

RUDIMENTS, VALENCES

A lecture given on
17 August 1961

Hello.

Okay, this is 17 August, AD 11 and I had a very nice lecture to give you today; and I'm not kidding you. I had it all taped and was going to explain to you all about valences. Instead of that, I'm going to rack up an overt on auditors.

Because I've just caught you out. Man, have I caught you out. All summer long we have had one god-awful problem. Why the hell can't you find a goal on a pc. When it takes me one hour and fifteen minutes to find the goal and the terminal and it takes Mary Sue about two and a half hours, why can't you find a goal on a pc?

And now I know why. And I'm going to twirl my long black mustache and look right down your throat.

There is a phenomenon . . . that an E-Meter ceases to register in the presence of an out-rudiment. The E-Meter tone arm will cease to register on any process you are running when a rudiment goes out. you can be fooled by thinking a process is flat when actually all that is wrong is that you've got a rudiment out. The tone arm will cease to move; the needle will cease to move; everything will cease to move except the rudiment that is out . . . that will move.

In other words, if you ask for the rudiment that was out, you'll get a response on the needle. But all other things in the presence of an out-rudiment do not move. Now, can you get that real clear?

All right, you've got Mr. Pc, and Mr. Pc is moving very well on the tone arm and the needle is moving very well and suddenly the tone arm slows down and stops, and it stays stopped for twenty minutes. So you say the process is flat. Flat, my hat! A rudiment went out which caused the process no longer to operate. The only thing which will now operate is the out-rudiment.

Now, if you get the rudiment off that has gone wrong and you get that rudiment in promptly and properly, the process will now pick up the motion of the tone arm and will now, in addition to that, move the needle. You got that now?

Now, don't make a mistake on this because this is the most important part of auditing there can be. There is no more important part of auditing than what I'm telling you right this minute.

A process can appear to be flat just because a rudiment's out. You're running "How often have you failed to leave something?" And all of a sudden, why, it's sitting there at 4.0 and it just sits there at 4.0 and it just doesn't move. And then you say, "Well, that's the end of the process, ha-ha!"

Mmmmm. Rrrrtf. Aw, you had a rudiment out and the process appeared to go flat and the process was not flat at all. And the only thing which will now move the E-Meter is the out-rudiment.

You can find the rudiment, the rudiment now will operate, but it's the only thing that'll operate the E-Meter. ARC break, present time problem, something wrong in the environment . . . these various rudiments, you see, will move the E-Meter. You flatten that with a rudiments process then you move back over onto your process. And what do you know, this process that was so flat, is not flat at all, but it wobbles the tone arm and it lets the needle fly around and so forth, and there it is.

So, two things have been happening, and this will become more horrible to you as I go along. I think very often auditors . . . not just here! I'm not scolding you here. You're better supervised here than elsewhere . . . but I'm talking about auditors elsewhere in other classes, in other areas, in HGCs and so forth. Here's where your HGC Clears aren't getting made, right here on this exact point I'm telling you.

These people are leaving Prehav level processes unflat on the pc. That's on the running of it. Just because they get the rudiments out, then the Prehav level looks unflat so they assess for a new level. Ah, but the old level isn't flat, so, of course, the pc doesn't go anyplace. So they just grind and then they not flatten the next level, you see, and then not flatten the next level and then not flatten the next level and we just go on grind, grind, grind, grind. Do you see what can happen here? You got that? Have you really got that?

Audience: Yes.

You really see this?

Audience: Yes.

All right.

The same thing will happen on a Goals Assessment. And I think your preclear's goals lies in the first hundred and fifty goals the pc gave you and I think it is knocked out by an ARC break. And I think the pc's goal has already been given to you, long ago, and now appears to be flat because it's ARC broken out of existence by some technical flub. Them's hard words. But I think I could take any person in this unit and in the matter of a few minutes get the ARC break off by auditing off the auditor who is doing the assessment and find in the first hundred and fifty or two hundred goals on the list that one of those goals is still alive and is still sticking and won't go out.

Interesting. I think I could do it with every person, not only here, but Australia, America; anybody who's had trouble finding a goal. I think that is it. I may be wrong because I've not put this immediately to test. I do know that I could find your goals. But I am pretty sure this is the phenomena that's getting in your road.

And you know what makes me sure? Because there is something . . . there is something in the South African regimen of Goals Assessment that hasn't been in any other unit or course. And what is it? I made sure that they had every student there checking the rudiments on every other student's pc, regularly and continuously. Isn't that right? And it aren't been done since. So the answer must be rudiments. There is the one difference, and that's why I think that is the difference. Follow me?

Seem logical?

Audience: Yes.

That if everybody, every twenty-four hours or something like that, was vetting rudiments checked by another auditor on his pc, and that they were

always finding them out, and that this isn't now being done anyplace . . . a piece of the lineup has been knocked out.

If the Director of Processing of a Central Organization does not, every single day, check the rudiments on every pc in the shop, he's a knucklehead. Well, he's a friend of mine, but he's still a knucklehead. Because, in the first place, the pc very often doesn't go live for the auditor easily on the rudiment where he will go live for another person on the rudiment.

And you can sit there and you can say to the pc, "Do you have an ARC break, present time problem? Is it all right if I audit you?" and so forth. 'Have you got a withhold?' and so on. And they're all apparently null. And then somebody else walks in on the thing and says, "You got a present time problem, a withhold, an ARC break?" Ka-wooww! They're all live.

You should have seen Richard Halpern's face one day when I took one of his pcs and found every rudiment falling off the pin. "But!" he said to me plaintively. "But," he said to me, "I just checked those fifteen minutes ago and they were all in." And it's true, he didn't get a fall on them fifteen minutes before. Isn't that interesting?

All right, two auditors should always audit as a team. Auditors shouldn't be out in the brush country of lower south Slobovia, upper north Manitowoc, Wisconsin, auditing by themselves. Anyway, auditors ought to audit in pairs. Wolves should run in packs, auditors should go in pairs. Oh, I didn't mean there was any comparison between the two. I didn't say mice!

Anyway, auditing in pairs . . . should check the rudiments on each other's pcs, every session. Sounds arduous, doesn't it? Sounds like an awful lot of administration, doesn't it? Sounds like an awful lot of people falling over an awful lot of chairs and so forth.

Well, actually you don't have to do it very formally in an auditing session. You can almost lean the guy up against the mantelpiece, prop the meter on the mantelpiece and say, "All right, take ahold of the cans. Now, do you have an ARC break with your auditor? Do you have . . . been audited with a present time problem? Is it all right if you're audited in that auditing room? Do you have any withholds from the auditor or anybody else including me?" And so forth. Fall. Fall. Fall.

Well, you don't do anything about them. you say, "Joe. Joe. Get on the ball. The rudiments are out on your pc."

"Well, which one?"

"All of them."

"Oh, no!"

You know, that kind of response.

It's a new look. The soothing drone of the auditor's voice has not got the pc into a super control where he mustn't be out of order. Get the idea?

That was in the South African lineup. And Jean, I'm sure, did it.

As a matter of fact, she had two cases that were banging her head in. And she finally, herself in person, went in and they've been running null on present time problems.

"Do you have a present time problem?"

"Oh, no, no, no."

And they did it all the weeks of the course. And she extended the course over a week just to make sure that it was better. And she grabbed hold of the meter on them and she found both of them had such fabulous present time problems that each one of them broke down and wept the second she put her finger on the present time problem.

Ah, they'd been audited. But she was saying Routine 1 does not work, you see, and something else is going on here. We must be doing something, you know? Yeah, they were running a Routine 1, but it should have been picked up during the Security Checking. But it wasn't picked up in the rudiments on the Security Check, don't you see? And so those people had actually gone six and seven weeks without anybody probing in to find out if there was something wrong with the PT problem. And there was something wrong with the PT problem, and that comprised almost 50 percent of her class. Do I make an impression on you?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Out of kindness to the pc and yourself, for heaven sakes, start cross-checking rudiments. Ka-now! See? Start cross-checking rudiments. By which I mean, get somebody else to check the rudiments on your pc. you check them perfectly soundly and run your sessions just as before, but always get somebody else to cross-check the rudiments on a pc. you got it? And do it often; do it frequently! If not every session, at least every couple of sessions, for heaven sakes. See?

Now, I'll tell you what you do with these endless goals lists. I could tell you what you do in a colloquial marine fashion, but I'm not going to tell you that.

You get you-self, the auditor, off of the case. That is to say you go on auditing a case, but just get any charge that you may have built up on this case with your Goals Assessment, off. Run yourself on the Prehav Scale. We don't care how, see? In other words, get that . . get that flat and then take the original goals list. The original, and find out if any of them are still alive and work it over and find out if there's been an ARC break around any of these goals and so forth. Get sloppy about it. I'm tired of giving you a mechanical robot activity, it's time you graduated up into body class II . . half human, half robot. Okay?

Now, let's just work over that original list and let's find out what is there.

You know, I know at least one person who probably is spooked because Mary Sue, operating I think with another auditor, shook that down in a part of an afternoon. And I think this pc doesn't trust his goal or terminal, because it was that easy, it was that fast, you see? It was that quick. And everybody else takes so long. Well, of course, it must be something wrong with that particular terminal and goal. No, there's nothing wrong with that terminal and goal, nothing at all. They were running just dandy.

There might be an unflat level someplace on the past run, but that would be about the only thing. Actually, a past run has been a little bit lengthy, so I would suspect there was a rudiment out on the run not on the assessment, and I'd check that over very carefully. But get your rudiments checked. Get your rudiments checked well, get them crisscrossed, get somebody else to check the rudiments on your pc and that's going to speed up all this nonsense about assessment. And don't be so anxious to rub out goals. You're trying to find a goal, you're not trying to erase all the fellow's goals.

Now, it doesn't take very long to find a goal on a pc. Just disabuse yourself from that . . it just doesn't. Williams was almost staggered into the . . . Who was the . . the wife . . the wife of Lot that went into a pillar of salt out of frozen shock from watching Sodom and Gomorrah go boom, or something. I've forgotten. It's some fairy tale. And anyway, he turned in . . he went to Australia and he started his course and everything was running all along, and he practically turned into a pillar of salt from shock at the length of time it was taking these goals to be assessed. Because it never happened to him in Aus . . in South Africa. Well, I was riding him awful close. And we were . .

and that was the missing factor, and I'm sure it hasn't been done since.

The American ACC managed to go all the way its length with tremendous gains . . tremendous gains. A great deal of instruction took place, everything was fine, all the students happy, and without one single goal being Sound in six weeks. A record, man! Well, they weren't cross-checking rudiments, that's for sure.

So, put that in as part of your auditing rundown, because it is a missing piece. When we had all these gains and got all this stuff whizzing and going down in South Africa here in this spring, that was part of the rundown . . is everybody was checking everybody else's rudiments. Isn't that right? How often did they do it?

Female voice: we did it every two days.

Every two days they checked the other fellow's pc's rudiments. I'm sure it hasn't been done since.

You get these little tiny pieces of stuff that get left out of the pudding, you know? It's a beautiful pudding . . it's a beautiful pudding except nobody put any yeast in it or anything. See, it just lies there like a pancake.

All right, that was part of the rundown. Rudiments out means Goals Assessment not done.

Now, I've given you some other tricky ways of getting around Goals Assessment. There's a lot of . . this hasn't been in vain by a long ways because you've learned a lot of tricky ways of getting goals and all that

sort of thing. You know more about that now and I've had to dig up a lot more about that and that's had to be articulated from one end to the other.

But I am sure, just as sure as I'm sitting here and just as sure as there's a body in this chair . . . I'm pretty sure of that . . . that it is simply a matter of you get the rudiments out maybe on one or two goals. Just as slightly as that, you see? You're going on down the line erasing goals and you get the rudiments out on a goal and then out on another goal, and maybe one of those goals was it. you see? And you get the rudiments out. And then maybe on the remainder of the list, why, of course, they all null with a great speed because the pc is chopped up or ARC broke or got a PT problem. You've got in other words, an inoperative E-Meter on the subject of goals. It'd be very operative on the subject of rudiments but it's very inoperative on the subject of goals.

Now, if this isn't correct and if this doesn't bear fruit, I will find out why. Don't worry. But I'm pretty sure that this is it. And what makes me sure is it is the one piece of stuff that was missing from the South African course. That was missing. And it's now missing here at Saint Hill. And it's now missing in Australia, I'm sure. And it certainly was missing over in Washington, I am sure. See? It's the missing item. Somebody else looking over your shoulder and checking the rudiments on the pc repetitively and often, making sure that those things are in. Okay?

You have a whiz at it here. And you go back over that goals list that was first given to you, or that you first got, and you cover that list again after you have gotten any possibility of an ARC break off or a present time problem off or anything else off or any anxiety off or having . . . finding one's goal as a present time problem off You got it? Just get all of those things straight, as straight, as straight, as straight, even if you have to run yourself on the Prehav Scale, don't you see, on . . . off the pc. And I'm sure that you're going to find the goal was in the first couple of hundred. You hear me?

All right, I'm pretty sure this is the case because, you see, I'm not having the trouble you're having in finding goals and terminals. I'm just not having

this trouble and it's just something that has got me saying, "What? How? How are they managing this? What has entered into this?"

Well, now here's another oddity: I get goals and terminals without checking the rudiments. Hm! You've seen me do it . . . repetitively. But you can assign that to altitude, because I'm in no uncertain toned voice when I'm getting off goals and terminals. "Is it this, is it that, is it the other thing?" You know, bang, bang, bang-bang-bang-bang, so on. There's a great deal of certainty concerning this. And also it doesn't seem to be very important. I don't make it very important. But I've even said to the fellow, "Well, do you have ARC breaks and that sort of thing?"

And the guy said, "Oh, yes, yes, yeah, yeah."

"Do you have any overts on me?"

"Oh, yes, something like that."

"Well, skip it."

So, that is an invalidative part of this analysis. But I think if you look this over very, very carefully, I think you will find that that will deliver into your paws. I think you have slid over the goal and I think, long since, it's in the background. Because you're also doing something else which is wrong, as wrong, as wrong. You are asking for more goals before you go over the goals list at the beginning of every session, see?

I never want any more goals off the pc. I got enough after he's given me . . . after I've gotten writer's cramp writing fifty or sixty of the things: I got enough goals. It's almost by postulate one of those is going to be it, you know? I should be careful saying that because you'll think I mean it.

But I just sort of look him over, you know, and, “Hm-hm-hm. One of these is it. one of these is it. Must be.”

But then, there is this factor: is I’ve actually never known a pc to lie to me. When I ask them for something, they deliver. See, which is all I mean by altitude.

I say, “What were your childhood goals?”

“Burrhm.”

“Thank you.”

“Burrhm.”

“Thank you.”

“Burrhm.”

“Thank you.”

“Burrhm.”

“Thank you. All right, that’s good. Now, what are your antisocial goals? You know, like burning down the town or something like this.”

“Burrhm.”

“Thank you.”

“Burrhm.”

“Thank you.”

“Burrhm.”

“Thank you. All right. Now, what artistic professional goals did you ever have?”

“Well, Burrhm.” “That’s it.”

“Burrhp.”

“That’s it. Oh, that’s enough, to hell with the rest of them.”

I don’t want him to have an artistic goal anyhow. And then I say, “All

right. Now, what withheld goals do you have that you just wouldn’t ever dare tell anybody about?”

“Burrhm.”

I hank you. “Burrhm.”

“Thank you.”

“Burrhm. “

“Thank you.”

I wind up with a list of thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty . . something of this character. That's it, I don't look over more goals.

Now, the difference is that because everybody was chewed away from this we had more methodology invented than was actually being employed originally on Goals Assessments. And the original Goals Assessment, it was quite odd that the one goal you made fall there actually will continue to fall. That's quite a discovery, but it's true. But you don't even have to do it. There's one goal there going to fall more than the rest of them, and that'll continue to fall unless you get an ARC break in the road. you understand?

Of course, this thing . . altitude is one factor, but only one factor of holding a pc in session while you are doing a Goals Assessment. And you can hold him in session like he felt he was cast in concrete, you know? It just doesn't ever occur to him to have a present time problem or an ARC break. That's about the . . that's the real secret of auditing.

If you yourself are sufficiently matter of fact, sufficiently relaxed, sufficiently in control of the situation and know your business well enough, there is never any doubt enters your pc's mind from one end of the session to the other but what he should be sitting there getting audited. But if there's a bunch of doubts around, then you've got to keep your rudiments clean, clean, clean.

So just as they have a large forty-seven foot wastebasket at Times Square; it's "cast your ballot here for a clean New York" . . I think that's awfully cute . . forty-seven foot wastebasket. That's just what Times Square wants. I can see it now. It was so outrageous that a bunch of businessmen have now chipped in to make a park and a grass plot and so forth there, and so on.

But just with that type of corny, corny, corny advertising we should hang up little signs all over HGCs and classes and so forth: "Keep your rudiments clean for a Clear." Pretty corny, but it's true.

Now, the amount of importance which you are giving an assessment is quite interesting. But a person can be assessed straight through to Clear by Assessment by Elimination, providing the rudiments are all in. If you use the other data which I have now dug up and given you. That is, get all the not-knows out about it and find out why he had the goal and so forth. Another . . another side of the coin . . an entirely different side of the coin.

Okay? You had enough hell for one day? You mean you haven't?

Female voice: Did you say hell or help?

Just hell.

Go back over and check it, and I think you'll find it's true, that your pc's goal long . . occurred a long time ago for running. I think so. This would be the only way that you possibly have missed somewhere.

There's the other road and the other road is you can assess a pc straight through to Clear. You get rid of all of his goals, he comes out at the other end; you get rid of all of his terminals and so forth, and he comes out at the other end and that's, that's it. That can happen, too. Apparently, they're practically two different processes.

And now I will give you the lecture I was going to give you today. All right?

Audience: Hm-hm.

Well, this is an important lecture. It summates the findings of a great many of years and particularly a great many of the findings of this summer. And the name of this lecture is "Valences." And I should start it with a definition of a valence.

There are several types of valences. In some other old PAB you'll find them classified into various types. But a valence is a synthetic beingness, at best, or it is a beingness . . . what the pc is not but is pretending to be or thinks he is.

Now, that beingness could have been created for him by a duplication of an existing beingness or a synthetic, which was a proper term, beingness built up by the descriptions of somebody else. That just as Horatio Alger, Jr. built up a synthetic beingness called "Local Boy Makes Good by Hanging on the Coattails of Rich Man" (which was his total motif), a synthetic beingness could be created which everybody would believe in and try to become. Or, Mama can run Papa down so continuously that Junior never, under any circumstances, ever meets Papa or sees Papa but becomes the synthetic beingness of Papa. All of which is an interesting thing.

One of the basics of this, by the way, is the first lecture of the first congress I ever gave in England. That . . . there's a tape on this. It's what you think the other fellow is, not what he is, that is the other fellow's . . . your trouble with the other fellow.

Now, this is a valence. A valence is, then, an artificial beingness of some kind or another. But with that we don't have, factually, "own valence." There is no such thing as one's own valence. This was thrashed out in 1950 and went loose through the middle of the fifties and people refer to it, and I may have even said it a few times . . . his own valence so forth. But it is not correct . . . it is just not correct. Because a person's own valence is silliness. That is a silly statement, because a person is himself or in a valence. You see, it's one or the other. He is either himself or in a valence.

Now, a valence is a package. And one of the earliest observations concerning this when I started to come to grips with this thing we now call a profile or a graph, I analyzed it from all sides and came to just one conclusion regarding it. And that is that it was a picture of a valence and that is all that graph is . . . it's a picture of a valence. And any change that you got on a pc was because you shifted his valence.

Now, you've already read that years ago. It's an old datum but now it merges up into first order of importance. Pardon me, it shoulders its way up through other data to stand on top as a king-of-the-mountain datum. That's a picture of a valence and you're never going to get another picture until you've done something about valences on the person. And this boils down to this didactic statement which can now be made, which makes this a very important lecture: The pc will not gain in any way, shape or form through any effort to alter the characteristics of a valence.

Swallow that one, because it's a very important statement and it's a very factual statement. A pc will not change in any way by reason of processes which seek to alter the characteristics of the valence he is in.

He's in the valence of an ogre. All right, you're going to change the characteristics of the ogre and this is going to make a better pc. No-no. No-no, no-no. The pc will alter only if you change the valence as a whole package.

And why is this? It's because the pc cannot take any responsibility whatsoever for any of the package of characteristics known as a valence. They are somebody else's. And he takes no responsibility for any of these now-I'm-supposed-to's that go and make up this package called a valence.

A streetcar conductor, of course, as a valence, has a number of now-I'm-supposed-to's, right? There he is ding-donging up and down the line, letting on the passengers and taking first crack at the nickels and sixpences. And after that the company gets what's left. And whatever it is that the streetcar conductor is doing, he's got a now-I'm-supposed-to. He's supposed to get up in the morning; he is supposed to go to work; he is supposed to see the passengers on and off; and he is supposed to collect the fares and make change. You see, now-I'm-supposed-to's, now-I'm-supposed-to's. He's supposed to wear a cap; he's supposed to wear a uniform. You get the idea? I am supposed to, I am supposed to, I am supposed to.

All right. Now, somebody gets into the valence of a streetcar conductor and all of these now-I'm-supposed-to's, are now the now-I'm-supposed-to's of a streetcar conductor, they're not anything that can be touched or reached by the person. All the person could reach is the knowingness or identity called a streetcar conductor.

Now, let's get down and find out what use does a thetan make of a valence. This is the only use he makes of a valence. Survival. The road out. The modus operandi of getting on in life surmounted by knowingness. Valence is a solid knowingness; a body is a solid knowingness.

You see a streetcar conductor, you "know" he is a streetcar conductor, so therefore all valences are knowingnesses. They're an effort to get somebody else to "know" that you're there and efforts to get somebody else to "recognize" something. And therefore they are a road out. They are a road out of unwanted areas.

This fellow is slogging around in the mud firing off Mannlichers, Lebel's, Lee-Enfields, Springfields, Garand Markets or whatever other asinine thing the infantry is supposed to do. And just as he catches the trench mortar in the midriff, he discovers he does not want to be there. He is in the wrong valence called "a soldier." Wrong valence. That knowingness is now invalidated, it must become a "not knowingness." So he exteriorizes and he says the only way to fight a war is as a general. Obvious, isn't it? So his next lifetime he's going to be a general.

I'll give you a big joke on me with regard to this sort of thing. I always said that in the event of another war, I'd be a war correspondent. I'd be sitting there with a blonde on each knee and a bottle of whiskey in front of me and a typewriter . . . real tough picture, you know? I used to tell my friends this around New York City. And I'd . . . we'd hear the horns go and then I would lean over and say, "Sit over on the settee a moment, honey." And I would pound out on the typewriter, "Our brave boys, today, went over the top," you see, and put it on the wires to Associated Press. But some of my friends had bad luck in the Ethiopian . . . ha . . . war and so on. So, when the war came along I didn't do that. But nevertheless, that's just an example.

You know, the trench mortar catches him in the midriff and he says, "In the next war," he says, "I had better be a war correspondent because the last war correspondent I saw was in that nice thick dugout eight miles to the rear of the front lines." You got the idea? He says, "That's the thing to be," you see? "That's dandy."

So the next war comes along, and he tries to be this thing and he can't

be this thing, so he's very unhappy about the whole thing. He can't be this war correspondent but he tries. And how he will go on a long cycle of tryingnesses if this is really one of these plowed-in sort of valence pictures, not as . . . not just a joke as mine was. And he's trying like mad and he'll go war after war, you know, life after life, and somehow or another he'll eventually familiarize himself enough with the tools of the trade. And sure enough a war comes along And so help me Pete he gets to sit in this dugout and pound out this deathless line, "Our brave boys, today, went over the top," see, while he's sitting there.

All right, that's fine. That's fine. He goes along like that; is very successful. Time goes on, you see? And they have run out of war criminals by a few Lifetimes later, you see? They've run out of war criminals utterly. They've hanged everybody, you see? And they find out they can no longer charge presidents, kings and things, and generals with starting wars, so they assume quite . . . probably quite rightly . . . that it's the fault of the press. So immediately after this war, the fifteenth life that he's been a war correspondent, he finds much to his horror that all war correspondents are now being arrested and being shot in a painful manner.

So just at the moment when twelve bullets, straight and true, hit him in the chest, he decides he had better not be a war correspondent anymore. This is something he had better not be. So he decides that the best thing to be in a war is Mata Hari, you see, or something like this. So over years then and ages and so on, he'll go on working uphill and upgrade to solve this confusing problem called war, to become a Mata Hari, you see? He learns how to be a woman, you see? And he keeps picking up female bodies and he becomes enticing one way or the other and he gets himself well endured to certain horizontal activities, and . . . excuse my French. But he moves on up the line and he finally makes it, you see?

And then lifetime after lifetime, why, he's just happy as a clam, here, being Mata Hari. And every time there's a war, why, he immediately becomes an espionage agent and everything is just dandy, and time goes on and so forth. And then he finds out that the G-2s of all of the armies . . . this one particular war . . . have gotten together and found out that this is how all of their information is getting across the lines. So every person who is a camp follower, vivandiere, call girl, anything associated with it, ever looks at a general, is promptly picked up and shot. And as she stands there in the courtyard, you see, with twelve bullets going through her chest, she decides at that moment to be nothing after that but a peacemonger. Now, that's the thing to be . . . a peacemonger. You get the idea? Still trying to solve this silly problem, you see?

Valence, valence, valence, valence. Valences are calculated to do something. They are calculated to solve a problem. And every valence picked up is solution to a problem.

So therefore, you can say, if you'll excuse my rough talk, that these identities as they are passed by on the track are old antiquated solutions to confusions. They're antiquated solutions to confusions.

Now, the goals which go toward beingness are of course the much more definite goal. And the goal which is much more profitable in auditing is the beingness goal because it goes at once toward identity.

Now, a person is not himself, he is a different knowingness the moment that he is a valence. And the auditing truth which emerges is this: You can patch up a valence's broken leg providing the valence is supposed to have nonbroken legs. Got the idea?

And if your auditing of a valence does not violate any of the vital now-I'm-supposed-to's of the valence, it'll work. Therefore, you can do assists on almost anybody, but every once in a while they're bemused and amazed on an assist that should have worked but it didn't work. It worked on everybody else but it didn't work on this particular person. Well, you can chalk it up just to this and this alone . . . this alone: You have violated a now-I'm-supposed-to of that valence. And the pc can do nothing about these now-I'm-supposed-to's, they are not under his control.

So your effort to patch up the broken leg was of a valence and the valence, oddly enough, was a crippled war veteran. Well, a crippled war veteran is supposed to have broken legs, so of course you get nowhere. You break your heart, you know? You say what's all this? Well, what all this is, is you're auditing a hidden valence.

Now, any pc is being dominantly, at any given time, one valence, but may be tortured or upset by other valences which are the . . . only the concern of the valence he is being.

So, any pc's troubles are only the troubles of the valence in which he is. And those are a pc's troubles. And the troubles of the valence are part and parcel of the now-I'm-supposed-to's of the valence.

So, this tells you bluntly and obliquely and straightly and helicopterly that there ain't no remedy of a valence's difficulties. There just is no such thing as being able to take valence A and remedy the difficulties of valence A. You can get rid of valence A but you can't get rid of the difficulties of valence A, because they are outside the power of the pc to touch, because they're now-I'm-supposed-to's which belong to something else, which he doesn't fully control, called a valence.

So we take a girl who is all geared up . . . she's all geared up; she's carefully grooved in war by war, you see; she's carefully grooved in and she knows the proper solution of this. And if another war comes along, she knows what she should do. She's got this solved, you see . . . Mata Hari. And she just is horrible to get a withhold off of. But she's awfully good in getting secrets off you. she seems to have a total promiscuity as a viewpoint; something that's incomprehensible. And no affair she ever has seems to have any real point to it. That's so mysterious.

And you try to figure this thing out and of course you have not got the key to the closet, so what skeleton is in it must remain, therefore, a mystery.

The key to this closet of course is, in event of another war, she's going to be Mata Hari. And a war is so dangerous that she mustn't let go of any part of this solution. But she would like to feel better. You get the anomaly about it? She'd like to feel better but she can't let go of any of the things that are wrong.

So you get this oddity of "Please audit me, but you better not make me well." That's what it looks like. But actually it's "You better get me over the bumps so I can take care of myself without having to be a Mata Hari in the next war," don't you see?

"These holes that keep appearing and disappearing on my chest while you're auditing me tell me that I had better not be anything but a Mata Hari in the next war." So, you'll sometimes have a somatic turn on in a pc and go off and turn on and go off and turn on and go off and turn on. you never seem to be able to get rid of it. It's part of a valence package that keeps them from becoming something else, and they know better than to become that, see? And so they'll actually keep around the somatic, to the degree that they

can, to prevent themselves from becoming an unworkable solution to a future problem.

So this girl's attitude toward men is unresolvable because it's part and parcel of survival. And just as you would be able to get your head torn off or get somebody very upset by you by walking in on a grizzly bear and taking his rations away from him, don't try to take that solution away from a pc so long as it seems absolutely vital that it be a solution.

What you've got to do, quite on the contrary, is to get the pc to face up to the various factors which make that a valence.

I wander afield. The only point I'm trying to make with you is just this one single devastating point, just one, and that is: You cannot make a valence well. you can move a valence. So this tells you that any process run at random on a pc has a very small chance of success.

You take Mr. A and you say, "All right, now we're going to solve your ideas about problems, Mr. A. And we're going to set you up, Mr. A, so that you can reach and withdraw, Mr. A. And we're going to get you over breaking your legs, Mr. A. And we're going to get rid of those funny red marks that appear and disappear on your chest, Mr. A."

Ah, but the trick is you're not auditing Mr. A. You're auditing a luckless person who has it all taped in the next war to be Mata Hari, but he's a man. So this life is a total loss as far as he's concerned. Wrong sex. Wrong, wrong orientation for a proper solution to the goal. And if a war came along, he would be utterly flabbergasted, because he could just see himself drifting back into this war correspondent, who of course is blamed for his war crime. Okay?

Moue valences, don't audit them. Now, that just strips down your bag of tricks, as the effective bag of tricks, to a very small bag . . . the really effective tricks. This preselects them for you, left and right.

Is this process going to change, familiarize, accustom the person to identity; or is it going to handle environments which make identities vital; or is it going to alter, in other words, valences?

If this process is going to alter valences, it will work and work rather rapidly and smoothly and stay worked; and if it is not going to alter valences, it is not going to work and it is not going to stay well and solved. Do you follow me there? That's a big piece of information all in one batch.

Now, what makes a valence stick the way it sticks? What makes a valence stick the way it sticks?

Let us define a psychotic. Let's newly define a psychotic in terms of knowingness. A psychotic does not know what is going on in his environment and does not know what is going on inside himself. It is all unknown and therefore unobservational . . . unobserved. He doesn't know what's happening inside himself, and he doesn't know what's happening with himself, and he doesn't know what's happening where he is, and he doesn't know what's happening in front of him or behind him at any given time of the day or night. This is the one common denominator of all psychosis: Not-knowingness, what is happening around him in his environment and not knowing what is happening where he is.

Now, let's take neurosis. Neurosis is he's got some idea what's happening where he is on some things and some faint idea what's happening in his environment on some things. But, generally, unknowingness overbalances the knowingness and so you get a neurosis.

Now, let's move it up scale a little bit and let's take you. you know what's

happening where you are but you don't know what's happening in somebody else a few feet away . . exactly what's happening at all times of the day and night. You don't always know what's going on with everybody. You got the idea? So, that makes a slight unknownness, doesn't it? So, just look it over now. Just get this as a pictorial picture, just as something to be graphed very easily. There you sit right where you are, and you know what you are, you know where you are, and you've got a good idea what you're doing right where you are.

All right, now let's take it to extreme. Do you know what is happening a hundred miles straight ahead of you? All right, do you know what's happening three feet straight ahead of you? Yeah, in this particular instance you do. Do you know what has happened within a few feet of you all of your life, at all times of your life?

Oh! There's some spots in your life where you didn't know what was going on, a few feet away. you did know what you were doing but you didn't know what was going on there, is that right? All right, those are the stuck spots of your track, because it's a disagreement . . total disagreement. You knew, facing an "unknown See, it's a "know" versus an "unknown and these two things are out of agreement.

You never be surprised . . a whole bunch of cheerful idiots all of whom are stupid and they all know everybody is stupid. You know, they get along beautifully? Look at a communist cell sometime. They're all happy and they all know they're stupid, you know?

But if a fellow gets up to a point where he has the least power of observation of any kind whatsoever, he starts to run into this one. And that is, immediately in his perimeter there are things he doesn't know, which makes an inequality.

Well, now, these unknowingnesses can get so overwhelming that one will adopt a valence to resolve them. He'll pick up a valence which knows about these things. They do it so often that in the United States a great many of the scientists today are content to let the valence know everything that a scientist should do and know.

I got the Polar . . my Polar Times this afternoon and it's got a bunch of pictures in it and of course the polar regions are now being absolutely infiltrated and butted into and so on. Everybody is charging into the polar regions and anybody who is a member of the Polar Society gets to know all about what snowdrifts they're jumping into now. And man, let me tell you they're really jumping into a lot of snowdrifts. The boys are having a ball.

And here's a photograph, here's a photograph and here's a bunch of perfectly valid human beings, but they've just invented a motor that will chew up snow. It's a ten-horsepower motor, and a fan blade goes underneath the snowbank and it just keeps chewing up snow. And it's all very nice, and so forth. But you look at the guy who is standing there posing with the picture, you see, of it and he is a scientist one way or the other. He isn't doing anything. He's testing it. And in all the midst of all these parkas and everything, here is the perfect mock-up, you see . . up there at about 89 degrees north . . here's the perfect mock-up of a scientist. They've got to have the old school tie; they've got to have their diploma signed just right; they've got to have all of these various things; they've got to be just so; they've got to belong to the right societies in order to be these things. And they get that . . that beingness has got to be just exact, you know? It mustn't vary a hair.

And if anybody comes along and thinks a thought in the field of science

who doesn't have this exact beingness these boys almost go mad! They just go berserk! Why?

Also, this doesn't add up. The boys who invented most of the civilization in which we are now confusedly involved and who laid the fundamentals of it, were not one of them scientists. Firestone, Ford, you know, Edison. These birds were about as far as you could get from this particular mock-up.

But this other mock-up is a kind of a whole track mock-up. Actually, they've got a scientist all mixed up with a technician. Oh yes, a good scientist always demands of his technician that he have the right old school tie and that sort of thing because he doesn't want him running off with the uranium pot.

But it's a sort of a body running without a head now, because they're calling scientists technicians and that sort of thing, you know? It's all messed up. But it's an exact beingness . . . it's an exact beingness. And the moment you try to shake that beingness even the least little bit and you . . . just by a question, you know?

Yeah, I asked one time, I asked a "scientist," who was being hired at vast expense on a government project to develop jet propulsion . . . atomic jet propulsion. And I said, "Well, have you ever made up an orifice . . . an optimum orifice pressure table for jet orifices?"

Well, this would be the most fundamental thing you would ever dream up if you were doing a jet propulsion job, you see. Because it says how big is the cylinder and how fast must the velocity of particles go out of the cylinder to give you the maximum horsepower . . . foot pounds of thrust. And this bird was absolutely turned into screaming, squirming jelly. They hadn't done it, you see? They were still using the Chicago Fire Department's hose tables. And I had suddenly, inadvertently exposed to view, you see, the fact that they were being about as thorough, you see, as somebody throwing bits of paper in the wind.

And I actually wasn't trying to invalidate the boy. But he just went all to pieces and he became absolutely savage about me . . . just real bitter, you know? Because, obviously, he's living the life of a mock-up.

You see, you've got the right old school tie; he's got the right letters; he's got the right this; he's got the right that; he is at a right desk; he is wearing the right pipe; he is, you know, he's got it all taped; he reads the right papers and everything else. But, of course, he isn't doing anything. See, all he is, is a package of now-I'm-supposed-to's operating with Chicago Fire Department's hose pressure tables. This becomes a very solid valence.

They seldom send the scientists out to fight the wars, by the way, and it could be just another Mata Hari dodge, you see? But the guy evidently really isn't thinking up anything; he really isn't adding anything. He's adding up figures and standing around and posing with a . . . One of the hard cases in the parka, you see, is the fellow who set this snow eradicator going and then stepped aside so the scientist could pose there by it, you see . . . manipulating it. Marvelous!

You can see on all sides of you these outrageously artificial valences which are pretended valences, and you see the level of pretence of the valence. And when you see it to that degree, of course, it immediately becomes spotted for you and you say, "Ha-ha! Yeah, that's very artificial."

Ahhhh, but Suzy Glutz sits down and she is not in this type of artificiality and you say, "She is real." Yeah, George Aloysius Doakes sits down and you say, "He is real." See, no pretence here, this man is a downright matter of fact . . . well, maybe that's the valence: downright, matter-of-fact. He's identified himself hasn't he? Well, if he's identified himself by a bunch of tricks such as clothes, hat . . . well, you must be looking at a valence. You must be looking at a valence and a package of valences.

Now, the obvious valence that the fellow has a body does not necessarily condemn him at all. It's the valence that he is being and is using the body to be, that is the auditing target. So a human being has a body. All right. So a thetan has a body and it's following the current mode. Well, this doesn't actually make a valence. You know, it's not plowed in; it's not below his level of consciousness. He's just soared down from Arcturus and he picked up a body and he's walking it around and he sits down.

Now, you say to him, "Who are you?"

And he says, "Well, I'm . . . I'm X54 and just came in from Arcturus."

The only trace of valence there is "X54" because he knows it. See? But of course a psychiatrist would lock him up.

I've always been going to write another Ole Doc Methuselah story, you know, about this type of crisscross.

Anyway, what I mean by valence, as far as an auditing target is concerned, is more or less the mental-image-picture package which the person has composed to resolve the problems of existence which he doesn't know anything about. He knows practically nothing of this valence. He cannot really identify the valence. He has fixed it up so that it is really unknown and really hidden. Because this thing, apparently, was surviving and it was totally unknown to him. He picked up the package and he's going on with the package, because it's a survival package. This he's fairly sure of.

He notices that this drunken, bum uncle of his, who flops around all over the place and gets sick regularly Saturday night all over the living room floor, is cared for. He doesn't have to work; everybody steps very light in his vicinity; he is just leading a perfectly easy wonderful survival life. And then we wonder why the little boy in the family all of a sudden grows up and is practically his exact image.

Well, one: He doesn't know why this fellow is leading this life, you see? And two: He's got all sorts of confusions himself that this fellow doesn't seem to have. So to escape from his own confusions, he could pick up the valence of this stumblebum uncle, you see?

And it's always easier to pick up a weaker valence than a stronger one. So your more logical target is the weaker valence.

Now, if the pc has a bunch of chronic somatics of one kind or another, these are part of the valence picture; these are not the pc. These are part of the valence picture. So somatics are part of the valence picture. Somatics are not part of the pc.

There's . . . even the mechanics of this has been worked out some years ago. I worked it out so you've got to have actually two identities counteropposed in order to get a smush and to keep a valence in. You've got to have a couple of identities pinned up. In other words, you've got the pc being himself versus this thing in order to feel pain. A pain phenomenon has to be highly artificialized. In other words, to hurt, why, you've got to have a couple of valences kicking around which are this way and that. I won't go into the torturous methodology of how this was worked out. I think it was Washington, 1957.

But it works like this. This fellow . . . to have experience, he says to himself . . . he will have to survive. This is the way he's got it worked out backwards: To have experience, he'll have to survive; to survive, he has to be this package.

You've got somebody who's convinced that he could not survive as himself or experience as himself. He has to be something else in order to experience; he has to be something else in order to survive; he has to be something else in order to live. And he is so sold on this idea of having to be something else in order to live, don't you see, that you haven't a chance until, all of a sudden, he realizes that he could live without it.

And of course his total game or his games condition is the "know-notknow," "have-can't-have," "be-don't-be," "do-don't-do," arrangements of this particular valence. And that's its relationship to some environment. And of course the tragedy of it is, it's usually measured up for an environment which no longer exists.

You get the boys going around . . . the Teddy boys, you know, or the Edwardian jackets, you know, that sort of thing. They think this is pretty good. They've got themselves all rigged up.

Now, you get the other crew that's going around these days in the slick motorcycle jackets . . . these leather motorcycle jackets, you see? They're all rigged up to live in space opera. Of course they're just

waiting. They're just waiting. Russia and the United States are going to have a ball sooner or later, and they're turning into space societies now, the like of which you never heard of, you know? Socialism. All these things are part of these: Balanced economy, slave dictatorships. And they're getting themselves all fixed up to be rocket jockeys. They're going around acting like they ought to act, you see, if the society were a space opera society. Well, they're getting familiar with it and they're getting in practice and that'll be a very good solution.

It's true too. You'll be able to put them in a spaceship and say, "All right, Arcturus or bust!" you see, and they bust.

And you'll see these various stratas with you right now as classes. You'll see whole classes of things.

I don't know what the girls of today are being, particularly. I haven't looked it over very thoroughly lately, but I will say this . . . I will say this, that the society has got practically every woman a bit out of arrangement, you see? Because here we had a perfectly nice society going along, which was an agrarian society, and its values . . . male, female, familial . . . they were all figured out, they were all taped, everybody knew where they stood, you see? Might have been rough, but everybody knew where they stood.

Now all of a sudden you have coeducation and "Girl sniper does for eighteen hundred Germans," you see? And what's she supposed to be doing? Well, she doesn't know. So she picks up all kinds of oddball valences of how women fit into other types and classes of society. And you find some real wild ones, you know? I mean not necessarily a wild girl but you find offbeat valences of various kinds or another.

And a woman tends even more so in a society which is in a state of flux and which hasn't instantly and immediately found a specific use or need for a woman at any given instant, such as an agrarian society where it was all comfortable, you see . . . everything was taped. Now you're in a society where it isn't all taped and the exact specific need for a woman isn't quite manifest. You know, she's supposed to get married; she's supposed to have children; she's supposed to work.

Now, wait a minute, let's see. She's supposed to work. Yeah, but she's supposed to work at home? No, not really. Where's she supposed to work? Well, she's supposed to work out and contribute her money to the family coffers. Aw, now wait a minute. Now wait a minute. This doesn't make sense. Now let's see, how can we figure this out?

Well, the girl goes half-balmy trying to figure this out and all of a sudden says, "Well, there's a much better solution, you see? I had a much better solution 1,266,000 years ago and a much better solution to the whole thing, you see? And that was to be a ballet dancer." Yeah, well, there's still uses for ballet dancers, that's for sure, you know? Well, there you go, that's the best thing

Only difficulty is she can't dance at this particular time and she's going to have to go several lifetimes grooving in, grooving in, grooving in. She'll eventually pick up a mock-up, then she'll be able to carry through this ambition. But right now it's on sleep, see? It isn't manifest, it doesn't solve the thing, therefore she's quite unhappy about it. Her now-I'm-supposed-to's get thrown aside so she then picks up a package of now-I'm-supposed-to's, you see, to get her out of situations which oddly enough she isn't in either. You get how the confusion merges and how it spins around.

All I'm trying to tell you is just that you've got to find and move valences in order to straighten out cases. You've got to do that. And you can't straighten out a case without moving a valence.

When you have moved a valence you have changed a profile. When you have not moved a valence, I don't know what you've done.

All right, let's look this over. How would you apply this directly? All right, fellow has a toothache. You don't say to him, "What valence would find a toothache profitable?" You could ask him that. But you could say . . . this is just a quick one, you see, "Who had a toothache?" That was the oldest one, 1950,

June. "Who had a toothache?" Bang, bang, bang. you remember several people who had toothaches and it tends to split the valence.

That is more valid than putting him in communication with the tooth in his head because that isn't his toothache. In the first place, this tooth can't ache without another tooth aching plastered on top of it in some kind of a mental image picture. Ah-ha! It can't ache, that's what's interesting, without another picture valence splattered on top of it. Got it? All right. We're going to say to this fellow. "All right now uhm. . ." He just keeps having this problem about cars; he just can't seem to keep a car. Every time he gets a car, why, somebody takes it away from him one way or the other, and so on. All right. You say, "When did you have difficulty with a car? When did cars have difficulty with you?"

Uh-uh. A car isn't really a valence. Could be. There's some engineers . . I've got an engineering firm. They're a very good engineering firm, and both the son who is about forty-something, and the old man who is close to seventy, talk to you. And when they start talking they start the motor. And they do. They say, "Rar-rar-rar." That's right. Well, Peter . . he's heard them over the phone. Yeah, they say, "Rar-rar-rar." And both of them have been to the hospital for repairs lately.

So, we might . . we might get someplace unexpectedly on this subject of a car because it might, itself, be a kind of a valence, you know? But we say, "When did you have difficulty with a car?" and, "When did cars have difficulty with you?" Well, if it was a valence it would work, but it would be much more profitable to say, "Who would have difficulty with cars?" See, "Who would have difficulty with cars?" "Who would have difficulty with cars?" "Describe a person that would have difficulty with cars," you know? Process

it right there at "Be." And all of a sudden, you'd find a fantastic thing.

All right, I'll give you the right and wrong one again, here, that's a little plainer. You say, "When have you hidden? Thank . . ." This guy is . . we find him on "hide" and we say, "When have you hidden? When have you hidden? When have you hidden? When have you hidden? When have you hidden?" Yeah, you get some kind of a result and you have a lot of somatics, and so forth. And he comes back the next day and he's got the same somatic, the same package. So we say, "When have you hidden? When have you hidden? When have you hidden?" Same somatics, same package, the next day. You, well, you're processing a valence, see? He isn't there to be processed, practically. You see, he's overwhumped in some kind of a valence and the valence is supposed to hide.

And you'd say, "Who would find it necessary to hide?" "Who would find it necessary to hide?" "From what confusion would who hide?" You know? That's an awful tough one, it's a divided split-double-question. But . . it wouldn't ordinarily be used . . but that's what you're trying to find out. you know?

"Who would try to hide from what confusion?" "Think of somebody who is always hiding." "Who else would be always hiding?" "Think of a person who hides." Because that valence has got the confusion, he hasn't got it. But you could double it in brass and you would produce probably more bombastic results. You would be processing the condition in which the fellow found himself, and so forth.

You could go at it this way. you could say, "What beingness would be a Food solution for an environment where it couldn't be? What beingness would be a good solution for a tough environment?" . . better one. We had this a long time ago. We had "Who would survive what?" you know, that sort of thing. Process your who's; process your valences.

All right, now let's get a little bit further and let's go upstairs a little more into the high school aspects of the thing.

Got a guy with a toothache. All right, you're going to cure this toothache. You'd say, "Who would want to cure a toothache?" And you do an assessment on terminals. You'd say, "Who would have a toothache?" "Who would want to cure a toothache?" "Who would have a toothache?" "Who would want to cure a toothache?" "Who would have a toothache?" "Who would want to cure a toothache?"

He's given you the goal. He's got a toothache and he wants it cured. You've got your goal. So your goal is understood so you're jumping right off from there. But make sure he wants to cure this toothache, you know? And you just run two sides of it and do a terminal assessment on the thing.

It might not last to a terminal. The thing . . . whole thing might blow before you got a terminal, do you see? "Who would have a toothache?" "Who would cure a toothache?" Cause-Effect line of the goal.

You get a whole terminals list on the thing: Don't be a bit surprised if it's blown. But if one of them doesn't blow, you've got it . . . you've got the valence. You've got it right there, bongo! bongo! and it's a real stuck valence.

So open up with your Prehav Scale and you do an assessment on that valence and you run it at that level of the Prehav Scale, not even bothering to mention the toothache again. You see?

You're not now running the Prehav Scale against a tooth. See, you're running the Prehav Scale right directly and immediately against the terminal you've found. So what did you do? You did a Routine 3 operation to do an assist.

Now, if you can see that a Routine 3 operation can operate as an assist and is workable as an assist, your faith and ability in doing Goals Assessments, of course, would increase enormously, wouldn't it?

Now, if you can find a hidden standard on your pc . . . and this is quite a legitimate operation, having not to do with an assist: Having to do with a present time problem. You find a hidden standard on your pc. "What would have to happen in order to know that Scientology worked? What would have to happen in order to know this processing was working? What would have to happen?" Oh, you'd get a whole list of these things and you'd do an assessment on the thing. These are goals; these are present time problems. You assess them down, you find one that bongs real good and real hard, bangbang on the meter, you see? You take that one, take that one all by itself and there must be a goal of some kind associated with that particular hidden standard. And if it isn't inherently stated in the thing that fell, you're still going to have to get the terminals for it.

All right, let us say, well, he's got a shoulder ache and that's what it is, you know? And when the shoulder ache gets more, why, he knows he's getting worse; and when the shoulder ache gets less, why, he knows he is winning in auditing. And this is the standard he uses in order to measure his auditing . . . worse or better on the sore shoulder. Good.

All right. Well, you could still go at it on both ends, "Who could have it?" and "Who could cure it?" "Who would have it?" and "Who could cure it?" or "Who would cure it?" or "Who would try to cure it?" or "Who has it?" If you just did an assessment on "Who has it?" you would win. Or if you did an assessment on "Who would handle them?" you'd win. you see? Just get your list of terminals that have to do with sore shoulders if that's what fell.

All right, do your terminals assessment, move it over onto the Prehav Scale and you get the terminal, if the shoulder is still there, and run it on the Prehav Scale . . . with your rudiments in. you follow this? All right, there would be a method of handling a hidden standard. Right? Using this rule of handle the valence, don't handle the significances.

Now, I will say this as a final word here. For a long, long time I had the question: "Should you handle solids or significances? Should you handle conditions? Should you handle solids?" And I knew even last year that you had to handle solids. You'd better handle solids if you're really going to get anyplace.

But this was not the full picture. No, the picture is this: Do not handle the conditions of the valence, handle the valence. Now that, clear-cut and wellstated, you'll find is far more workable than conditions and solids because some conditions can appear to be solid. "Think" to somebody could be a black blob.

No, let's make it much more workable than this. Don't handle conditions of a valence. Don't audit at those things. Don't say, "Well, how could you cure a sor . . . shor . . . uh . . . a sore shoulder?" Boy, try to

say that one as an auditing command. And so forth and so on. "Now reach from the shoulder, withdraw . . ." Even though assists work and that sort of thing.

This is the limitation, by the way, of a Touch Assist . . . is explained to you right there. And you know how limited it is. Well, its limitations are the limitations of the valence. You're trying to cure a valence of some kind or another. It's the valence that's got a bad one, not the other. So the condition, the condition, the condition. No, because it's the condition of the valence.

In order to handle this thing, handle the valence. Handle the terminal. Handle the terminal. Always handle the terminal and you've got it. And this

thing will wrap up and I think you'll find this will hold true very, very nicely and very easily.

Now, that moves Prehav . . . a Prehav 13 sort of an activity right up into the limelight. The tremendous success you had on Failed Help by making a long list of terminals of everybody the person had ever known in this lifetime, and then assessing those down, and then running on the one that seemed to be the livest . . . Failed Help; is of course, simply expanded into this other area of you assess the terminal on the Prehav Scale and you . . . not just Failed Help . . . but you take any level of the Prehav Scale that this terminal falls on.

So you get Prehav 13, is an exceedingly profitable type of activity if you went right at it and did it hammer and tongs. You have a person make a list of everybody they have known in this lifetime. And then you go on and add to this list the way you would do a terminals assessment. And you just take everybody they've known. And then you assess that list to get the one that falls the most this time. Now, you don't assess it by elimination, you just assess it by the steepest and biggest reaction. You assess it by reaction of the needle.

And it turns out to be Mama or Grandpa or something of the sort. All right, don't pay much more attention to it. Doesn't matter if you miss. Take that particular terminal that you found by the greatest reaction and you move that particular terminal over into the Prehav Scale and assess that terminal on the Prehav Scale. Find out about Grandpa all up and down the Prehav Scale and you finally find that Grandpa is falling gorgeously on Failed Abandon. And then you run a five-way on Failed Abandon and you've got this thing pretty well set up.

Now, that was the original Prehav 13. Of course, you don't run any twenty-minute rule with Prehav 13. You run the needle quiet, and the tone arm doesn't seem to be moving too much, and you run the needle quiet. But it's just a little . . . very short period of time that you observe it. Do you see? And then go over and take off another one. Take another terminal and assess this . . . this lifetime terminals for the now livest terminal and run it on the Prehav Scale. Assess it on the Prehav Scale. Do you follow? And as soon as you've got this set up, run it and promptly get the charge off of that one.

And all you're trying to do is take charge off of these terminals, one after the other, and you'll find your pc will make a tremendous jump.

Now, a pc who has always got the rudiments out should probably be run for a while on Prehav 13, because you're running valences. You're running valences pure and simple. These are the people they're tangled with up and down the track.

Now, you'll find some of those are pretty tangled. And some of those might require a session or two to run, but the pc will emerge at the other end of this thing feeling much better, always . . . consistently and continually.

Now, when you're trying to clean an auditor off, you use this same procedure. You take all the auditors the fellow ever had, do a Prehav 13 type of assessment, get the auditor that falls the most, move him over onto the Prehav Scale, get the idea? And then you run that level flat and you take the next auditor and . . . any way you wanted to go about it like this.

You could take any Scientology personnel or any people in Scientology and make a list and run it the same way. you have another type of action, and it'd be very beneficial. You'd get all this . . . That, by the way, is how you would get off all the auditing a fellow ever had. And also, if you used all

Scientology persons, you'd get off all the auditing he d ever given, too. See? Not that you'd get them both off. That's for sure. It's an interesting thing.

A fellow could have been run on a thousand processes and all of them wrong and this rather short . . short activity knocks out all the auditing he ever had. Leaves him with the gains and takes away all the losses. Interesting thing to know, isn't it? If you do it by valences.

So, just look at this as a valid activity: That anything you can do by valences is going to get you someplace and things you can't do by valences won't get you anyplace. If you want lasting gains, do it by valences.

All right now, goals . . goals. You can run lots of goals on a pc, one way or the other. And I'm sure you can find goals on a pc, left and right. But if you just ran goals, goals, goals, goals, goals, for weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks and weeks without finding any kind of a goal at all, you'd never get a crack at the valences. You only want the goal to get you into valences. See?

Now, you could probably do an entirely different type of Goals Assessment. You could just take a list of the fellow's goals and find . . do a valence assessment for each goal. Then check the goal and it's blown up. And that would be auditing by assessment.

Do you see how you'd do that? You'd just take a list; he gives you forty goals; you say, "Fine." You run down the thing; you find one of those things is hot. Well, let's do a terminals assessment on it right now. We don't bother to erase it. Just do a terminals assessment. Well, the thing is going to blow up on a terminals assessment. You'll probably never get to the Prehav Scale with it.

If you just took goal after goal, find out "Who would do that?" and "Who would it be done to?" and so on; and just shook down all the terminals and got him to remembering people this way and that; and got the valences all stirred up on the thing, even a minor goal would produce a considerable case change, don't you see?

So he's got this silly goal, well, "To eat my dinner better." All right. Almost starting from the first goal that he gave you on the list, say, "Who would eat their dinner better?" and "Who would force somebody to eat their dinner better?" You know, something like this. And you get a list of those people, you know, and you'll find out that goal . . that goal is cleaned up, man. That cleaned up slicker than any platter he ever cleaned. Got the idea? There would be a different way of attacking this.

Until you've got a clear-cut idea in your own mind of exactly what the put-together is . . exactly what the put-together is in the mind . . the put-together is a very simple thing. The fellow found himself to be inadequate. That must have meant that he was in some kind of an environment which was horrifying to him. So he adopted a beingness of some kind or another to get him out of it or to be something else, don't you see? This is going on. But he also had a goal to get him out of it.

So he went out of it with a goal and he went out of it with a beingness . . sort of a double action was going on here. Now, he doesn't want to go back into that again and he'd just better not ever go into it again. So, of course, you start picking up goals and you start picking up terminals, and you pick up goals and you pick up terminals. Well, you get all of his escape points and he has to look at them sooner or later. He has to see how he got started along this particular . . was going. He starts as-ising bank like mad. Right?

All right, I'll give you one more thing, one more thing here, and that is you can always put a Not-Know bracket after a Know bracket on the Prehav Scale.

You've got a five-way bracket and it has to do with Grandpa . . a grandfather leaving. Well, now find out on five different legs what isn't known about Grandfather's leaving, you got the idea? So that you run the five Know, the five Not-Know. And that'll just about treble your speed of run.

Now, the mechanism by which people used to be able to recall on ARC Straightwire . . and then they'd recall the same incidents over and over again and then they'd never get any further than this . . they . . you know . . they'd just recall those same cycles of incidents and no new incidents would turn up and you were whipped. Well actually, what was standing in their road was the not-know . . the not-know. What did they not know about this particular thing, you see?

So if you were to have added Not-Know on any Recall Process of any kind whatsoever, you'd have plowed out more track. Simple?

"Well, let's see," you'd say, "With whom have you communicated?" or "Recall a time you communicated." And then, "What don't you know about having communicated?" or "What communication don't you know about?" And you'd find out that your ARC Straightwire would not then cycle on the same span of track. It'd be more and more track, and more and more and more and more and more and more and more and more, as long as you were running Not-Know alongside of the Know. Right?

So we look over this, then, we find out that we could as easily put in Not-Know or some version of Not-Know in every command bracket, five for five . . run the Know's, run the Not-Know's. And you'll plow more and more track, more and more track, more and more track and speed the run.

Give you a model of that sort of thing: Well, it's just "What don't you know about Grandfather leaving? What wouldn't you know about a grandfather leaving?" or "What haven't you known?" or any way it works out on your command sheet. Get the idea?

Those commands . . package commands are very unsafe. It's very unsafe to run an exact package command with no check for the pc against the E-Meter. You should always clear your commands against the E-Meter and find out if they're all live and all answerable before you settle down for any kind of a run. Okay?

Well, now, you have tomorrow and a whole weekend in order to digest all this and after you've digested it, probably somebody will change your valence and probably it was only the valence remembering, so thank you.