ROUTINE 1A - PROBLEMS AND SECURITY CHECKS

A lecture given on
11 July 1961

Okay. What is this? This is the 11th of July AD 11. Okay. Eleven, eleven. Okay. Now, are there any ARC breaks? Any ARC breaks? Well, is it all right if I talk to you?

All right. Do you have any withholds? And more importantly, do you have a present time problem?

All right. Bringing us up by gradient scale to talking to you a little bit about present time problems and talking about problems in general.

Routine 1A. Routine 1A, definition of: any combination of processes which combines problems and Security Checks. And that is all. That is the total embrace. You don't have to say, "Routine 1A is revised," because you are running a different Problem command or it isn't Routine 1A Revised because you are running a different HCO WW Form Security Check. You understand?

So it could be any Problems Process and any Security Check. And when you are combining those two items alone, that is Routine 1A.

Now, this would presuppose that there would be other combinations which included other parts of the rudiments. And I remember an Australian auditor . . you call them Australian auditors, but down there they're Australian auditors and doing very well I may say so.

I've been thinking of sending the whole Joburg staff over to Australia there for a while . . and it's horrible, horrible thing to do . . and sending the Washington staff to Joburg, and the Los Angeles staff to Washington, and HASI London to Los Angeles. I've just been thinking of this, you see. But that's the kind of thing you do when you're overwhelmed by problems, you see.

Problem equals change. Change equals problem. We could presuppose that any rudiment, then, will eventually have some routine number and letter; any rudiment. So that you get ARC breaks and Security Checks. You get the idea? You get various combinations of these items.

Well, right now the most fruitful in production of any known process is Routine 1A as far as it comes to plumbing the Stygian depths of the reactive mind, because it takes care of those two items which are most prone to give the auditor trouble. Constant and continuous PT problems on the part of the preclear will prevent any gain of profile whatsoever. He's got present time problems? Powee! No gain. Just add it up. Look, I've been looking at this now since about 1956. You better look at it.

It just adds up to this: present time problem . . no change of profile, no gain of case. I don't care what you run! I don't care what magic button would suddenly arise in our midst; we would still not make any gain at all on a case that was being run that had a present time problem. You might as well just make up your mind to it. And when you see the graphs of HGC auditors or you see the graphs of a field auditor, and he wants to know why "Recall a ruddy rod," or something, didn't work on the pc, and you said it would work, but he's proven that it didn't work because there's no change of profile . . .

Now, look. You're auditing mechanics all by themselves, just sitting there and going into Model Session and giving a repetitive command "Do fish swim?" to the preclear for hours will produce a change on a profile, providing one of three things or all three things aren't present: first, major present time problem . . there's no present time problem (which could be a present time problem of long duration or present time problem of short duration); if there's no ARC break . . and if there is no major withhold . . and if these three things are absent, "Do fish swim?" will produce a change of profile. You got it?

Now, make up your mind to it. I mean I'm not giving you any datum there that's light. I mean I want to give that a few neon lights and underscores. And when you end it off, put an exclamation point after it

and a number of rockets going up. And don't add any false stories about Russian sputniks after it. put real ones. Something exclamatory.

This is one of the hardest things to teach auditors. Obviously it must be, because from 1956 when problems first made . . pardon me, 55 they first made their emergence; but 56, 57, when they were really being used hard and problems were being pushed . . from then on up to now I have said this many times. I remember that in 1955 telling the HGC, then located on 15th Street in Washington, DC . . and Julia was running a mighty good HGC . . but I remember telling those auditors on a telephone auditors' conference (we used to have speaker phones, and we had our auditors' conference every day on speaker phones) that if there was no change of the profile, a present time problem was present. No profile. And if an ARC break was present, you would get a down drop of the profile.

There has been no reason at all to amend that statement. And the only thing that's been added to it is, in the presence of a withhold you don't have a preclear even in-session. The pc is not even in-session. You can't even say he had a present time problem because the fellow sort of has to . . in an auditing session, if a fellow has a present time problem . . you've already said in an auditing session, and the withhold avoids that. you don't even get a session, much less no gain, see.

The guy will be audited for a little while and he'll blow or, you know, he's in, out, bang! Gone. And he doesn't know, and so on, and all of a sudden oddball effects to . . our processes don't work. Things all du-hen-di-woa-pu-dawha-boap, and there's just no session. And you're spending all of the time trying to get your big paws on the pc and hold him still long enough to keep him from getting ARC breaks and present time problems and everything. And you just spend all of your time doing this, doing this, doing . . you haven't got a session going yet. See? That's all that . . that's what a withhold amounts to. So that's the only thing added to these other two things.

So what are the major barriers to auditing?

The major barriers to auditing are a present time problem, ARC break and a withhold. Those are the major barriers to auditing Major barriers. And boy, they rear up like the Atlas. They're big.

All right. If that is the case . . some Australian once said to me, "Well, from what you've just said then, it becomes fairly apparent that someday we will be auditing only the rudiments." Well, you . . that is not true. What you could say, however, is for some time after his entrance into auditing, probably the only thing that should be run on somebody is rudiments in some version. Not the rudiments themselves, but the elements of the rudiments, you see. Which consists of what? Present time problem, ARC breaks and withholds. So as I say, you can then expect to get some numbers and letters which will combine these three, one way or the other as the data emerges, and I get bright ideas, and some research material and so forth, you will see some more of these things.

Well, right now you're actually having very good luck with running problems in a most outrageous sort of way. So I had better tell you about problems; and this, therefore, is a lecture on Routine 1A, and I'll also talk about some Security Checks.

You're all using problems at this time, so maybe if I told you a little bit more about them, you would be more prepared to deal with the situation. Okay? Because there are some things to know about problems.

In the first place, there's the definition of a problem. A problem is postulate-counter-postulate resulting in indecision. That is the first manifestation of problems. The first thing. Postulate-counter-postulate. And the first consequence of a problem is indecision.

Now, our next observation is that any time you have a postulate which is a fixed and stable postulate, it accumulates thereunto or came about because of a confusion. So a problem actually is a multiple confusion. And you are looking at two stable data and a confusion phenomena when you are looking at a problem. There are at least two . . at least two stable data. That's a postulate that is counter the postulate. See, two postulates in opposition. And these two postulates in opposition are surrounded, each one of them independently, by a certain amount of confusion. So therefore, a problem at the lower stages looks

like a confusion-counter-confusion. That's war. When it gets that MESTy, it's confusion-counter-confusion; and there aren't any postulates.

You take a fight between a psychiatrist and his patient. I don't think you could ever dignify it by calling it a session or anything like that. But if you take a fight between these two, and you've got what? You've got a confusion versus a confusion. The psychiatrist doesn't know what he's doing For sure the patient doesn't know what he's doing. And yet, boy, are they busy. This looks of course idiotic to anybody.

Now, you take a war . . I've heard a lot of things called Mein Kempf . . Mein Kempf. I don't even know what Mein Kempf meant. I know about Garbage and Herring and the other fellows, but not Kempf And you know, I heard an awful lot of shouting coming through the ether. I think there still must be ether there. The old physicists believed there's ether, so there must be ether. Something's putting people to sleep. That's for sure.

Anyway, I ran into this head-on, on Riverside Drive. Way back before the war, years before the war; and I was up on Riverside Drive minding my own business. Had a very lovely apartment. And I was doing nothing but writing and getting into trouble and amusing myself And one fine day there was a horrendous knock on the door and it like to have caved in, and a couple of gents walk in, and they've got the funniest looking space opera gadget you ever saw. And it's actually a radio direction finder, and they have located the insidious fact that my electric typewriter is generating static. And I wondered why anybody was so interested in my electric typewriter generating such a tiny amount of static. And they told me that I would have to muffle it all by myself, at my own expense. And so I got a suppressor and hooked it through. And after that my electric typewriter did not generate static. And the electric light company was very, very happy and so were the people next door.

And unbeknownst to me, during my writing time, they had not been able to follow out their favorite vocation which was listening to Hitler, from whom they had escaped with their lives. And that's all they did morning, noon and night with a high-power, high-velocity transatlantic radio receiver, you see.

They were listening to Garbage and Herring and Kempf and . . and the second the static was missing in the apartment building, which was my poor little electric typewriter, they could turn it up full volume. And while I was trying to write about this and that, I was entertained with Garbage and Herring and Kempf And the super emotionalism, the shaking emotional tones of that voice and so forth were really marvelous. Absolutely marvelous. One didn't have to understand a single word; and it's a good thing because there weren't any there. There wasn't a postulate in the lot.

You take his speeches apart, and you find out the German people should have been going north because they should have been going south, you know . . except for the times they should be going east and west. And it's all for the best, in this best of all possible youth Sportplatz groups providing they had free love . . the Germans must be pure and virtuous. Everybody is being an inferior race. Everybody is inferior, but the Germans are superior. And the Germans are a superior race, but the only slight difficulty with the Germans being a superior race is a lot of the Germans are inferior.

And by the time this had entered into Chapter One, Chapter Two, Chapter Three, I'd decided that these refugees had tortured themselves enough. And I would go and get my electric shaver which put out good static . . high-velocity static . . and I would keep it there alongside of my typewriter, and I'd turn it on, and that would be the end of Hitler. I would turn it off again and they would become very interested after another hour or two to see if the static was gone. And they would turn it on, come on full blast, he'd get right up to his Freud Garbage and on would go the electric shaver and off would go Hitler.

I probably saved those people from numerous anxieties. But they sure must have been in a confusion. They escape at Lord knows what cost and travail with their lives clear across the Atlantic, and then they sit on Riverside Drive in a perfectly decent apartment in a free country and can't do anything but listen to Hitler. They were in a confusion, weren't they? Well, Hitler was sure in a confusion. The man didn't know whether he was going north, south, east or west, fighting Roman legions or cat fur. He was a madman, but a very intelligent madman. He sounded so real, you know. But he was a confusion.

Now, very probably, there is a problem. And a problem is something like this: "Young centurions of Roman legions should not lead punitive expeditions through villages which have not offended against the Roman frontier." That's probably the problem or something and that's probably been the problem ever since; and there's probably no problem in Germany but this one. Only of course there are no centurions; there are no legions.

So the original postulate, lacking its own confusion, has accumulated confusions ever since. And this thing has rolled along up the track madly. And here we've got it amongst us . . still today. I'm sure they are still expelling the legions. I'm sure of it. Or preventing themselves from being expelled by the Russians, or something. But there's some basic and fundamental postulate in there. There's some basic and fundamental appositive . . or a positive postulate that is against something, see.

And then this adds to its confusion and then it's completely lost in the shuffle. Only it attacks things and makes confusions, but these originally have a postulate like "We must repel the German hordes." See, we must repel that. Well, that postulate all went to pieces because nobody could do it. Then that added to itself a great deal of confusion. So we have . . that original idea is totally wound up with some resistive effect against Germany. Only it gets lost in the shuffle and nobody can find it in the confusion anymore.

So we have a confusion of Germany's "warlike spirit" (quote) (unquote), and the confusion of something else's unwarlike spirit or something of the sort. And these two confusions are absolutely pressed tight together, and they keep bursting forth at the drop of a hat. And they've been doing it now for about two thousand years. It goes back almost that far. It's way, way back. And if anybody can tell me what these wars are all about, I'd like to know.

I at one time had a good solution to the thing. I went down over all the terrain, the common invasion terrain that goes from Germany into France, you see. And you've probably heard some tape or another with a dissertation on it, because I did solve it. I did figure out what the wars were all about, is that the Germans are basically at heart cattle rustlers. And they every once in a while go on cattle rustling forays, because that's all there is down in the part of France that they ever attack are a few cattle, do you see? And there's a lot of things that you can work out with this. It's an interesting premise if you start going along this line. you eventually get all wound up in various aspects, but you do come up with this one fact, is that's probably the only possible reason they would ever go across the border.

There's nothing in that country, by the way. They've overrun it so often that you could drive the length and breadth of it, and there are just . . I've noticed the villages along the route, for instance, are built out of stones unmortared. They're all set to be blown apart again. And after they're blown apart, well, there's no difficulty in putting them back together again. You just pick up the stones and pile them up one on top of another, you see, and you've got a village again. You mark it the next time you go through there. That's the way those towns are built now. In other words, they're all ready to have another confusion, see. And their own structure has gone into a confusion, and so on. Well, these are the problems.

Now, when you see it on the order of magnitude of some great psychotic force in the world, like Hitler, and opposing forces and postulates which gather to themselves confusion, and now we look at it twenty years later, and what do we find? We find there's still innumerable signs of these confusions still around, sewn into our industry, sewn into our various political principles. For instance . . I don't know, American troops aren't goose-stepping yet, but almost, almost. And you get various aspects of this. It's all over the place. It's all over the place.

Economics expresses itself in these talks about common markets. And you see this. It just keeps echoing these waves of this tremendous force of opposition . . of two or more great forces which were in opposition . . and the confusions still continue, you see. They go on and on, and they roll down through the years. And all of a sudden . . these confusions . . somebody gets ahold of this, and he makes a big deal out of one of these confusions, you see. Adds a new spark to the thing, gathers new confusion to it and boombo! And goes off up in some new direction, you see. Finding some other force to oppose, you see.

Well, it's a good picture of a reactive bank . . the only reason I'm bringing it up . . good picture of a reactive bank. This fellow set up originally some idea that he should oppose some other idea, you see . .

probably quite logically, you see . . only this idea that he should oppose, in committing overt acts of confusion or which confused the other idea, you see, got back in turn confusion. And the other idea, of course, counterattacked this idea. And you had eventually two confusions, one going against the other. And then you got more confusions. And then these confusions go rolling down the ages, and nobody can identify them. see how this is?

Now, you try to take apart a reactive mind. What are you taking apart? From a standpoint of problems, at least this one aspect of the reactive mind and a very powerful aspect it is, because it has endurance; it continues . . you've got a continuance of these old problems. So that you have a problem, and then a solution, but the solution becomes a problem in itself There's that mechanism. There are other mechanisms, you see, aside from this, all of which add up to what? Duration.

Now, the one thing you could say about the reactive mind: that it is right here right now, performing right here right now as it should have been performing at some other period or time.

All right. How do you take it apart? You should understand it from the standpoint of problems. Problems are in the reactive mind. Problems do exist in the reactive mind. How many ways could you take that situation which I've been describing here . . trying to put it on the third dynamic so you could easily see it in the first dynamic . . how many ways could you take that apart?

Well, you could take it apart in the form of motion. You could take it apart in the form of looking at two things at once. you could take it apart in the form of getting confusions of comparable magnitude. You could do all kinds of different things to resolve this particular situation without, remember, adding a new solution. Ah, that's the one thing that has never happened on the track.

That is why Scientology in this particular department is doing something which has never been done before. Scientology at large is doing something that's never been done before. But here, vis-a-vis, you've got something that just was never done before. Solving problems without finding yourself with a new solution. Incredible. Incredible. You don't lay a new solution in to get the old problem solved.

Now, let's compare that with psychoanalysis. Do you see that psychoanalysis lays in a new solution? See, there's a new solution for the old confusion. Which will only add to what? Which will only add to a new confusion with a new solution, which of course gathers to itself a new confusion, and then you've got to have a new solution. And then it adds to itself a new confusion, and then you've got to have a new solution, haven't you? So you get interminable branches of psychoanalysis . . all different, all solving what? All solving the original confusion which gathered around the original postulates of psychoanalysis.

Well, the thing starts to look like a field full of black puffballs, all of them rolling against each other. And you wonder, "Well, there could be no end to this. There is no end to this. It'll just go on and on forever." Yes, as long as you add new solutions to get and gather to themselves new confusions. And you start adding new confu- new solutions and new confusions, you'll all have . . always have new confusions and therefore always have a reactive mind. And that's one of the reasons it has continuance.

Now let's look at it from the standpoint of confrontingness. You realize if somebody has to have a solution, they didn't confront and therefore as-is. You see a solution, then, is always a no confront. So you can put that down as a stable datum: solution equals no confront. and confronting equals vanishment of problem.

Now, there's the equation on which all of these operate. Everything along this line operates that way. If you look at it, factually it vanishes. But if you solve it, it persists.

Now, if you're ever having any trouble with getting something to persist, one of the best ways of handling it is don't confront it. Well, I mean you can use this in reverse, see. It's not necessarily a destructive or an arising mechanism. You can use it as a persistent mechanism. Look at it, you see, and you'll see that if you wanted something to persist, absolutely to persist, then you prevent . . let me phrase it better . . you prevent all confrontingness. You wanted something to persist, you'd prevent all confrontingness and we get back to the original mechanism. The original mechanism of structure in this universe happens to be preventing the solution of the problems of the universe to guarantee the persistence

of the universe. So that anybody who solved problems with regard to the universe was non persona grata with anybody who was trying to get a total persistence of the universe. You got that?

Audience: No.

You don't get that.

Female voice: Say it again.

Well, this is an interesting problem in itself. How would you guarantee the persistence of something? Well, if you prevent confrontingness, you will guarantee its persistence. Let's be extreme. We have a monument and we fix it up so that you can't run into it, the wind can't hit it, nothing can touch it, nobody can look at it, nobody can come near it. And to do all these things, of course, we have to hide it, say it doesn't exist, we have to deny it in every possible way we can, prevent confrontingness. And sure enough, nobody will ever touch that monument. You got the idea? If you did all this. All right.

Now, let's take and blow that mechanism up to universe size, and say, "All right, we've got some space and we've got some time and we've some plants and dirt and various things, and some myths and legends. Now, let's . . let's take this thing here, and now, because it's so very hard . . very, very difficult . . you see, this is the problem that this other thing solves. It is impossible to create and say that something will persist. You see? That's the idea of the problem.

Now, this problem thing that I'm talking to you about is the solution to this "impossible to create." See, we can't create, so therefore we've got to preserve what's been created. Well, the way you preserve that is to get this exact mechanism that you're trying to undo in the reactive bank, because it's a preservative mechanism. "Anybody who solves problems is a dead duck. Horrible things will occur to anybody who solves problems. And we will prove it." And everybody agrees 100 percent and everybody does it to everybody, and you get a physical universe fact which enters the mental field. And here is where structure and mind take their first divergence. This is the first time these two things start separating.

And we say, "Anybody who solves any problems is going to get the problem in his face like a custard pie. He's going to really get messed up. Now, you solve any problems and boy you've had it."

Now, what is this? This is a protective mechanism. If you've got a universe which is persisting . . you've got a universe that's persisting somewhat, limply . . and you want that universe to persist solidly, completely and forevermore, you've got to prevent the solution of its mysteries. You've got to prevent it from being confronted.

So how do you prevent it from being confronted? You say, "Anybody who tries to solve this thing is going to get it, man." And you're going to get a total persistence of the universe. And this goes over into pcs trying to solve their problems from day to day. The terrors of solution then bring about all of these other mechanisms I have been talking about. I'm just giving you the exact bedrock genus of the problem. So eventually it becomes absolutely, fantastically impossible to solve problems. You must not solve problems!

It's all borne out of this one fact: The universe must persist! See, we mustn't let anybody go around and take a look at these pillars and rocks, planets, space, time and find out anything about them at all because they pose a problem, don't they. why is it here? That's the first problem they propose. Why does time go clickety-clickety-clickety-clickety-click? Why? Big problem posed, isn't it?

Well, we right away have to rush around to somebody who's taking a look at this, and just as they did in the Middle Ages, we'd have to say to him, "Tsk! tsk! tsk! No, no, no, no, no, no, no. We'll have to burn you at the stake."

"Oh, you're researching into why time is here. you realize that's sacrilege? Uh-huh-huh-huh-huh-huh." Even in ancient Greek times, it was sacrilege against Cronus to investigate time. The Greek broke free, but everybody was being prevented from solving problems, then you got a total persistence. And then in a

more self-centered sort of a way, the fellow who could be a tremendous mystery, of course, thought he could guarantee to himself a tremendous amount of persistence. Obviously, it would follow.

So the way to live was to be mysterious. And if you were totally unknown and if everything remained totally unknown and you confronted nothing, why of course, you would just live on and on and on and on. This was obvious . . except what were all these funny black masses and this . . so on . . that's gathering up? And "Why are we unhappy?" and so on.

So we developed a whole genus of thetan, developed not to solve anything If you solved anything, it was dangerous. And this is proven by the fact that if you just simply ask a pc to solve something, solve something, solve something, solve something, masses close in on him. He goes through the exact I'm-supposed-to. He dramatizes the cure of the impersistence of universes.

Do you follow that now?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Do you see what that is? And that is exactly how he got that way. Basically and fundamentally, there's nothing wrong with solving problems. But when you've got tremendous overts on people who were trying to, of course it becomes impossible.

So we find this dear old lady who never did anything in her whole life. I remember the history of one of these as a pc one time. And we couldn't get her going as a pc until we had solved innumerable second dynamic affaires do coeur. All of them in direct violation of the basic principles of matrimony. We get this dear, sweet old lady standing on the corner, innocent you know, silver hair, as a halo about her head.

She's standing there and she can't make up her mind whether to cross the street or not to cross the street. You can label her. She's no victim. She's somebody who has forbidden, forbidden, forbidden, forbidden the solution of any problems or the knocking out of any mass or the vanishment of any universes. Which arrives at what? Total indecision. Because you've got problems, problems, problems, problems, problems. And you don't dare solve any problems, problems, problems, problems, problems. And you mustn't look at any problems, problems, problems. So what's going to happen? And you get a dwindling spiral. And in terms of problems, that is the dwindling spiral. You can't solve them. you mustn't confront them.

Now where are we? We stand one-half a block north of the southeast corner of nowhere. You see where this is? And you see somebody saying, "Well, I just don't know. I should have . . oooooh, no . . now . . no. I think I . . oooh . . well, I . . oooh . . . Mmmm-mmmmmmm."

You say, "What are you trying to do?"

They say, "Well, I'm just trying to make up my . . well, as a matter of fact . . well, the truth . . ."

They can't even tell you what their problem is. And when they can't tell you what their problem is, of course, hammer and tongs along with this, hand in glove, is they don't dare solve it either. They can't look at it. They don't dare solve it. Boom!

How did they get that way? Well, it's overts against people trying to solve problems. That's all. So solving problems had a consequence connected with it and the consequences was you got packed in black mass or something or the other happened to you, and "Everything collapsed on me." You'd have no universe left. You'd have no space left. All of these various consequences, consequences, consequences, you see. And they keep piling them up. "You mustn't solve problems, you mustn't solve problems, you mustn't solve problems." And the fellow finally just says, "What are you talking about, problems?"

They say, "Well, you know all those things you can't see and you don't know about? Huh-huh. You know, all those things you can't see and don't know about . . well, those are problems." Well, isn't that the way it's normally defined?

So we look over this pattern . . we look over this pattern . . and we find out that it can be used two ways. you can make something persist with it, and you can get somebody real loused up with it. Therefore the persistence of the reactive mind is Q-and-Aing with the persistence of the physical universe. Therefore you find most of the physical universe principles which affect the mind are in the zone and area of problems. There are other things, you see, which affect the mind besides what I'm talking to you about. You see this? It's physical-universe things, you see . . gravity, motion, energy, being still, being fixedly located or trapped.

Being trapped is a direct result of solving problems. "If you're going to solve this problem, we're going to put you in jail." They did it a few hundred years ago. I don't know how long they kept poor old Galileo . . they let it out now that he had a rather not unenjoyable captivity. He was merely kept away from his instruments and things of this character, but that sounds like to me like captivity.

"You solve a problem, we'll put you in jail." So the fellow has a problem. He doesn't solve the problem. He doesn't confront the problem. Therefore it doesn't create any space between himself and the problem . . which is the real closure of the mass, you see . . and of course he gets embedded in a sort of a black basalt of energy of some kind or another, you see. He solves the problem and jails himself. You see, he knows what he's supposed to do: "If you solve problems, you jail yourself: That's the way it is; and if you confront a problem, you're going to get confused. That's for sure."

See, these are all fundamental, pattern arrangements which have been laid out in order to protect various monuments, planets, thingamabobs and whatnots, all of which are based on an upper-strata failure, and the upper-strata failure is create failure.

Now, the consequences of creating are something we've been told all about since we got into Step 6. I didn't know there were any consequences to it, but there obviously are. Amongst a lot of people there are tremendous consequences to creation.

So after the universe was all figured out on the basis that: If you create one, there are terrible consequences. Therefore, it is impossible to create another one, see. So therefore, your havingness would all be shot to pieces if you knocked out the one you've got because you can't create another one.

You see you've already had earlier on the track these tremendous problems on the subject of creation, you know. It isn't enough just to create something and say, "That's it." Everybody had to decide, well, it's very valuable, and nobody can ever create another one like it.

You go around art museums sometimes, and here's some horrible daub, you know. Some painter has been by there carrying a bucket of paint on the end of his ladder, you know. And in some of these museums, particularly down in Greenwich Village or places like this, this is what happens, you know. The interior decorators and people like that got careless and just slopped up the canvasses that were there, and eventually this is what you've got, you know. That's the only way you could explain these things; and here . . I'm talking about . . [not] necessarily about classical cubism or immersionism, but I don't think they're talking about art.

Anyway, here is a . . here's this idea of "It's very valuable. It can never be replaced. There is only one like it. There was only one Van Gogh or Van Went or something, and here he is, see. And therefore this is terribly valuable, and we're going to prove it. Now we're going to have an auction and the highest bidder gets this totally invaluable thing which he can then hide away in a private study which will never be confronted, you see. And he gets to pay 8,765,000 quid or something like that for this painting." Aw, this is nonsense. It's nonsense, man, but that's protecting the valuable, you see.

You make it valuable by protecting it. you make it valuable also by never being able to replace it. And these are all mechanisms of value. These are all mechanisms by which people try to get you to lay off MEST, see. These are the mechanisms of "don't touch it." These are the mechanisms of "preserve it," but fundamentally the mechanisms of "no create" . . the penalties of creation. And when these things have been exercised to their full and everyone is totally convinced that creation now carries such fantastic penalties with it, that nobody else is ever going to be given a show of any kind, then you get this problem sequence. Why? Well, you have to protect the things that are created because they're liable to get as-ised.

You see, you unfortunately possess the ability to look at something and have it disappear. Unless you look at it cross-eyed or upside down or something like that, something is liable to happen to it. And of course, this gets very upsetting to somebody who is already convinced that it's impossible to create or make anything.

So he will tell you at once the solution to the problem is going to get you in plenty of trouble. The confronting of this thing is going to get you in plenty of trouble. Medusa's head . . the old legend that dramatizes this and so forth. You looked at it, you turned into a stone or warriors turned into snakes or cat's fur or something. I've forgotten. I'll run into the preclear someday that made that up. Pandora's box . . her curiosity, you see, and when she finally opened the lid, then all the evils of mankind came out. And they scattered all over everything, and man has been in trouble ever since. Now, isn't that smug

These are the kind of legends which they generate on the basis . . they say, "Don't look, don't look, don't look, don't look, don't look. Don't investigate. Don't go anywhere near it. Get ah-da-da-ah-ah-ah, you're too close to that, man. And do you realize that if you solved the problem of time, all time would cease. All the temples in the world would no longer chime their bells, and Big Ben would no longer strike, and everybody would be totally motionless where they as . . ." You know, the most fantastic nonsense you ever heard of

If you solved the problem of time, the consequence to you would be, you would have to put it there again. Mass without time, of course probably could not entrap anybody. So nobody would be held motionless.

I was running a process one day "Look around here and find something you can have" and stopped all the clocks in the house. This was rather upsetting to the auditor. Well, I looked at my watch, and I said, "Well, I could have the time," and at that moment my watch stopped and all of the clocks in the house stopped. And there was a kind of a . . an odd white streak appeared on the consecutive time track, you see. you know, there was a zero, a zero. And the watch stopped and it wouldn't go on running and the watch stopped elsewhere. You get the idea?

Well, this was terrible, wasn't it? But the only reason the auditor got the least bit upset about it is I . . it actually encroached in the direction of time. And that's something we mustn't create. That's something we can't create, so therefore we mustn't confront. And you get how creation and confront and problems and solutions and these sort of things proceeded in their evolution. Now, if you understand some part of that . . if you understand some part of that . . you can see what's happening to your preclear.

Now if you said, "Face a solution. Thank you. Face a solution. Thank you. Face a solution. Thank you. Face a solution. Thank you," he would be very disturbed. In the first place, solutions are the easiest things that a thetan does and the easiest things to create. And so he'd get his 'ead practically knocked off by the confusion which was around these solutions and you didn't have him looking at the confusions, you only had him looking at the solutions. So of course things apparently get more and more confused.

Well, undoubtedly somebody could go through the door like this, but it would be terribly uncomfortable. It would be very, very, very uncomfortable. That's the least I would say about it. Because you're bound and determined to overlook and not confront any part of the confusion which surrounds any of the solutions. So you then never have any reason why any of the solutions ever occurred. This is strictly problems now I'm talking about.

So if we say to them, "Look at the confusion. Look at the confusion. Look at the confusion," why, they haven't got much of an inkling of where the confusion is but these two things packaged together are rather communicable to man, and that is "problem."

We're asking him to look at the confusion or the difficulty. We're not asking him to look to the solution of the difficulty; we're asking him to look to the confusion or the difficulty and in view of the fact that the difficulty also contains other postulates, he's also looking at the further solutions, isn't he? He's looking at the solutions then which cause the confusions to some slight degree. So you get an as-isment of problems when you have him look at problems.

Now, the basic thing you're trying to do is get the fellow, not to solve problems, not to erase problems, but to become habituated and accustomed to and get over his stupid nonsense about the terrible liabilities of solving things and the horrors of problems.

You're trying to get him to recover from these things which were set up on the earliest, earliest, earliest part of the track. These are very early track. You're asking him to get . . recover from his inability, apparent inability, to examine confusions, apparent inability to resolve them.

A person who can't confront problems, of course, does not ever exhibit very much judgment and we have the cue to judgment in this. This is judgment. Judgment . . so-called "sound judgment" . . can only take place in the presence of observation. Now, we can observe synthetically, but it is nevertheless observation. Well, you observe synthetically when you observe with mathematics, when you mock something up you say, "Well . . " or think it over or try to approximate the various conditions which exist and then you can come to a judgment about it. you can come and . . to a conclusion. So judgment is completely absent in a person who would be completely unable to confront a problem. That would be the total missingness of judgment. You'd get zero judgment.

Now, if you want to choose an executive, just test him on the subject of problems. A few of the briefest questions on the subject of problems which establish immediately his index on judgment. Just instant, almost instant coordination on these points. If he can't confront problems, he won't have any judgment.

Now, similarly in auditing, the auditor who cannot confront the problems of the pc, of course will pay no attention to these things because they won't seem to him to be problems. Therefore he will not handle these problems and therefore the pc will make no progress.

So, completely aside from the fact that it resolves cases, it also resolves auditing The more confrontingness that the individual has, the greater his ability to confront, the sounder his judgment will be with regard to anything; and of course, an auditor with good judgment is a very valuable auditor.

Now, let's see how you would get there. Now, I've given you the various ramifications and the discursives, theoretical this-is-where-it-came-from. How would you get there? Well, you'd get somebody to basically not really confront, not really do this, not really do that. We don't have to be very specific beyond this one thing: we'd have to get him familiar with problems.

Now, we take this fellow out. He can't drive a car. Every time he comes near a car, the door falls off, you know. He doesn't even have to come near it . . very close to it. He brushes against the rear fender, and the whole radiator goes splat. You've run into such people, I'm sure. And here's this bloke, and we want him to get to pass his driver's test and be able to drive a car so he isn't a menace to his license plates or something. And all we do is get him out there patting fenders, you know. Just let him reach and withdraw from fenders and the bonnet and the radiator cap and the hood and the top, and . . mix up some American and English terms . . and the wheel and the key and the gearshift, and you know, just the lot. Just reach and withdraw, reach and withdraw, and it's utterly fantastic.

The first thing you know, this individual can pass a driving test like a breeze. Why? It's familiarity. You don't have to say it's confronting. You don't have to say it's reach and withdraw, because there are probably tremendous numbers of ways to gain a familiarity; lots of ways to become familiar with something. Lots of ways, in other words, to know something better and these are mechanisms by which you can know something better.

So when we say "the process for problems is," and then follow it with some auditing command, we have actually fallen short of a complete statement, so this is what you're up against right this minute in your auditing and handling of pcs. You're up against only this one fact, is I said "Recall a problem," and then gave you a five-way . . six-way bracket about problems and so forth, and several of you at once started writing "1A Revised." So let's put this one right.

1A is simply familiarization with problems and getting off the fellow's withholds with Security Check. That increases his knowingness by getting off the not-knows he's running on the rest of the world . . see,

the Security Check decreasing not-knows. Now you're increasing his knowingness by getting him to be familiar with problems. Not necessarily get the solution out of the problems in order to know it.

People will do that too. It's quite interesting They take all the problems and they take the solutions off of them. They put the solutions in their pockets so they'll know something and then let this problem just go adrift, you see.

They never face any of their problems. They just get . . they're like stamp collectors or something of the sort . . they just get an innumerable library of solutions, you see. one of the best books on the subject of survival that was ever issued was issued for United States and Allied pilots during World War II on the subject of survival in the jungle and there was another one issued which was survival at sea. And it was quite fascinating . . if you were down in a dinghy or something of the sort or off a torpedoed ship. This little booklet of survival at sea was a whole method of navigation. And what they had done is just take the ancient method of navigation used by the Polynesians, researched the thing completely and turned it out in a booklet form and gave you all the hot dope, you see.

Now, those were fairly practical books. But now let's get up to An Encyclopedia of Camping Lore. Coo, you know. Talk about people making something out of practically nothing, look over sometime A Complete Encyclopedia of Knots . . you know, knots that you tie. It's fabulous, you know. How many ways are there to make a piece of rope hold itself by binding against itself? That's all a knot is . . all a knot is. It simply is something you do with a piece of line to make it hold itself with itself And there are various complicated methods of doing this. And they get more and more complicated, and they finally go off into art as they naturally would, you see, having no in . . no practical value of any kind whatsoever. But this is a Turk's-head, and this is a double, super plated Turk's-head with the twelve inner strand type of Turk's-head, you see, that is used to make mats for admirals' barges, you know. And I imagine down here in the . . in the nautical books available in the Admiralty and so on, there's all kinds of this stuff It is just innumerable. It's just so fantastic. There are about eighty-nine hundred ways of making one type of lace out of rope called Spanish lace and there are just innumerable methods of doing this, you see. And this is what you would call the collection of useless solutions.

Because man and boy, I've been going to sea quite a while. I never found use for more than about three-four knots. Yeah! It's fantastic, you know. It's just fantastic. I look around. Decorative purposes? Yes. Yes, you can make everything look very pretty, you can put walls and crowns and Matthew Walkers. And if you haven't got anything to do some sunshiny day, and you want to make everybody believe you're busy, why, start preparing heaving lines and things like this, tying various complicated knots of various kinds. It gets an awful lot of admiration . . but of no value . . of no value at all.

The collection of solutions. Science now includes in its ranks innumerable subjects which are merely the frantic collection of solutions. They haven't anything to do with any problem known to man or beast. But boy, can they collect solutions that might someday be of use to somebody, possibly.

Botany. Botany is a most interesting subject. You probably never collided with botany . . not head-on, not head-on. But it's a classification science. Botany. After you've classified all the herbs and flowers of a district and area, you'd think that would be plenty. But no, they've got to correlate the confounded things.

And I was reading the other day on fauna . . not allied to botany . . on the island of the Azores. Finally a great mystery had been solved by examining the inner ear of a shrew. And they found that it was really, actually related to the subgenus clasamatus. It was not actually related at all to the subgenus clasamotus.

Now, I sometimes start giving this kind of thing the ha-ha by calling it "the little facts we cannot possibly live without."

Collection of solutions. Collection of solutions. Collection of solutions. Solutions. Solutions. Solutions. Solutions. Libraries full of solutions. Libraries. Books. Great institutions growing up. Buildings springing up like mushrooms all over the landscape. Every office, in every one of them just full of solutions, full of solutions, full of solutions and you go in and you say, "Hello" to one of the gents that's

there, see. And you know what he says? He doesn't say anything He doesn't see you. He didn't even know you're in the door, man.

You walk through the place . . I've often wondered what would happen in some universities if I simply moved up a moving van and started moving the library out, moving the prexy's office out and that sort of thing I walked into the president of a university's office one time and took all the famous, ancient prints down from the wall, took them down to the photolithographer's, had them all photolithographed for a school edition of the paper and took them all back. Nobody noticed they were gone. By their terminology, there must have been a hundred thousand pounds worth of prints on that wall, those walls, in those offices. They were absolutely invaluable, see. They had ceased to confront anything, but boy, they sure had an awful lot of answers, you know?

Now, get that extremity with the fellow who will have nothing to do with the solution, but must live in problems. Now, he's just got to live in problems. You find him normally down in skid row. Brother, he is really a gone dog of course, he's just totally caved-in all the time about everything and you would be utterly fascinated to find the number of things which are to him a problem.

And you start examining this, and you absolutely fail to be able to classify them because they don't seem like problems to you. Because he'll give you facts as problems and his problems are always facts. He never announces them as problems. He never announces them as "how to." He never announces as to "what is" or any question mark. There's no question marks connected with these problems at all. They're all problems, but they are announced as facts. You say, "Tell me a problem," and he'll say, "the sidewalk."

Now, any time you enter a problem chain on a preclear you will find either one or the other of these two conditions existing. If it is a type of problem that has . . the preclear has never been able to handle, he will either be in an obsessive automaticity of solution or he will be totally immersed into the confusion of the problem as a fact. one side or the other, he will be on both sides of this, but he'll never be in the center line of "these are problems."

So you have a preclear all of a sudden waking up to the fact that he has problems, which startles the life out of him. Well, you could have told him that. The fellow has never been able to eat lunch in his life. He gets violently sick at his stomach at exactly 12:02. And one day you've got this fellow in session. You're auditing him and so forth and he announces to you as one of the most classical statements of all time that he has a problem at noon every day. He can't eat lunch because he gets sick at his stomach; and that is quite a problem to him. Only he announces it as a fact.

He doesn't announce it as a problem. He doesn't announce it as "Why do I get sick at my stomach?" see, or something of that sort. He announces it as fact. Or he will say, "I wonder . . I wonder if there's any connection between my taking Tums . . I have to start to eat Tums, let's see, at 11:50. Yes, I always eat Tums at 11 . . I wonder if there's any connection with that and the fact that I get sick at my stomach at noon?"

And you look at this and you'll say, "For heaven's sakes, what is happening here? What is this? You mean the guy doesn't connect these things?" Well, it's worse than that. He never thought there was anything significant about his eating Tums at 11:50 and he didn't think it had anything whatsoever to do with anything because he never eats any lunch.

There's no problem there, don't you see. It's just this vast vista and he's got the total solution: You eat Tums and that's the solution, but there's no problem. And you're auditing him, and all of a sudden he relates this solution to some extant condition, and he says these two are related. Well, you could have told him that. Only that's his reactive mind at work, not yours, you see? You see how this is?

So they go in one of two different directions and you can always tell when you run a problems chain of one kind or another, because the fellow starts coming up with solutions, and then on a gradient will start to relate them to facts, which turn out to be unpalatable facts, which turn out to be problems. Or he just goes into it head-on on the subject of facts, facts, facts, facts, facts. Only every fact he announces is

actually a problem. It's not a solution to anything. It's just a problem. Each one is an isolated, distinct and different problem. So you don't think you're listening to problems.

You say, "Tell me a problem."

He says, "The sidewalk."

And you say, "Whaaa . . wha . . what?"

"Well, yeah."

He thinks you're stupid, man. you can't see that a sidewalk is a problem? Why, of course a sidewalk is a problem; and you start to think of ways and means by which a sidewalk could be a problem. That isn't what he means at all. He means a sidewalk is a problem.

There is no further ramification. There isn't any puzzlement about it. There is no mystery about it. There is no relationship of the sidewalk to anything else. The sidewalk doesn't give him any difficulty that he could enunciate or talk about. It's just the sidewalk is a problem. And that is the behavior of a chain and you'll see it yourself as you're running them.

These cannonballs fly overhead and of course we all agree that a cannonball is a problem. But then we have done the mental gymnastics of dressing up the cannonball with all the ramifications which make a cannonball a problem: (1) It is fired usually in anger, (2) it has a target, (3) if it hits anybody it's going to blow them to smithereens; and naturally you have to avoid them, spot them, and not be in the place that they are hitting. You can think of all kinds of problems, but the pc isn't doing this, you see.

So you say "problem," he says "toothbrush." Now, you go ahead with an automaticity, trying to make a problem out of a toothbrush to see what he's looking at. Well, that isn't what he's doing He just says "problem . . toothbrush." That's it. There's no further ramification then.

Then off of this toothbrush peels the first onionskin of a problem and he starts telling you "Toothbrush, toothbrush. Yes, I've recalled a problem . . toothbrush. I've recalled a problem. Toothbrush. Toothbrush? Yes, that's it." And he'll go on about toothbrushes and glasses . . glasses that you put toothbrushes in and all of a sudden will recall that he has been severely beaten at some time or another for having not washed his teeth.

We're getting somewhere now, you see? And then we'll get a little bit further, and all of a sudden, "I wonder why I always had to wash my teeth. I wonder if it's true that teeth are preserved if you wash them."

Now you'll start to see problems coming off, you see. The skin is coming off of the onion and eventually you'll get down to the fact that this is a hard fact which has now disintegrated or deteriorated in something by observation and familiarity. And you ask him if he's worried about it. No, he isn't worried about it now. Well, what has exactly happened to this toothbrush that was the problem? Well, it's gone through all the stages of all the problems a toothbrush has ever been to him, down to a point where he decided to get even with his mother, you see, by doing something like dipping the toothbrush or dipping her toothbrush every morning in a bottle of vinegar or something of the sort.

We get an overt around it, and it's a solution to something or other, and then it got to be a problem, and that all blows. And that whole thing has been confronted and it's gone. you get the evolution of that? Or he will tell you overt, overts, overts, or solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, solution, solution. Problem, problem, little bit of problem, little bit more problem. Little bit more problem, more problem, more problem, more problem, more problem, less problem, less problem, some kind of a solution. And all these solutions go. See, you can enter this thing from both sides. Actually, they're both the same mechanism. It's just the stage you enter the mechanism.

How do you take these apart? Well, you simply get the pc more familiar with them. Well, how do you get the pc more familiar with them? You get the pc to look at them. How do you get the pc to look at them?

All right. Now, right where you sit, you can develop, undoubtedly, ten or fifteen different ways of getting a pc to examine problems; and all of them probably would be perfectly legitimate running Routine 1A. The first and original command on it is "Recall a problem." The next command combines Confront with Problems, which is the most logical way of getting somebody to confront something. But not the most logical way of plowing up his bank. So you could combine these two.

You could run "Recall a problem" for a session, and you could run Confront on Problems for a session, and you'd find out it was something like mining, and then getting all of the ore up out of the mine on the mine dump, and then going over the mine dump, do you see, to find out if there was anything of value in it, don't you see. And that would be the Confront Process, is pulling apart the mine dump after you've mined it and the Recall Process would be mining it. And you could keep doing this one after the other.

Well, there's a liability in this. If you have run "Recall a problem" on a pc and have not followed through the cycle back to PT with his problem, you have probably hung the pc, so Confront will not operate on him. you see that? Confront won't operate on the pc unless he's been cycled back to PT. So any Problems Process that is combined with "Recall" must be run with Model Session cyclic endings.

In other words, you've got to bridge it with getting him back to PT and ending it. Not two more commands and ending it. you got it? That is a must. if you don't do that, you can actually hang your pc up in some old, powerful problem and now you're going to start to run Confront, but that hasn't anything to do with it because he's back down the track, and he isn't in present time, and he hasn't handled that problem. The Problems Process isn't flat to his sense and you have transferred the process, and he is hims . . you have become a problem to him; and he's liable to fix on the problem of the session rather than on other problems. You got it?

So any recall Problems Process must carry with it the absolute rule that it has to go through a cycle and back up to present time. You've got to make sure it is and if the person is very unstably in present time, run the cycle through again till he's nice and stable in PT. Got it?

All right. There are various ways, then, of handling this. There are various auditing commands you could use, but these auditing commands must all contain the word problem. That is the simple thing. No matter what you're going to do with these problems, you're going to get him familiar with them.

Well, what auditing commands can you use? You could sort it out on an E-Meter what the pc would best respond to, if you were being very expert and very able with your E-Meter, and you would actually get some version of Problems that would fall, and that is what you would run on him. He might not fall on "confront problems" at all. He might fall very nicely on "recall problems." You see, you get a meter reaction on "recall problems." You don't get any reaction on "confront problems." So you could sort out any version of a Problems command until you got the most active meter on it. Then you could follow through this type of cycle of mining it and then overhauling it.

Now, there is another Recall Process which is a killer. This is even worse than "Recall a problem" which tears pcs into small strips and this is much worse. Infinitely worse.

And the auditing command is "Recall a present time problem." This situates of course, the pc in the immediate instant of time as to when he had the problem. So you're running him through a whole bunch of consecutive moments of time when he is right there and of course you're not doing any alter-is of time while you're running it. It's sort of a head-on sort of process like you turn the freight train loose and let it run into the station, you know. Head-on! Crash! Boom!

Now, if you were going to run anything as violent as that particular process, you sure should follow it through with some kind of a bracket to compare and get him to confront problems for a while. In other words, you really ought to alternate that with something else. That's awful strong mead. it's something like feeding the cannibal on nothing but human flesh day and night and expecting him to remain docile and gentle.

Give him a chance to confront it. But of course, you're actually confronting it all the time you're running "Recall a present time problem." So I would only bother to shift this when it apparently was sort of flat and had died out. Now, in view of the fact that a problem was originally originated in its aberration . . the aberration about problems and solutions were originated to protect the universe or various works or machinations . . you of course find the early end of a problems run . . appearing to run forever. Because the basic aberration about problems was planted there to secure persistence.

So Problems in running has a peculiar behavior pattern and that is early on in it, it looks like it's just going to slog and plow forever. It looks like you're never going to get rid of any part of a tone arm motion. The pc isn't having any cognition's. There is nothing happening, except it's just slog, slog, slog. And you've seen that happen with lots of pcs. Well, that's what actually they're floundering in when it happens. They're floundering in the middle of a problem. Only they've got a present time problem and you're not auditing it, so they don't come out of it.

But you run through this exact mechanism when you're doing problems You say, "Recall a present time problem" and then you go on like this; and honest, he gets no cognition's, no new problems turn up. The tone arm is very active. He knows it isn't getting him anywhere; it doesn't seem to be doing any good. Nothing is happening. He is doing the auditing command, and this is going to go on forever. And this is sort of the atmosphere that seems to surround the thing early on in the run, you see. And this gradually starts disintegrating and the onionskin starts coming off, you know, and all of a sudden he's liable to pass then to either side. These are facts and he starts announcing these facts, you see. And they're very didactic facts. You know?

"Recall a present time problem." "The sidewalk." You go on, wait for him to say something else. Well, I'll tell you right now it'd be an error for you to coax him to say anything else because he's answered your auditing command to his best ability. A sidewalk is a problem. You see, you don't have to say, "How is it a problem?" "Why is it a problem?" Don't get him to elucidate. I would call that bad auditing.

We did it one time back about 56. We were asking them to do all sorts of things with problems and we found it inevitably knocked the people out of session when we were doing this. So the best way to approach it is accept the pc's answer. And that's an auditing maxim anyhow, which is a long-duration auditing maxim. He thinks he's told you a problem. Okay. Don't disillusion him. The problem is . . the problem was a sidewalk. Okay. It was a sidewalk.

The pc, then, in the basic part of the first grind run is liable to move off to either side of this and all of a sudden starts to give you solutions, solutions, solutions, solutions, solutions or is apt to get 8 thousand, 762 million cognition's per square inch. Pandora's box indeed, you see. Or on the other side of the thing just starts telling you a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact, a fact. And then he will be in a far groggier state of mind than he would be if he were telling you solutions. But he can alternate between these two extremes.

You ask him for a problem; he gives you a solution. All right. Buy it. So what?

You say, "Tell me a problem."

And he says, "Airplanes. The velocity of flight of airplanes. The velocity of flight of airplanes which suspends them and permits heavier than air flight . . the wind passing underneath and creating a vacuum above the edges."

Seems like a problem to him, so that's a problem. Got the idea?

Now, in handling the Security Check, which very briefly should be mentioned before we wind up . . very, very briefly . . the Security Check will vary more in its character and quality while running problems than most anything else. It'll move all over the place because you're moving him to different spheres of the mind and area and so forth. But the type of Security Check which you should run while you're starting a pc off and using Routine 1A to start him off with . . the type of Security Check, the best one is of course the most general Security Check . . that is the Joburg Form 3 . . unless you have a specific Security Check that fits his exact case.

Let's say he's been an old-timer. He's been an old-time auditor and that sort of thing. Well, give him that old-time auditor Security Check, you see. Work that one over until it's clean as a wolf's tooth. Then go on to something else, don't you see?

If you haven't got a Security Check that exactly matches the pc's case or that comes close to it or characterizes it well, you would do best just using the Joburg Form 3. But in any event, you would not consider that he had gone through Routine 1A until you'd worked through any and all Security Checks you had that fitted his case or not, as the case may be, and had completed successfully, so that he could do easily and not forever, Form 3.

In other words, it'd finally have to come down to Form 3, no matter what else you did and he'd have to do it easily. Not thirty-six hours for one pass through the Security Check, you understand? He's got to be able to go through this Security Check zippety-bop, like a flat rock skipping across water, see. Bangety-bangety-bangety-bang! He's got to be able to really go through that Security Check.

Now, if you ran these two things one against the other and ran them in that, you have set up a case so that it won't have any PT problems and it won't have actually any major withholds for quite a while in auditing

But now, does problems . . do problems appear again anywhere else in auditing? Yes, they appear in rudiments. You handle them ordinarily as they come up in rudiments. But if you're running process on problems, for heaven's sakes, don't waste any auditing time taking care of the guy's PT problem, because he's just about to run it anyhow with a better auditing command, you see?

Now, how about running SOP Goals on somebody and he comes up against the fact that he's starting to develop PT problems of some kind or another or "problem" starts falling? Well, it would not do any harm to revert the case to some Problems . . to run some Problems until that factor seemed to be kind of cared with and go on with your SOP Goals run.

As long as you can keep rudiments in easily on either Routine 2 or Routine 3, you would not do anything extraordinary. You just let them run. As long as you can keep routines in easily. But the moment routines . . the routine seems to be having a hard time because it's running up against a lot of work on rudiments . . every time you run rudiments . . then you certainly had better handle the thing with Problems . . Problems and Security Checks. Got it? It's a kind of a return to Routine 1A to get this thing out of the road although these things will later on have different names. Okay?

There . . you will find that most cases going for goals now . . going for Clear on SOP Goals Processing . . most cases are halted or slow gain simply for one reason only: They've got problems and problems have got them stopped or we assume that their withholds have been pretty well cleaned up or are kept cleaned up. But between these two the problems and the withholds, I don't care what goal you try to run or what terminal . . if you found the goal, if you found the terminal, if you tried to run these things, you're going to stack up just hundreds of hours of auditing.

So you had better get rid of Routine 1A, and you had better get rid of it and straighten it up and finish that up with the pc no matter how many . . how long you've got your goal or how well you've got the thing pegged, because he's not going to make much gain.

Nothing in SOP Goals has occurred to alter any consideration concerning the value of a problem or a withhold in stopping a case from making progress. These things still stop cases from making progress whether on SOP Goals or not. Okay?

Now you've got all kinds of Security Checks. There'll be more Security Checks. In running SOP Goals, about halfway through the run, going up that direction, you've got a Whole Track Security Check. Person's memories are opening up and so forth, and you actually are getting a case there that is being held up by the reason that he can't get off his withholds on the whole track. There's no way he can do so, you see. But you've got a Whole Track Security Check. But you for sure would never use a Whole Track Security Check over here in 1A, you see. you wouldn't monkey with that over here in 1A. Okay?

Now, I hope I've squared around most of the problems that you have or will be having about problems and I thought I'd better give you a good look at this. And I want to say I want to thank you for buckling in and making the fur fly. Sitting over in my office over there, you see little bits of paper flying out every once in a while and you see little tufts of fur going out every once in a while out of the auditing windows and so forth. It's a very, very satisfactory state of affairs.

So thank you very much.