, a framework in which we were operating. Which way is this cat going to jump? You see, it was way back. We weren't sure about how – what recovery measures were going to be taken. And some guy comes along and gives you, a few seconds later, few minutes later, he gives you, gives you all of these solutions about what they should do, except they've got a mad glaring eye and are completely nuts. [laughter]

And you walk up the street saying to yourself, "Am I nuts?" You see? You've had this happen to you, I'm sure. You felt then that the ideas you had must have been very, very daffy indeed if Joe Blow had them. [laughter, laughs] You're supposed to react this way to a comedian who comes out and mimics your accent, and so forth, in a disdainful or contemptuous way. Lower-scale mockery. Ridicule is all based on lower-scale mockery.

Anyway, there is the – now, I'm going to vary the situation and – vary the situation and try to give you just a few more lectures on this particular lineup, and the people that are here are going to be introduced at the next lecture. I see I was giving them a bad time here – giving Alan a bad time last time about not having all these things written up, and so forth, so he did a beautiful job. Actually, before, probably copied them painstakingly so I could read them. Now he's got them on beautiful cards. So I'll give them to my aide to make sure that we get them at the very next one and bid you this afternoon, a very good afternoon.

Thank you.
Thank you.

What's the date?

_Audience: 13 December AD 16._

Thirteen Dec. AD 16, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, and we've got some more definitions coming up today.

I would like to make a comment. Just before each lecture here for the last couple of Tuesdays, why, we've managed to have accumulated a flap – you know, one of the press flaps. Last Tuesday the minister of health was shooting his face off and this Tuesday, why, the local council was shooting its face off see? Trouble is they're very bad marksmen and they don't quite make the grade, so their faces don't entirely disappear. But the truth behind all this is – you should know; we're issuing it in a directive, just the rebuttal statement – the council has said, "Yes, the minister of health's statement that Scientology is potentially harmful; they'd better keep an eye on this." That's all it amounts to. See, they can't say anything or do anything. Now, where they go off the deep end is simply on this fact alone. Hubbard Association of Scientologists International since 1952, the very formation of Scientology, was a religious fellowship. That's one of the first and earliest lines in its charter in the state of Arizona. The current organization is the Church of Scientology of California, operating throughout organizations throughout the Commonwealth.

Very good. What is Scientology? How does it fit into the framework of man? This is not the counter statement that was issued; I will tell you what that is in a moment, and you will see it in full.

Truth of the matter is, is you are studying an extension of the work of Gautama Siddhartha begun about twenty-five hundred years ago. He sought to end the endless cycle of birth and death and birth. And this death-birth cycle led into an effort to show men that they were a spirit and did not _have_ to be a body and did not have to go on being clay. Gautama Siddhartha perfected some work that we did in 1952, and we did it better: How to exteriorize.

Now, the trouble he had with his work was how to stably exteriorize or continue somebody in an exterior condition. He did not know how to do this. Actually, Lamaism, which began in Tibet after Gautama Siddhartha was no longer around. He in actual fact went
to Tibet and worked in Tibet and developed what is called Lamaism in an effort to produce a methodology to reach the basis of the mind and permit an individual to be spiritually free.

Now, that work too was relatively unsuccessful. We were more successful in that in 1952 in Scientology. We could more easily and more swiftly exteriorize an individual and show him that he was a human spirit than had been done.

Yet the work of Gautama Siddhartha, although looked upon [by] him as a failure, produced the – a sufficiency of wisdom on this planet to bring civilization to three-quarters of Asia. Buddhism is the oldest and most numerous religion on this planet at this moment. It is very numerous and it predates Christianity by 500 years. Probably the shreds of Buddhism, coming into the Middle East with the silk and spice merchants who, after the contact of Alexander in about 333 B.C., found out there was a Europe. The spice merchants and silk merchants of India and China followed on back on the trail of his retreating conquest and made a trade contact with the – with Europe, and from there on supplied Europe with spices and silks and so on, on an overland route.

Well, along with them undoubtedly came Buddhism. It sparked a religious revival and a considerable amount of messianic activity in the Middle East. Now, regardless of any truths or prophecies or prophets or anything like that that happened as independent endeavors, this nevertheless was sparked off by Buddhism.

Buddha predicted that in twenty-five hundred years the entire job would be finished in the West. That's in the Pali canons. Well, we finished it. Now, were somebody to claim that Scientology were not a religion, that religion was a disguise, this would be about the most erroneous statement that a man could make, because it is an extension, a direct extension, of the work of Gautama Siddhartha Buddha.

It has very many peculiar facets. Buddha never pretended to be other than just a man. Everyone, anyone, race, color or creed, could be a member of the Buddhist church. It was not limited to one caste or class or race or nationality. It was the first international religious movement. And it has carried forward but it has moved actually in its technology not one inch further than it was pushed in Tibet, until 1952 – the successful exteriorization of human beings by a very brief, swift technology.

Now, human beings do not stay exterior. You can demonstrate to them that they are a spiritual being and that in essence is the essence of religion. Man is a spiritual being. Now, where he came from and so forth are questions developed in religion.

But the spirituality of man is the basis of religion and is the one thing that all religions have in common. They have different creators, different gods, different altars of worship but in one thing they hold a common truth and that is that man is a spiritual being. Only in Buddhism was this ever proven.

Now, what is interesting about this is that any such forward push runs into the fellows who are sufficiently suppressive to not want anybody free. They are men who are essentially afraid. They are afraid if you got better, you would be able to knock them off. If they had been very evil chaps indeed, I should very well think you might gratify it – their ambition. There is something there for them to be afraid of. They could no longer carry on licentiously,
suppressively, no longer dip both hands to the elbows in the public funds to support their private friends. They could no longer do a number of things. But the basic goal of psychiatry today is to wipe out religion. It does not have the goal of healing the sick or helping the insane. That is demonstrated by the rising statistic of insanity throughout the world during the duress of psychiatry. The longer they operate, the more insane they've got. Well, now that's what we would call a very bad statistic indeed.

The truth of the matter is, they inveigh against religion to this degree: They say anyone who is religious is psychotic. That's what they say.

Now, I think what they intend to do has very little to do with us, but I think by knocking us out of business and disqualifying the fact that we are a religion, they can then pick bigger game, can knock out a bigger church and a bigger one and a bigger one. Their sole interest is in the quick buck.

As far as these national mental health associations, and so forth, are concerned, you must realize that they are private organizations which have nothing to do with the government, which pretend that they are part and parcel of the government. They call themselves the National Mental Health Association. They have no right to the word, and it as a matter of fact is in controversy to the Companies Acts which passed, that said the word must express exactly what the organization is.

It might surprise you to know that the British Medical Association is simply a private company of doctors and has nothing to do with the government. Similarly these national mental health associations are only, solely and entirely private profit companies.

The one here in England runs mental homes that charge fees that would make us blush. They take care of nothing but the idiot children and the senile parents of the aristocracy. That is their role in life. They use their name to obtain, falsely, public funds. And in addition to that, one such association – and we have it signed – stated that in view of the fact that I was a millionaire I would not miss a hundred thousand pounds, and that unless I paid a hundred thousand pounds, every minister of health, every information service and every government in the world would be provided with information by which to crush us, and all I had to do was pay up a hundred thousand pounds. We have that, signed.

The Australian Inquiry would make the Profumo case look like a Sunday school picnic. They called all the hostile witnesses together, they arranged their testimony and then they went to the hearing and gave their testimony. Our witnesses were neither – either not heard or intimidated or discredited. Perjury was permitted by the QC. There isn't a legal crime that you could mention that was not committed in the (quote) "Australian Inquiry," instigated by psychiatry far enough away that they could make a splash because I was totally inhibited from appearing or testifying at that inquiry. It's very interesting. So, they've rolled through to their brother organization in England who is now kicking up the fuss.

This is what it is all about and this is really all it is all about. As long as religion brings solace to man in any way, shape or form, as long as churches stand in any way for the spiritual freedom of man, psychiatry will not really be able to progress, whatever its end goals are. Therefore, our rebuttal to any such attack is that psychiatry should not be permitted to wipe out a small church and then go on to a bigger church and then go on to a bigger church, and
so take it all over. And also that the minister of health, as we have just told the press, has no right whatsoever to comment upon religious beliefs or practices. And in addition to that, that they are telling us that we must not do something we are not doing.

Now, this is the yickle-yackle that appears in the world. The public at large is in actual fact getting ready to turn. Much of it has already turned. They see something very rotten in this idea of attacking Scientology. They are sick of this, see, because it's gone on too long. And we hear cross comments of this particular character here and there. And they've gone too far and they've said too much! And they are now talking to an hostile public on the subject. It's up to us to make sure that this is the downfall of all suppressive practices in that line.

Well, the local council has been told that it has no objection to euthanasia in its local hospitals and that it should avail itself of our invitation to have a council-elected representative sit on our advisory board at Saint Hill. And then maybe they could learn that we were not doing what they say we are doing. Because they say that we are treating the sick and treating the insane. And we are not doing that, as you know, by policy.

So that is the total way this thing sums up. There are no other ramifications to it. Psychiatry is demanding its right to kill or maim any human being after it states that he's crazy. Now, if they can do that, they can control a planet politically. And it's quite a push. We don't say it's a total conspiracy, because it's a bunch of incompetent boobs trying to pull it off. But it is already in use politically, as in the case of Long, I think it was. They wanted to get rid of him as a political rival, so they had the psychiatrist pick him up and throw him in a hospital. They wanted to get rid of Walker, General Walker, and so they picked him up and said he was insane and threw him in hospital. In other words, this is a political mechanism which is being used, and I think it should be resisted. It's not too hard to resist it in view of the fact that the men are too suppressive to actually carry through.

There's two things that a suppressive cannot do: he cannot choose a right target and he cannot complete a cycle of action. But the one thing – when you are talked to about this – the one thing that you should give them back right in their teeth is that if you are not doing something, you cannot stop doing it. And that there is no law or regulation of any kind which says that you cannot make people more intelligent or more able. And that's all we're doing.

Now, we threaten – we threaten – the very fundamentals of the psychiatric push on this planet. It's not just psychiatric; there are a lot of people pushing on this planet. This planet is full of pressure groups, any one of which is trying to do in every other group on the planet.

We try to ignore this type of action all that we can and carry on. Actually we have completed our technology, we are well on the way out. We are just about as stoppable today as a juggernaut. You can't stop this much wisdom.

Now, there's another factor involved: is when anyone tries to cut a line of pure theta, it tends to blow them up. What would you think of somebody – you had just received information that you had won the raffle, and he got the piece of paper that said you had and he put it in his pocket and he didn't say anything about it to you. What would you say when you finally found out that he had done this? Well, now, that's just a minor example of what happens to somebody who tries to cut a theta line.
Scientology is a line of pure theta. There just aren't any pitches or curves in Scientology – it's trying to do exactly what it's trying to do. It's trying to secure the spiritual freedom of the individual.

Therefore, when they chop across that line and sit squarely on that line and try to stop that line, they'll blow up. You want to take out a few minutes sometime in argument or discussion as to why Scientology is attacked, and so forth? Why, help them blow up!

The whole situation, though, is it would not really matter very much what happened at this particular stage of the game. Three years ago it would have mattered. Not now. Too late! Too late! Do not send to find for whom the ax is falling. [laughter]

You see, our victory was not in the suppression of a private group or a specialist group. That was not our victory. Our victory was a much greater victory than that: the victory of the individual over fate and the universe. Therefore, if we win everybody wins. The incidental crushing of the opposition en route is even hardly worth doing, because we're moving up to a position now where I can assure you anybody really opening his face on this subject to the public is to some degree damaging himself. The public is not in agreement with him.

Now, we will feed back and we will tell the press that we can't stop doing what we're not doing. And we have just got through telling the press that the local council was incompetent as observers, and that we could have bought the whole thing off for a hundred-thousand-pound bribe. And the press has just been told this. [laughter, applause]

Well, let's get on with some "daffynitions" and so forth. [laughter]

And I've one staring me in… I don't know if this is where I left off? Is this where I left off? Yes, where I left off. What do you know. Nobody has added any cards to this. You know, I ought to have all the simple words, too, you know? You know, simple words like idiot and so forth. [laughter] What is an idiot? It's someone who is on a council. It's not clever but bitter.

All right. The first word here is inversion: Now, inversion simply means it should go one way and it goes the other, basically. It inverts. It collapses in on itself downward. Now, when you take an inversion, when a person is introverted, why, he would look in on himself, you see? So you get an inversion – this means, it's going south of zero, or it's a reverse scale.

Now, this also is used in terms of inversion: This scale is going plus while this scale goes minus. Do you follow? As one factor progresses, the other factor degresses. Do you follow? So when we say it's an inversion on something, it means, actually, it's a go-downward about it. So that two plus three plus four plus five – that would be a plus scale, you see? But a four and a three and a two backwards would be the inversion scale. Do you understand? It's a reversion of what it is. There are undoubtedly other meanings and connotations to this particular word, but that in essence covers what they are. It means it goes backwards.

All right. Exteriorization: This was an action which I have, by the way, just described to you as the history of Buddhism. It simply means a thetan walks out of his body, moves out of his body or exists out of his body, but it – in actual fact exteriorization would mean the action of moving out of a body.
Give you an idea how thoroughly psychiatry tries to boobytrap the whole field of the mind and so forth – they claim that the insane people can exteriorize. And you know, that is the most blasted lie I ever heard of in my life because I have actually exteriorized insane people and had them go suddenly sane. I've actually been talking vis-à-vis to an insane person and banged them out of their head – this is back in research times – and had them all of a sudden talk to me totally rationally and just perfect – could have passed anything, any board, discussed their problems and what they were into. Didn't last. When they get up to leave, they go back into their head again and start gibbering. But exteriorization is not a symptom of insanity, quite the reverse.

People who are interiorized – that means something else; it isn't the reverse of this. An interiorization means going into it too fixedly and becoming part of it too fixedly. It doesn't mean just going into your head. You could interiorize into work by which one would get so fixated and so surrounded by his work that he never got out of it. See, you could interiorize into most anything. But exteriorization is relegated in our terminology simply to an exteriorization or a moving out of the body by the spirit.

Restimulate: Well, restimulation, that means the reactivation of an existing incident. If you restimulate it, you reactivate it, some approximation of the original incident causes it to go into play, and you get a point where it was restimulated. Here's an example: A fellow was out here and he gets run into by a truck and he has then an engram, a mental image picture of pain and unconsciousness. And he has this, and it's – has got a truck in it and it's associated with a truck and so forth. Now, there is the engram. And a few days later he walks by a similar kind of truck, and he feels afraid and upset and he doesn't know why. Now, what he has done is restimulate the incident of being hit by the truck. It remains unseen to him and the restimulation is usually unknown to a person. If it were known to the person, he would immediately recover from it. But if it remains unknown, why, it tends to be buried and have an effect upon the individual.

Restimulate. This is very, very, very interesting because by picking up restimulations you can knock out of action an engram without running it. It's sort of as if the engram sat over in locker A undisturbed and not troubling the individual. But one day he passes by a truck, and this engram comes out of locker A and drops in his lap and he doesn't know what it is, and he becomes the effect of it. Now, if you picked up the moment it went into restimulation – not the original engram – if you picked up the moment of its restimulation, it would drop back into locker A and cease to trouble the individual. It is upon this fact that the whole subject of releasing depends. You're dropping the bank back into locker A; it isn't really troubling somebody. The erasure that occurs is erasure of these points of restimulation.

Now, restimulate has an opposite word, destimulate, which means to take away the restimulation. Now, destimulate does not mean the erasure of the original incident; it means simply the knockout of the point of restimulation. Got it?

Now we have GE – genetic entity. Now, what is a genetic entity? Theoretically this is the world and science of cytology which has to do with the field of biology and so forth. It's the science of cells. Cytology. And cytology conceives that there is an unending stream of protoplasm passing through time which has branch tracks known as bodies. And that is the
basic theory of cytology. It is not a well-constructed science because it does not follow thoroughly its basic theory. So that the body which you have is supposed, in the field of cytology, to have originated at some dim point in the past from a sea of ammonia or something – and in earlier times, in pagan worship and that sort of thing, from-full armed from the brain of Jove or something like this – and then by the process of reproduction keeps passing itself through time over and over and over and over. So that this gives your unending stream of protoplasm. Now, obviously, if that were the case then, if an unending… supposing man were not a spiritual being, or if he were, somewhere along the line there must be some kind of a pattern arranged for a body. Otherwise, it wouldn't be able to make a body. Quite obvious. If you have no blueprint in the planning room for a ship, it's highly unlikely that anyone would build a ship. Do you see?

They haven't got any blueprints for a ship, so they don't build a ship. If they knocked one together, it would be pretty slipshod. But the body is a pretty complete entity.

Now, back in the days of Dianetics (and this is a Dianetic term), when the thetan had not been particularly regarded as part of it, the only way we could account for past lives – and a good way to account for them now, if somebody is wondering about what they are (but it's not correct) – would be to say, "Well, they are incidents which happened on the genetic line."

Now, the Darwin theory is in actual fact, although Darwin did not know it, an explanation of this unending stream of protoplasm. Now, he studied the evolution of bodies. Now, I assure you, if there was no unending stream of protoplasm making bodies one after the other up through time, there would have been nothing to have evolved, right? So if the Darwinian theory was correct, then someplace there, there must have been a blueprint. And someplace there, there must have been adventures which were recorded as experience which then modified the blueprint of that body. Do you follow the logic that's involved here? Well, that was what a genetic entity is.

Now, when we find, however, the theory of evolution does not in actual fact hold good for various reasons – when we find out that man is a spiritual being and a lot of other factors surround it, the genetic entity ceases to be very important. We have the actual explanation of what a past life amounts to and we don't have to blame it on the genetic entity. But theoretically you would be able to find the blueprint if you looked in the body and you went back-track; obviously, the body must have a time recording of some kind or another. Matter of fact it's – we used to think it showed up on the E-Meter, but it never has. Only you have.

I've just described what general blueprint. That would be the "Where do you put the ears?" you know?

Well, the first overt would be the first overt on a chain of overts. And if you were trying to get a fellow over an impulse to hit every girl he saw – which I should think would be a rather healthy thing to get somebody over. He complains to you that he wants to hit every girl. And you don't handle these impulses and obsessions and so forth. Any time you process one, and so on, you generally go a cropper. But I would show – I'll show you how you go about it. He has this impulse to hit girls, so what you would do would be to trace back all the times he wanted to hit girls and you would find him back at his first overt on the chain on the subject of hitting girls. And at that moment when he saw that, why, it would release, and he theoreti-
cally would not have any more impulse to hit girls. I say "theoretically" for the reason that the ability to sort out through the hundred thousand other impulses which he also has, and choose this one selectively and alone as the auditor – or preclear's particular hidden standard – "Have I gotten over hitting girls yet?" – is fraught with many adventures and they're all bad ones. You should not try to process a specific type of aberration. If we processed a specific type of aberration, we of course would be in the field of mental healing, and so forth. But long ago we actually discovered that we must not process specific aberrations, which takes us out of the field of mental healing.

It is quite fatal to do this because in the first place it's an evaluation for the case. In the second place, it's a negative type process; you're condemning the individual for hitting girls. Doesn't validate the individual at all. Do you follow? And if carried on very long, does not result in the betterment of an individual. All we're interested in is the spiritual betterment of the individual, and you don't achieve that by finding these little bits and pieces and nasty habits and throwing bottles and things like that – by selectively picking those up and processing them. Now, if any auditor were to go along this line, he would soon learn the truth of what I am saying: that when you try to process the specific aberrations of a human being, you are now going to take on an endless task which probably won't resolve.

So, therefore, there is – not only are we not in the field of mental healing – you see, that would be mental healing: He has an impulse that should be healed, so you process him on something to heal that impulse. Do you understand? Well, completely aside from not being in the field of mental healing, mental healing, if any claim is made for it of any kind whatsoever, would be the biggest fraud of the centuries. Because I can tell you by experience that the percentiles of successes when specific aberrations are directly addressed by the practitioner is too low to be considered. It's not successful, because that isn't what's – what's right with the person. You have to validate what's right with the person. It's an entirely different field. Do we follow? You don't have to find out what's wrong with a person, for instance, in modern processing to make him right. You don't.

You know what can go wrong with human beings, or what he's having trouble with anyway, but they are not things that need healing. There's no wounds present. The individual simply isn't talking very much and he isn't communicating very much and he can't reach very much. And so you bring him up into communication level. Then the individual can't handle his problems because he can't recognize what they are. And you bring him up there and then you find out that he's been resolving his problems by committing overts. And you get him over doing this. And then you find out he's very ARC broke with life, and life is very cruel to him. And you get him over his ARC breaks and so forth. And then you bring him up to a point of where he'll find out that he has a good solution. He's got a marvelous solution for everything. And any time he has a bad break, he goes and lies down and be – is a horse or something, I don't know. But we're not interested in what his solution is and we're not treating him for that reason.

Now we move up into the higher grades, and so on. And all of these things are simply increasing the abilities of a spirit, not healing what's wrong with it.
Now, the entrance point to this universe: Now, that comes under classified information and is in actual fact a misnomer. Many times on the track one has been told that he has just entered this universe. It's a big swindle. You're already in the room; somebody says… [laughter]

And here's one: OT activities: What are OT activities? OT activities would be those programs conducted by OTs to assist Scientology. Simple. [laughter]

And here's one. This has to do with old anchor points and so forth. It's the gold balls. Well, a body is constructed in a space framework, and you can actually see these things. And actually as you look around, some people can perceive these. And when an individual has dark hollows under his eyes, it's all these little gold balls – they all grouped together underneath the eyes and caved in and gone black, and that gives him… It's very interesting. If you could in actual fact shift this golden-ball framework of the body and so forth, you could probably bend the joints in the wrong places and that sort of thing. It's quite remarkable. Every once in a while somebody's face is out of shape or something, and you get him to pick up the ball and put it back where it belongs or put a bunch of balls out there to remedy his havingness of that particular ball. And this is anchor-point processing way back when, and you all of a sudden – the ball, instead of lying against his face, goes back where it belongs, and he reasserts his sense of balance and so on. His face will actually change shape. It's quite remarkable. But this has to do with the structure of bodies. What is the space in which the body is formed? What is that space? The body has to be held in [a] certain rigid form in space. And apparently the system which is used in mocking up bodies, or one of the systems used, is to put gold balls out here, balanced left and right and back and around and so forth. I wouldn't look for them if I were you; it's rather fraught with disaster in some cases.

First and second postulate: This is a first postulate situation and the second postulate situation is, "What is the first postulate made on any existing situation?" Now, if you get the first postulate made on any existing situation, you can actually ignore the second postulate that's made on the situation. That's the general thing. Now, actually, one tried to make an end all out of this back about 52 and so on: What was the first postulate on the track? What's the first postulate that one ever made and so forth. Now – we now find out it's not necessary to have that.

And we have energy: Energy would simply mean a potential of motion or power. And energy is normally conceived of in modern physics as being made up of small waves which are flowing from point A to B, or potentially can flow from point A to B. And there's a lot of explanations in modern physics, but we know they still haven't got an efficient engine, so they probably haven't got the right definition of energy either.

But energy would be a potential; it would be the force or flow, or the potential force or flow, from something to something, or the ability to accomplish work or the ability to make motion or movement and so on. I'm giving you all – all the possible things. We're taught in physics that if something moves from A to B, then there is some energy necessary to move it and probably some energy developed in the movement of it. When you move something, you develop energy; and when you move something, you also need energy to move it. We are taught this very carefully. It is highly doubtful.
Well, look, look. If somebody knows all about something, he can do some remarkable things with it, can't he? And you don't need to fill an Empire State Building full of fuel at a cost of a hundred million dollars and touch a fire to it and send it into space to burn for a few seconds, to land a half-ton capsule out into orbit if you knew the whole system of energy. Because I assure you that they some day will find that this is not that energy-consuming a process and that it's not quite that necessary to carry out that vast expense of the public purse. I think if they'd worked in the field of pure mathematics for a long time before they started buying all those Empire State Buildings full of liquid gases, they might have saved the taxpayer some money. But that was not the point, was it?

What is energy? This is in actual fact – is something that is above modern physics considerably. But they can define it, and I've given you a working definition: It's potential or actual motion or force – potential or actual motion or force. Sloppy definition. I know certain fellows who would call me down for saying so, but there it is.

*Flow:* That means the progress of particles or impulses or waves from point A to point B, or point C to point D, or in any direction, but rather outlaws the idea of a dispersal.

Something that splatters all over the place is not a flow. Flow has the connotation of being somewhat directional. So that if something is flowing down off a mountain, it could be flowing awfully wide and on a considerable front which could be widening. And at some point that would cease to be a flow and become a flood or something.

Flow is looked upon as something moving from A to B, and once more we get back to what is energy. Well, energy is a particle in progress, or energy is a motion or a wave vibration or a bunch of other things. But it would be flowing in some direction. And when we say "Joe talks to Bill," then Joe is flowing words and impulses toward Bill. And when Bill talks to Joe, why, he's flowing impulses or words back to Joe. And it has a connotation of a limited and directional progress of particles or wave motions through space.

*Thought:* Thought. Well, that is a very wide subject. That is a very, very wide subject indeed. What is thought? Now, every philosopher since the beginning of time has tried to answer this question of "What is thought?" and they have gone from the idiotic to the stupid and back again many times on this particular subject, because if they had understood what thought was, why, then they wouldn't have confused it with life and they wouldn't have confused it with the spirit.

Modern psychology confuses thought with life. It says where thought occurs there is life, so therefore a computer is alive. That's one of the first mistakes you can make. Fact! They can – they sort of tend in that direction, see?

Now, thought would simply be a spaceless, positionless product of a thetan containing meaning. That's all. It's something a thetan produces that doesn't have space or energy or location or so forth. It is a thought. And we can say what it is not. It is not life. And we can also say that a thought is not a spirit. They are different. The mistake is originally in the word theta. The Greek said that the word theta, if I remember rightly, stood for life or thought – stood for either one. Well, actually, for us it stands only for a thetan. Even life has a connotation. Life is something that is being lived. And do you know a thetan has a perfect choice not to live it.
Now, \textit{lambda}: I have forgotten what that symbol was but it occurs in the Axioms and so on. And I think it is life in the Axioms but I won't go down on record with regard to it. It's an unused symbol. There's phi for the physical universe, and then I think there was lambda for life. I've forgotten what it is.

And \textit{not-is-ness}: These are contained in the Axioms and nothing is better expressed than those Axioms. Not-is-ness implies that the thing is but is being "not-ed." [laughter] You couldn't not-is something that wasn't in the first place. Do you see? Here's an E-Meter. I can not-is the E-Meter. I can say it isn't there. I can actually push beams against it and say it doesn't exist, and so forth. It's actually an assertion against fact.

Now, \textit{counter-emotion} would be the emotion which greets the emotion. You have point A exerting an emotion. An emotion is normally something which has flow and quite normally has a wavelength and has meaning, and it's got concept all mixed up with it and so on. It's quite a packaged affair, emotion is. And it would be the counter-emotion to any emotion.

Well, now, any emotion could counter any emotion. Love can counter anger and hate can counter boredom and so forth. It's just any emotion that is countering an existing emotion. When you start to take apart the energy in a bank on the subject of a fight, let us say, you could actually – you don't have to – but you could actually pick out of it – the fellow is raving – and you could pick out his heavy antagonism, you see, and you could differentiate that with a victim's total apathy. And the counter-emotion to the antagonism is apathy. It's the emotion which is used to meet a situation or which does meet it.

Quite an interesting study, by the way. It is a study which has even reached into the field of politics and control of human beings, the advertising world also, and so on. They're very interested in this subject. They want to know what emotion people will counter emotions with. Hitler, for instance, raving and screaming and so forth, was actually greeted by the Germans with enthusiasm. You remember? You ever hear that raving, screaming voice? You probably heard it, and then the waves of "Heil" going on in the background. Everybody going to town on the subject. In other words, the counter-emotion to hate and rage in that particular case was enthusiasm.

Of course, what emotion produces want? Well, the funny part of it is, "want" isn't an emotion. See, that is a desire or a postulate or a pull-in or something of the sort. Now, wanting something because you like it, the "like it" is the emotion. But it doesn't have to be there at all. People very often want things that they neither like nor hate nor feel emotional about in any way, shape or form.

So you see, the advertising executive, when he's trying to handle emotion and counter-emotion, is rather going up against it, because what he's trying to bring about is to get the people to want something. He's dealing with want and not-want, and he's trying to generate
want on certain subjects and not-want on competitors' products. And when he tries to handle these things emotionally, why, he starts laying an egg.

You'll see in beer ads. They handle this very directly without emotion in beer ads, it's... and so forth. They know that in – that fellows love beautiful girls, see, or like beautiful girls. So, I think it was Rheingold beer was the one that started this, and they never had beer associated with anything in any of their ads but beautiful girls. So the people would look at the beautiful girl and immediately want Rheingold beer, which – I think the guy must have been bats! [laughter] Makes no sense at all.

Memory and recall: Well, actually, there is no difference between these two terms that's significant to the auditor. Memory means some – remembering something, and recalling means remembering something and so forth.

Now, recall, however, implies that you bring it up to present and look at it. It has that connotation. Whereas memory would have the connotation of you simply knew it had happened. Now, there's two different connotations to these things, but actually they are very, very easily interchanged – very easily interchanged – because one doesn't have to bring it up. When he's Clear, he doesn't any longer; there's a lot of things he doesn't bring up to present time to recall them. He can recall them in detail and tell you exactly where they are without having them brought up into the present to review. Do you follow?

To that extent Clear is actually far, far in advance of the Book One definition of Clear.

The reason might amuse you. The reason one can't recall is totally contained in the fact that his memory is surrounded by mass which prevents him from recalling. It's quite obviously that if you got rid of all of your – all of the mass of the mind, why, you obviously wouldn't have anything to recall, correct? Doesn't work that way at all, which is one of the most astonishing things. Undue duress prevents recall. For instance, if you just – if you were in a lion's cage and the lion jumped at you and you got out through the bars and you got about ten, fifteen feet away, the mental energy contained in drawing back from the lion and squeezing out through the bars and running that ten feet would in actual fact – not because it's a dangerous area – but prevent you from remembering that you had been in the lion's cage.

And that's basically the mechanics of amnesia, of how an individual ceases to remember. The track, you might say, gets too charged. Not that it gets too dangerous, but his recalls fold up on him because he's protecting himself again so many dangers and actions on the track that that very amount of charge or energy or mass, and so forth, prevents his easy penetration into it. So what he actually starts doing is bringing up the pictures to look at them. He can't just say "My license number in Rome was..." Do you see? He sort of has to get a picture of it in order to read it. You got it? Well, that would only be when his track was very heavily charged and he was mocking up all kinds of charge with relationship to it. Anyway, that's the way it is.

And confidence: Confidence is an expression of trust. One could make some witticisms on the subject of money is an idea and it's value is proportional to the confidence in the government. Whose money is inflating? Inflation actually is an expression of no confidence in the government. Just as nasty as that. Now, we're talking about philosophic money; we're not talking about economics. The basic ideas which underlie money are simply it's an idea
and a degree of confidence. Money is an idea. Now, we have to bolster that idea up and give it substance and give it mass and give it reason and give it economics and give it idiocy and give it ideology, and when we get all through, why, we're having a ball. But it's basically just those two things. It's as valuable as one has confidence, and it is originally an idea.

Now, if you work with those two things in relationship to money, you can understand more about money than reading a thousand texts on economics. You see, when money goes bad is when people cease to have confidence in the issuer, and therefore money is considered that much less valuable. So on Tuesday the public likes dictator Benzene, and on Wednesday they hate him. Well, you'll find out that on Tuesday the country's money is worth whatever it was worth on the exchange, and on Wednesday is valueless. See?

That's why they put pictures of kings and presidents and prime ministers and things of this character on money. They try to associate these facts.

So confidence is just degree of trust in. Confidence is no absolute term. It's degree of trust.

Trust, of course, is composed of past experience. People who don't trust anyone have just had too many past experiences and so forth. Total trust is looked on by people as being total idiocy. And, as a matter of fact, it happens to be the only condition under which you can exist. That's interesting – exist on a line of total trust. Somebody says, "Well, the thing wrong with Ron is he just trusted everybody, and he always trusts people. And he trusts, you see? And it's all very bad and so forth." It may be very bad, but look where we are today. We didn't arrive there being suspicious of everybody.

Certainty would mean the degree of willingness to accept the awareness of an isness. Isn't that pretty good? This is what's known as juggling with words to make more words. I know, you'll have to play it back – I can't remember it myself. [laughter]

Now, if there is a potato masher in front of you – as an example – if there is a potato masher in front of you, and if this potato masher is, and if you're willing to accept the fact that it is and are willing to be aware of it, then you have certainty in it. Certainty is one of the most conditional things that anybody ever had anything to do with, because there's a question in the first place to begin with that any mass has mass. The physicist plays on this all the time. He's not at all sure that mass has mass.

This brings up something else. A Scientologist actually takes off philosophically in this particular direction with relationship to the universe. If he does this, why, he's perfectly safe and it's all very rational. This is one of the basic problems, by the way, of most philosophers. Is somewhere in his texts there will be this discussion of reality. Now, when we're getting down to reality, we're getting down to the subject of certainty, and we're on the subject of nothing else but certainty, see?

Now, there is a wall. There is a wall. And now, certain philosophers would have you believe that before you can accept the fact that there is a wall there, you have to know from where the wall came. But that is silly. Do you see? So a Scientologist simply starts out, not on the basis of "Is there a wall there because it came from someplace?" or "how long the wall is going to be there" or anything else. His sole question with regard to reality: "Is the wall
there?" The wall is, so therefore he is then certain the wall is. What is he certain of? He is simply certain that the wall is. See, he doesn't have to be certain of anything else. And this is a reduction to simplicity of one of the greatest philosophic conundrums that philosophers have ever boxed the ears of students with. You have to ask the question "What is?" to make people uncertain. That would be the greatest mechanism in the world, of the generation of uncertainty. "Is the world really?" And you start asking questions about it, you shake people's certainty.

Now, brainwashing simply is the trick of mixing up certainties. All you have to do if you want to know and extrapolate or develop the entire field of brainwashing as developed by Pavlov, is simply to make somebody certain that the wall is black and then certain that the wall is white and make it less black and less white and have it eventually become gray. But not have him certain that it is gray at all; leave him with the two certainties that it is white and that it is black. And with those two certainties merged and confused one with the other, he gets into a confused or hypnotic state in which he can believe anything.

So to unconfuse somebody, it is only necessary to let them regain some certainties. Therefore, you ask somebody to pat his foot against the floor as we used to do. Well, he becomes certain that the floor is there. He doesn't have to become certain where it came from, what it's composed of or how much money is still owed on the mortgage. The only thing you're asking him to do is just to make sure that it is there. And so you get the increase of certainty which is attended in processes such as CCHs and spotting processes and so forth.

It's quite remarkable. An individual is displaced after he's been in an accident. Because of his mental image pictures made at the time of the accident, he tends to remain at the moment of the accident and in that moment of time and in that location in space. Now, he dimly sees the room around him. So he can't be certain, because he sees dimly the accident around him and he sees dimly the room around him. So he really cannot be certain that he is in the room or in the accident. Now, by asking him to spot the room, gradually we increase his certainty so that he becomes unconfused. Then he feels straighter and more comfortable. His certainty is up. Do you see?

Now, we probably also could run the engram out so that he couldn't be there, and then have him look at the room, and we would accomplish more or less the same end product, either of which would increase his certainty as to the is-ness of his current location. And certainty is, of course, trust and so forth mixed up again – similar to confidence. But when you're walking down steps and there isn't one there and you were certain that it was, this is a betrayal [laughter] the end of which you never heard of. And it does more than jar your spine. You also get into ARC breaks. One quite often ARC breaks because one's certainty suddenly is shifted. He thinks he's looking at a gillywhobbit, and he actually finds himself looking at a goolawhoobit.

One of the ways of teaching people so as to render them into a total hypnotic state is practiced in most universities, and that is to qualify every statement in such a way as it's not quite graspable. "The 'allahipatoodrum' lived in the 'cleocene' period except where he was in the 'mongoic' period, and Professor Whomfдыгumph challenges that he lived at all." [laughter] Typical, typical one of this type of operation, typical. The actual statement should be
made is, "These bones was found in tar pit X. In order to be able to talk about them, we call them whoosis bones. Now take it from there, kid. Build yourself a Tyrannosaurus rex if we want to, but as far as we know it's whoosis bones." Big certainty, see? You'd probably developed a terrific paleontologist if you did it.

Generality: Any unspecificity or unspecific statement or indication tends toward a generality. It is a substitution of a plural for a singular, or a substitution of a greater for a lesser. It implies that a generality is used more or less purposely. Actually individuals who are pretty dispersed or, you know, sort of all around and hazy and so forth, tend to talk in generalities. Bill, who just talked to them, becomes "they." A letter just received from the public about the magazine becomes "the public." Unspecific, and it's actually blowing up a smaller to a larger or a singular to a plural. And that's what's known as generalizing.

Now, the whole system and subject of classification comes under the head of generalizing or generalities but isn't looked upon normally as doing so and is called classification. In other words, the word boys includes all boys. The word girls includes all girls. Well, now, that word itself; of course, is a generality, and you naturally, to converse at all, must have that word. But because you do have a generality when they are in actual fact boy, boy, boy, boy, boy, boy and girl, girl, girl, girl, girl, girl and really not girl-s – there is no such thing as a girl-s. Really. Really. There's just a bunch of girl, see, [laughter] repeated several times. Because that generality has been condoned, then you get into a further generality, a much larger generality. And you get "Men are no good," you know? "Everybody" or "Boys don't like me." You see? That's a hell of a generality.

I've never failed, by the way – in exploring with a meter – I have never failed to find out who "they" was, and it was always one person. See? "They" instead of "Joe." Very interesting. Generality. You have, in actual fact, one of the sources of aberration, and you certainly have a big answer to suppression when you have this whole subject of generality explained and understood.

Suppress: And we immediately have – the primary mechanism of suppression would be generality. But suppress means "to squash, to sit on, to make smaller, to refuse to let reach, to make uncertain about his reaching, to render or lessen in any way possible by any means possible to the harm of the individual and for the fancied protection of the suppressor;" and that is what it means technically in Scientology.

The suppressor, considering himself in danger from something, will try to suppress it. And suppression of it, and so on, is done in many ways and covertly is done by expressing generalities to it. "You are surrounded by dangerous space" – typical. Fellow is standing out in an open field full of daisies, and somebody tells him, "Don't move!" [laughter] And the fellow says, "Why, why?" He doesn't ever tell him. [laughter]

Matter of fact, invention of things or the outlining of things, like germs, that nobody has seen tends to be a bit suppressive, see? You get a mama who tells you that "Everything is covered with germs, Johnny." [laughter] See, these are all tricks and mechanisms to prevent reach. Tricks and mechanisms.

Postulate means to generate or "thunk" a concept. A concept is a think, a thought. And to postulate, however – to postulate – infers a requirement that something goes or it stays,
it turns white or goes blue or remains blue, or that it is something or that it isn't something, or that some action is going to take place, and so forth. In other words, a postulate infers conditions and actions rather than just plain thinks.

Now, when an individual says, "Ah, lovely day," he's not making a postulate. But when he says "Lovely day!" and the sun doesn't instantly turn on and move up in three or four shades of brightness, and if leaves don't immediately start appearing on the dead trees and so forth, why, he would consider his postulate hadn't worked.

Postulate is associated more with intention than it is with a thought. It has a dynamic connotation.

And **havingness** simply is the feeling that one owns or possesses. Havingness. Now, a fellow actually can be wearing a coat without having a coat. So it must be the feeling that one owns, has or possesses, or that the group owns, has or possesses, see? And then it becomes havingness. Mere possession does not make havingness.

And **confronting** means the ability to front up to. That word *front* is very important in *confront*. Now con-fronting by derivation would mean "with-fronting." So it sort of has a dim implication that if you confront the door, the door is confronting you. Co-action is implied here, but in actual fact doesn't exist in our meaning of it. It means the ability of the individual to face up, look at, stand in front of, be near, see, visualize or otherwise perceive something. So you say he isn't confronting cats. That means one does not look at, stand up to, and so forth, and – by extension – won't handle cats. To handle things you have to stand up to them, you know?

Now, there's many a thetan has been very badly steamrolled by confronting, and he learns this rather easily in a body, and he can also learn it as a thetan. There's times to stand up and glare, and times not to. So the total answer is not total confronting. Total confronting is not implied. But when an individual can selectively confront or not confront anything, why, then he of course is total power. And it happens that these do go together. When a thetan does not want to confront something, he tends to mask it or turn away from it, and it tends to make him an effect. Now, if he cannot bring about – make an effect on it, it can make an effect on him. That is the connotation. But as a matter of fact – as a matter of fact – to stand in front of a sixty-mile-an-hour automobile and let it run over you just to demonstrate that you're not afraid of confronting it is not sanity; that's asininity. [laughter]

Now, you ask the individual, "Are you willing to confront being run over by a sixty-mile-an-hour traveling individual – or by an automobile or something?" And he, of course, get very very searching about this. Well, if he gets too searching about it, you can realize his confront is out just on the basis that he is already obsessively confronting, and he thinks that there is some sense in your asking him to do – what – this… And he counter – he has the idea that there's something wrong with him that he won't go do this! Well, I assure you, there'd be something very wrong with him if he did.

So willful and knowing act, or willful and knowing confronting, or willingness to conceive the idea of; or to confront or not to confront – all are contained in this single idea. Don't get the idea that – on confronting – that you've got to be able to stand up to *any* circumstance
in *any* action in *any* anything can *ever* happen to anybody, because that would simply be to confess that you couldn't stop anything from occurring.

Now, you see, I'm perfectly willing to confront being able to put out my palm (quote, unquote) in a straight-arm on a sixty-mile-an-hour traveling automobile and have it stop, and then, therefore, to that degree perfectly willing to confront. See? Now, this doesn't mean conditional confronting. What would be the conditions under which you would be willing to confront this? These are really not fair questions. Well, who wants to live a life of ruin? Nobody. Well, now, some people have made it a virtue to be able to confront living a life of ruin. Well, it's a kind of a philosophic booby trap and they persuade individuals that they should be perfectly willing to live a life as dope addicts, bums and in total ruin in order to demonstrate that they can confront living this kind of a life. But that's simply suppression.

Actually it has precious little to do with sanity, but is a terrific process in that the individual will come up and find out what he is obsessively confronting as well as what he is willing to confront and what he doesn't *have* to confront. And the big thing he normally finds out about something like this is, good heavens, he doesn't have to go on and keep confronting forever! He's, matter of fact, quite tired of standing there! [laughs]

As the power to confront and not to confront arises selectively, an individual's self-determinism arises accordingly, because very often the thetan who never likes to be wrong explains the fact that he got run over by X by saying he was perfectly willing to confront it, and he was perfectly willing to confront the experience, and he's very happy that he got run over by X because he's now got such an experience. And he could never have another experience. And you often hear him say, "Well, it was good experience, but I never want to do it again." [laughter] Well, what was the matter with his arrangement of spatial objects and velocities and so forth that he had to stand there in the first place? See, that is a much more burning question.

To purely a humanoid-type thinking that you can't do anything about anything, this is deadly and disastrous in its connotations – telling him that he must be able to confront anything. See? All right, he must be able to confront anything. Great. Now to imply that because he is willing to confront everything, he *must* confront everything, we have an SP at work – nothing but. Because the truth of the matter is, above this level the individual has some control over his environment and so would find it utterly silly to confront the soup kettle falling off and spilling all over the floor and burning the baby as a necessary thing to confront. As a matter of fact, it is a – it's rather a comment upon one's ability to pick up soup kettles in mid-air, scoop them down, pick up the soup that is also falling in the air and set it on the stove and not waste all the dinner.

But when one loses that ability, then he says, "Well, at least I can confront it."

All right. Well, we've run out of time and there it is. And I will leave you confronting your sins. [laughter]

Thank you very much.

*Audience: Thank you. Thank you.*

Thank you.