

ON AUDITING

A lecture given on
26 May 1961

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

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

Well, I want to tell you today that they have no value of any kind whatsoever. They are as sounding brass and the tinkle of the temple bell. They are nothing. If you get the idea that Scientology will rise or fall by public opinion, circa 1961 or 1960, you are very much mistaken. They will have absolutely no bearing on Scientology.

It isn't necessarily that Scientology belongs to the ages, but this is vividly true, vividly: If you don't get results, all the publicity, good opinion in the world will do nothing. Your standard is quality, not opinion. From quality, opinion stems. The advance of this world does not depend on a bunch of wogs who happen to be heading the BMA, or the "Race Hate Society" of south Cape Town have anything whatsoever to say.

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

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

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

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

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

Well, you have the bulletin, May the 25th 1961, which says "Preparatory Steps for SOP Goals." And apparently, from the experience I have now had over telexes and at the other end of HGC lines, this bulletin will be done. People will do these two things if they know how to do them and they can learn

how to do them rather easily. So let's look at this whole subject of clearing as an effective activity, which, if effectively put into practice, will bring about a considerable resurgence of this particular civilization. This is fairly obvious that this will happen and let's stop worrying about and dividing our time around amongst a great many superficial activities that have no bearing on much of anything. Let's just go ahead and get the show on the road.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And she says, "16 pounds 10."

And I say, "Forget it."

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

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

This is amazing! But do you know, it keeps more randomness off the lines than you could possibly count. You have to take some little countermeasure occasionally, but you just take the measure to end that

game. You don't play that game. See, I know clearly what game I'm playing and what game we ought to be playing. The game we ought to be playing is getting ourselves technically perfect with the mostest that can be learned. And as soon as we've got that game straight and that one's all squared around . . well, that's our game. And frankly nothing can stand up against that type of a game.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Now, of course, people expect me to stand back and go on a big withhold. That's a good way to damage somebody. So they expect me to get on a big withhold about everything that goes on. Well, I'm not on this kind of a withhold. What we are doing is what we are doing, not what I would like to make it look like. All kinds of things have happened. This has been a rather dramatic arena for the last eleven years. It's rather fantastic some of the things that have happened one way or the other, this way or that, good or bad. But the good of the last eleven years doesn't just overbalance the scales, it practically goes through the ground with a thud. It's tremendous, tremendous. I . . . the letters which I get rather routinely;

the people that come up to me at congresses; the people I stumble into one way or the other; a letter I get out of the blue: "Of course you don't remember me because it was way back in 1952, but you audited me for two hours and it was a tremendous experience. And evidently the experiment failed, because you turned me over to another auditor after that. But it was tremendous and it changed my whole life and I have been well ever since. And now I want to thank you very much for that experience."

This . . . nine years later.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But look, if it is not an index of service, then it must be dishonest money. Right? So . . . your basic mission is the delivery of quality in service and that is the only mission we've got. Now, if we can do

this and if we ourselves in the process get the bonus of getting Clear, this gets to be pretty darn terrific. You've got the fundamental building blocks under a new civilization, you haven't got a bunch of rickety props holding up a rickety civilization. And I don't think too well of this idea of holding up a bunch of clunks that . . .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

you . . .

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

But do you know that is way in advance of not knowing that you don't know anything about it? See, it's an increase. Even if it's uncomfortable, it's an increase of knowledge.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So we have a whole bureau of the government or a big department of the government, set up to prevent war. Do you know that it's going to prevent war madly, day and night, but because it's doing it

reactively, not analytically, it is going to do nothing but bring on a war. What they resist, they become, because it's all reactive. They have no way of handling this whatsoever.

That's why I say, not that you can't do anything about the society as it exists, but that the best remedy for the existing society is to put able men amongst it. And the first thing you do when you do that is put men amongst it who will one, know and two, will know when they don't know. And that way you've opened up the whole highway toward enlightenment, education and a future for this race.

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

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

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

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

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

And the tone arm here is not too far goofy. See, it's not down here at 1.2 or it's not over here at 6.5. It doesn't say that auditing won't put it there, but it does say that it stays down here in the middle range someplace . . . 2.5, 3.07 3.5, 4.0, something like this. It's going to be in that zone. Ordinarily if you'd pick the fellow up anytime during the day and put him on an E-Meter, if he weren't being audited, why, he'd strike into the 2.5, 3.0, 4.0 range. He'd be in here someplace. That would be kind of an E-Meter manifestation of what a Release is.

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

A PT problem will prevent this person from being audited. But a little, tiny withhold: he'd still stay in session on it. You got it?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

All right, so you have this . . . these two first conditions, that is the actual state of Release, so that you would actually have, then, another condition, a special type of Release which we'd call a tested Release or a stable Release, which would be the fellow had no adverse needle reactions on the buttons of Help, Control and Communication. Do you follow that? Well, at that stage you can issue him a certificate and a lapel button. I mean, he . . . he's all right.

Now this doesn't say that if he gets tangled up with a fire engine and loses his grandmother on whom he dotes utterly, that he isn't going to practically go into a flat spin, because life still is very much capable of putting the thumbscrews on our boy. You understand? But he'll be able to come through it better than he ever would have been able to before.

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

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

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

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

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

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

But on the other hand, he could put up the engram again and could react again if you ask him to and he might do it to be pleasant and then you would probably get a reaction on it. But he'll do this to a relatively slight extent. In other words, its thinkingness has an effect upon the bank. That is the common denominator of all case states up to Clear.

How much effect does his thinkingness have . . the . . on bank? Now, you first start a person in . . you see, giving the person SOP Goals is pretty therapeutic, actually . . giving him a Goals Assessment. It goes along slowly. You're using one of the oldest processes known (repeater technique) coupled with another old, old process of about 1957 which is Goals Processing. And these two are actually processes. You're not running them for processes. You're trying to find the goal . . that's the reason you're running them . . but they are processes and they do result in a therapeutic gain for the case, which is pretty good. But you will notice at the beginning of a Goals Assessment that the length of time it takes to get a goal to null on some cases practically make you hold your head. I mean, the goal stays in and stays in and stays in and stays in and stays in, and then all of a sudden gets a little less and then a little tiny bit less and then a little tiny bit less and then a little tiny bit less and then it disappears.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Well now, the same mechanism occurs under the heading of responsibility. And responsibility goes this way: The individual is totally irresponsible in the society. And he's going around robbing lollipops from little babies and he's doing all sorts of weird things in the society. And he didn't consider this was wrong. But now his responsibility increases and all of a sudden he says, "Hey, he AMA, the Ku Klux Klan or the World's Betterment Association for Emaciated Cats; it depends exclusively on better people. And the more better people you turn out, the better this world will be and that is the end of it. It goes no further than this.

It is behind this that my press policy has long been: When the newspaper reporter knocks on the door, let him climb the stairs so that you can kick him down them. We care nothing for adverse publicity or

publicity that is for us. I certainly would not go ask what do know! I've stolen lollipops from little babies and that wasn't so good." At that moment it becomes a withhold.

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

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

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

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

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

It's not what you would consider a withhold, but what the person being checked considers a withhold. Got the idea? With a lot of criminals, it's out there on a second substitute: his pal . . . the things he won't tell you about his pals.

And you can go right back over a Security Check that a person has passed with the greatest of ease. He's told you. "Rape, murder, sudden death, revenge, arson. Oh yes, yes, desertion, mutiny." He goes down the line, "Yes, oh yes, yes, yes."

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

When you get to the end of it and you don't think you've gotten any place and that needle hasn't wobbled and this case is no better off than he was before; you're going to have to do another Security Check on this fellow in some other guise or wise. You're going to have to find out what are withholds to this guy and you'll very commonly find they're about his pal.

So ask . . . just Hobson-Jobson the whole Security Check into a second dynamic proposition: "Do you know of anyone being burgled?" "Do you know of anyone burgling anybody?" in other words. Ohh, clang! "Oh, I can't tell ya that. Day'd rub me out!"

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

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

So this seventy-five-hour pc was undoubtedly sitting there giving all sorts of long and sad stories about all the mad and mean, horrible things he'd done. But on none of those Security Checks did the auditor look at the meter to see if he was getting a reaction on what the pc was talking about. And he didn't

probe around with those Security Check questions until he did get a reaction and then get it off. Do you see how smart you have to be to give a Security Check? In other words, you run a Security Check by the meter, not by the life history of the person.

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

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

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

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

You can say "something" to the person, you get a fall. You say "someone" to the person you get no fall. So your five-way bracket is made up on "something." You get the idea. You have to test your auditing command, which is another subject entirely.

But in other words, you give him this run on the Prehav Scale. You flatten out the motion on the tone arm. And when the motion ceases to be wild on the tone arm and comes down and gets rather narrow, you give him another assessment on the Prehav Scale. And you run him with another fiveway bracket till the motion comes out of it.

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

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

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

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

Naturally, if he's been saying, "Scientology is no good" to himself all the time and yet here is Scientology working on him like mad, obviously Scientology is some good. Therefore the overts were on Scientology. He was being processed into his tomb practically. And the only way he finally saved

his bacon was fly out of the organization and take up a job that didn't bring him into very much contact with Scientology. He did do that, too.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

level on his former wife. You just couldn't do it! You see, you're running it by name and you just couldn't run that . . . that . . . that. You could run it on "a wife" or something like this, because this has got some track to it. But you couldn't run it that way. You got it?

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

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

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

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

The pc would say, "Oh, yes. I've decided I'll live." Well, this would account for his no longer being mean. But these wild changes that occur without your auditing are something that you should suspect. The commonest action is the pc leaves the session with the tone arm at 3.0 and returns to the next session with the tone arm at 5.0. Now, something has gone on between sessions, that's for sure.

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

All right.

Thank you.