AUDITING BASICS

A lecture given on
23 August 1961

How you doing? How you doing?

Audience: Okay. Fine.

You all dead today . . I mean, all alive today?

Twenty-third, huh? 23 Aug., AD 11.

Well, I'm glad you made it. I didn't think you'd ever get to August the 23rd.

Back there in the Roman Empire I was damn sure you wouldn't get here! And I remember one space-opera society when I didn't think it was very probable that you'd make it. I remember standing there at the edge of the spaceport as the battle planes took off, and I said, "Well, they won't make it." I knew, you see, I knew the high command hadn't given you any ammunition.

Well anyhow . . anyhow, you're in the midst of clearing And your first takeoff on this subject has already occurred. And I've been talking about it for years . . talking about it for a long time, everybody coming along and saying, "Where's the Clears? Where's the Clears? Where's the Clears?" Very embarrassing, you see. Central Organization pcs flying over banisters you know, and hung up by their heels you know, and being sup . . people pouring cornstarch into them so they looked like they were standing up stiff, you know.

And "Where are the Clears? Where are the Clears? Where are the Clears? Where are the Clears?" I never got so tired of a sentence in my life! Now, I'll tell you my withhold. "Well instead of sitting . . standing there, asking me silly questions, why the hell don't you find out?" You know, I mean, kind of forthright. But that's kind of the way it was.

Because it's very mysterious over a long period of time as to what were the elements missing. What were the missing elements? What brought about this condition where people didn't get cleared? And now I realize that we might have had . . well, have had dozens and dozens of clearing processes. That's why I've been studying, you see, for some years, auditing. Been studying auditing.

There's been a parallel study: The theory and practice of Scientology has included, of course, theory, experimental results and that sort of thing, but this other study . . a big broad one . . is auditing just as such. And I just sort of relaxed a few years ago and just started watching, looking it over and seeing what this was all about, and looking at it from all sides and "What were people doing with people?"

You see, it isn't good enough that I can take somebody and audit them and get some horrendous result and so forth, and everything is fine, because you run out of me rather rapidly. In the first place, it interrupts my photography. And, you know, frankly, you can only put in so many hours a day; figure out the number of human beings on Earth, and it gets to be some very disproportionate figure, doesn't it?

Group auditing, well, matter of fact, that comes close to blowing a lot of cases apart with group auditing, you know, but it still didn't make any total grade and there still weren't any Clears on a group auditing basis so it had to fall back on individual auditing.

Well, what happens in individual auditing that makes it fail to result in clearing And our biggest single breakthrough on this . . of course, aside from all the technology we have on how to audit . . the biggest single breakthrough on this is simply that the goal disappears and the terminal disappears if the rudiments are out. And that is . . becomes one of these crusher things, like when you pull the trigger on a guillotine, why, the blade falls, you know? And it's one of these facts that stand up there and . . twice as big as the

Empire State Building with three Washington Monuments on top of it, you know. I mean, it's a Fact! with an exclamation point and a capital "F." You can't do it.

Now, if that is the case, why do pcs get audited with the rudiments out? Let's take a look at that. Let's be very dispassionate about all this.

Why these four little simple rudiments? How come? And we find something very interesting when we look there. We find something very, very interesting. They aren't considered to be important. See, the level of importance of getting those rudiments in is slight.

Now the auditors . . . Our first Clear here, and one of her first clear observations is the fact that auditors thought of Security Checks as something you got through with luckily because nothing dropped. Duuhh! See.

So Security Check isn't looked at as something that will advance a case. It is looked at as something that has to be gotten through with and the faster we get through a Security Check, of course, the more time we can put on auditing. And I think rudiments fall into the same category . . the same identical category.

Rudiments are a necessary evil, and if we can just get through the rudiments without anything dropping, why, wham! whiz! everything is fine now, because of course if we spent any time on the rudiments, why, it'd just be time lost from auditing. Interesting! But I think that is the basic consideration. Do you agree that it's just kind of a . . it'd be too bad if you had to take up a lot of PT problems and ARC breaks and things of this character, because you wouldn't get any auditing done in the session.

See, it's an unlucky thing. It's just an auditor sits down in the beginning of the session and he puts the cans in the pc's hands and sometimes he has lucky days. Sometimes the pc has no PTPs, ARC breaks, withholds or anything of the sort, and he can get on to auditing. And sometimes he has unlucky days and the pc has present time problems and so forth, and he has to take these things up. Isn't that kind of the way it's looked at?

Well, I think that's about the first consideration we have to shift. Now, it looks like the rudiment is out mostly on the evaluation of importance of the rudiment. Now, I gave you a series of rules that if the rudiment didn't fall with the meter set at a third-of-a-dial drop, why, then you could neglect it.

Well, that was in sort of desperation because everything was going awry, and so forth. And I'm going to exercise my privilege of having created it to as-is it. And let's go to the other extreme, Aristotelian. He had a pendulum, you know. And the world was all described as swinging on a pendulum and it went between the two extremes before it settled at the mean. So we might as well go over to the far side of the pendulum and run the whole thing at sensitivity 16. Just for kicks, try it. Because the rules I just gave you yesterday basically take care of these rudiments being wildly out.

The materials I gave you on the 22nd, which just simply consisted of what you did if you consistently had too many present time problems . . you did 1A. If present time problems is the trouble and if you were getting lots of ARC breaks, same remedy. Let's get 1A flat on this case. Got the idea? So, that gave you a good way to approach the whole situation and didn't leave you messed up with doing nothing but rudiments.

Now, I think that this is one of the difficulties with rudiments, that the rudiments processes don't work well. I think that is one of the basics . . difficulties with rudiments . . is the processes which are given in Model Session are tailor-made as a highly generalized shot at an awful lot of cases and I think they miss cases often enough so that auditors become impatient with these particular processes. And there are pcs who cannot run responsibility, so running responsibility on a present time problem is a waste of time. And it just takes you forever to clean up the present time problem running responsibility on it, so you say, "Oh my God, he's got a present time problem. I'll be sitting here running this responsibility, and the pc can't run responsibility." So there's a hell of a present time problem arises around the present time problem, you see? And that makes a rough show.

So, it must be . . a certain dissatisfaction must exist around the processes, which are given in Model Session and which we've had for some time . . must be a dissatisfaction with those. Otherwise you wouldn't feel such a strain on the subject of handling rudiments.

Now, there are several constants in auditing sessions and these constants are this . . are these. And you've got an awful lot of rules and you could be terribly rule-happy. You know, you could just be ritual-happy until you can't see where you're going. But there are few out of all of these rules (and there could be said to be hundreds of them) . . out of all of these there are very few of them which have any real bearing on the subject of auditing. And I can give you those very, very rapidly; run them straight off. I already gave them to you, I think, yesterday. I can give you possibly a slightly varied version of it, but just because I play it off the cuff.

And that is, you've got to start a session and get the pc in-session, and you've got to get all your rudiments in, and you've got to flatten all the processes you start, and you've got to end the session. And that's just about the lot. And the errors you can make with this are most flagrantly failing to get the rudiments in, running too many processes without flattening them, and failing to end session smoothly. And those are the failures that go along with this. And if you don't manage that little small basketful of tricks, of course you're going to have an awful time of it.

Now, you can get particularized and say, "Well you've got to have your TRs well." That's for sure! That's for sure! But that almost goes without saying, that a fellow who is an auditor would have his TRs in some kind of shape, don't you see.

Now, to this we can add this interesting observation (just to show you how particularized we can get): For a pc to be in communication with the auditor, it is necessary for the auditor to be in communication with the pc. There is some added factor here and that is added into in-sessionness. You see, the pc has to feel he is in communication or able to talk to the auditor.

Well, let's broaden this. Able to talk to the auditor, able to be in communication with the auditor. Let's spread it a little bit further, and an auditor who would give invalidative comments or who would fail to articulate an auditing command, so that he couldn't be understood and so forth, is knocking the pc out of session. Get the idea? Because the pc's understanding of what the auditor is saying drops. Therefore, the pc's understanding of what the auditor is doing drops. So therefore, the ARC drops, and the auditor finds a pc going out of session. On what? On himself not being in session. You see? So the auditor's got to be there, giving an auditing session, before you can expect the pc to be in-session. And that sums it up. Part of in-sessionness for the pc is for the auditor to be giving a session.

So we can add, in a masterfully way here, one third line to the pc being in-session. One, he's got to . . the pc has to be interested in his own case, and he has to be willing to talk to the auditor . . we can still say it the same way . . but the auditor has to be giving a session. And that is in-session.

Now, what is . . what consists of an auditor giving a session? Actually it's an auditor sitting down to run the session. The auditor sits down and runs a session. Now, he can run an awfully haphazard-sounding session and there'd be no doubt in the pc's mind whatsoever about who was running the session, and you'd get an awful lot of auditing done, wouldn't you? There'd be an awful lot of auditing occur on that. There might be a lot of rules violated one way or the other; but the rules I've just given you can't be violated. The second you violate those, you've got no auditing session whatsoever.

So it isn't how you hold your pinky, it's how you hold your pc in-session. And of course the best way to hold a pc in-session is by giving one. That sounds like one of these horrible, horrible simplicities. There's a whole tribe of Indians that I've commented often and their wisdom . . their wisdom, read off their . . actually, out of the books of the missionaries who were so interested in them, way up the Hudson someplace or the Saint Lawrence or somewhere. You know, "The way to cross the river is to cross the river." "The way to eat duck is to eat duck," you see. And their wisdom just ran on like this and it actually filled up numerous pictographs on numerous wigwams and has come down to us in the numerous pages of numerous long-since-murdered missionaries. Bunch of it up here in the Hudson Bay Company archives. "The way to cross a river is to cross the river." "The way to eat a duck is to eat a duck," or "The

way to shoot somebody is to shoot somebody." This was a very Q-and-A sort of wisdom. But in this particular case it sure fits. The way to run a session is run the session . . rather a thing.

Now, to tell somebody how to run a session has its limitations. And the limitations are these: How much disagreement is there on the part of the auditor with the forms and actions he is using to run the session? And that should be a subject taken up in a HPA Course, and that should be one of the subjects, and we will institute it in HPA Courses. After the fellow . . you know, it's HCA, but it's HPA. Never heard it called anything else in the early days in England. Always has stuck with me as being . . it's rather nostalgic to me, as a matter of fact. We had quite a few in the old days . . we had quite a few cockneys and so forth around the organization. It was marvelous to hear them, you know. you could remember some of them.

Anyway, it would be simply this. We'll probably write up some sort of a drill or some sort of a test. I've got a couple of them to get together, and this would be the second one. The other one is a straight Security Check that out-rates this 7A, 7B. I haven't written them finally yet. I've got the notes on them is all. And that is simply this: is after the fellow is all set up, and knows . . has been jumped through the TRs and has been given rudiments and Model Session and that sort of thing, and he's supposed to sit in there and pitch and deliver this, you see. Now we're going to take an E-Meter and we're going to find out what disagreements he has with these elements. Good idea, isn't it?

He must have some disagreements with them, he won't do them, or he must have some basic ARC breaks with some part of the modus operandi. And of course, I've enumerated a couple of practical aspects of this. Some Says you can get some auditing in and some days you run rudiments . . the lucky and unlucky aspects of it. But the dissatisfaction must stem from the fact that rudiments processes do not easily handle the situation which you Find in the rudiments. So that would make it kind of tough to handle rudiments. So there must be some kind of a disagreement with handling rudiments. But there might be some more fundamental disagreement than this, such as, "Well, he shouldn't have to be audited." That would be an awfully sweeping disagreement with the whole thing, you see. This expresses itself in numerous ways, such as, "A pc shouldn't act that way."

In Upper Indoc drills . . we have had the remark made in an Upper Indoc . . I was running one ACC when the remark was made "Pcs never act this way." Little did she know! She, by the way, ran slam-bang into a pc, abruptly and immediately afterwards, who did act that way. And was she surprised! She thought that we were running Upper Indoc much too rough, don't you see. So she was in basic disagreement with this much roughness in an Upper Indoc, because "pcs didn't act that way."

Now, that's a very fundamental disagreement and yet it works this way: that you, using the elements of auditing, could take anybody, and I do mean anybody, and by running them with the rudiments out produce a confused, ARC breaky pc. you could make anybody into an ARC breaky pc, that I'm very sure of, just by running with rudiments out. Now, if you don't run an ARC breaky pc, you're liable to run down into a propitiative pc. So don't look for just violence. How about propitiation? You run with rudiments out, you get propitiation.

Now, I'm about to send a cable after the lecture here to . . it'll be a very historically noteworthy cable . . I'm about to send it to a certain area and say, "So-and-so is expected at Saint Hill for training." This will be a vast shock to one and all, because everybody insists that this so-and-so is a very fine auditor, and he's not. He's not. Because I've had the unfortunate experience of meeting some of his pcs, and they've just been beaten with out-rudiments into a heavy propitiation with regard to this particular chap. And they all look caved in. He's not making any Clears and he's having a heck of a time with auditing, but everybody says he's a marvelous auditor. You got the idea? We're getting a lot of advertisement going on here. So I'm going to send a cable and say send him in here. And we'll get him over this trick and he'll be a good auditor.

But there will be some wild impatience with rudiments or the mechanics of auditing. And I know already that this particular auditor never flattens a process . . never. I mean it's almost a modus operandi; never flattens a process . . never! And this leaves everybody stuck on the track, you see. So that's a bum show, and just for the good of the game, why, I'll send a cable. Now, I'm not bringing that up for any other

reason but to show you here's somebody who never has an ARC breaky pc because dead men can't protest.

This guy, you see, the fellow says, "I have a present time problem". And the auditor just comes down on him with a horrible crush and a crash and so forth and bowls it through. And the pc says, "Well, I don't really like being bowled through." And the auditor knocks that out of the road, you see. And then he says, "I have a . . .." pc says, "Well, I do have a little bit of a withhold." And the auditor says, "Well, that's not important to the session." And if he runs any rudiments at all that's about the net result of it, you see. And the and product is not an ARC breaky pc, but a highly propitiative pc, you see. So you see, you could go in the other direction too. And of course the guy has to come up through all that auditing . . that's easy to do too, but . . in order to go anyplace. You see how it could work?

So the rudiments could be out and you could produce several different phenomena, which I won't bother to list, by having the rudiments out during session. So a disagreement with the rudiments or a difficulty in handling rudiments or an actual technical lack in the field of rudiments then could produce a considerable bit of randomity. It could prevent clearing; it could upset things; it could prevent case advances and make Scientology fail in all directions. See how that could be?

So we'll shape this up. Now we've already had a breakthrough and the key rudiment is the present time problem. That is the key rudiment. This is a sneaky one, because it very often doesn't fall on first inspection. You say, "Do you have a problem?" Fellow has a very immediate present time problem, you get your instant fall. But you ask him if he has a present time problem, and classification and dispersal and "It must be something else," and that sort of thing enters into it, you see, and it isn't even reactively in view. He has no reality on his migraine headaches being a present time problem to him. you audit him a little bit, and 30 forth, and you suddenly are facing a long duration present time problem that wasn't really there before.

And on a little inspection of present time problems as you go along, you suddenly start finding out why this case hasn't been snapping and popping. It's because he's just getting a reality on the fact that he does have a problem. And this other factor enters in and this is an interesting factor. This is probably a sneak limiting factor on all cases. The pc goes into action by reason of auditing, and being now in motion on this planet, accumulates problems, and is now being audited with present time problems. Do you get the idea?

Audience: Mm-hm.

All right, sitting there quietly in the corner like a mushroom, he didn't accumulate any present time problems. You audit him, he gets up a little bit, he goes into motion in the society and you have a universe absolutely triggered up to furnish more problems than you can easily count. He gets a whole bunch of problems, and then his continued auditing, then, is auditing against these new present time problems and so he doesn't continue to make a case gain and you get into a grind.

In other words, all the auditing benefit he got was enough auditing benefit to pull him up into action. And I've noticed it now for about thirteen, fourteen years, that one of the primary characteristics of a case gain is the person going into action.

See, I've tried this business of just sitting in an ivory tower and processing people endlessly. Didn't work well, because I kept losing everybody. See, they didn't think there was any game, and there was nothing doing, and it was just Ron, he was supposed to do these things and he did them. And then they went out and they got into action, and they'd go over the hills and far away.

And I'd very often run into a case that I couldn't complete. Fellow was now too interested in life and he was getting going in all directions and so forth. Well, it's just as well that I didn't continue to pressure auditing as far as that particular person was concerned, because I would have been auditing uphill against all these brand-new accumulated present time problems, don't you see.

But where you continue to audit somebody who has gone into motion in life, you are probably auditing up against new present time problems. So the cycle that you could expect on present time problems is, as

the case went along, he would get more, not less. you could expect as auditing continued, if it were being successful, to run into not just more and more withholds . . which you know he comes up to the responsibility of knowing he's withholding . . but this other thing: he accumulates and has in a session, more and more present time problems to handle.

So you're liable to get some cyclic aspect. You're liable to get a cyclic aspect of a pc who is relatively ARC breaky, and it would look like this: You audit him up the line and then he goes into action and he gets a lot of new problems, see. And then we have some ARC breaks of some kind or another and his auditing ceases. And then these settle out, don't you see. And he gets . . and then we audit him again and at the time we pick him up for auditing, why, he doesn't have many problems because he's not doing much, you see. And then he moves up into a bunch of present time problems and then he ARC breaks, and then we get all ARC busted in the sessions, and then he knocks off auditing, don't you see. Only he's not crawling up three inches and falling back one, he's crawling up two inches and falling back two inches, and crawling up two inches and falling back two inches, just endlessly, you see. This would be the way it would be. So that is probably the sneak limiting factor on cases. That's a sneaker.

It is your very auditing gain which brings the pc new present time problems, because going into motion of course in this universe, he accumulates more present time problems if he is in motion. He was all right as a vegetable; he didn't have any. It's true too! He didn't have one!

We've run into somebody who was on a pension or who was getting a disability payment. And if we'd cured the disability payment he would have had problems, you see. So we cured the disability payment and then all of a sudden we had an ARC breaky pc and we'd lose him as a pc. you see, it looked like because we'd gotten rid of his pension, you know, he was upset with us, or that he wouldn't give up his bad heart, or something, because this'd mean he'd give up his pension, or something. So auditing sort of stalled there someplace.

Well, actually he had everything taped. Here's what really happened. He had everything taped. Life was absolutely by the square, diagonal, and perfect circle. You see, at the first of every month he drew a check and he went home and read the comic books, or whatever he did, you see. And this was all that ever happened. All that ever happened. He just went through this cycle. And now all of a sudden, why, we move him up the line, he goes into a little more action, and as he goes by the comic bookstand, he makes . . a triangle is put into his life, you see, he walks by some girl's house and sees her. That's guaranteed to give him problems!

And then because we've been running a quiet preclear who didn't have any problems, we then, of course, don't expect to have a pc who does have any problems. So we are a little bit taken by surprise. So therefore, we are lulled into not looking for them. So a little datum for you, as you go by. Probably you . . not a surgingly important datum, but one that's well worth noting is, as auditing progresses there are two tests of progress, independent of all other tests, which an auditor can note. Does the pc have an increasing number of withholds? Does he have new withholds on the Security Check? That's a very good test.

If you give your pc a Security Check and you went through it all very, very nicely, even though it took quite a time, and there were . . oh, seventy-five percent of the questions had no fall on them. And then you gave him another Security Check and seventy-five percent of the questions had no fall an them. And you gave him another Security Check and he had no withholds of any kind, watch it, because this boy is not getting better. Betterment is represented by increased responsibility, which brings about new withholds. And what you should finally work up to on a Form 3, really, is every question live, particularly the way you're running them now. you see, they go on the whole track.

You mean to tell me . . do you mean to tell me . . are you actually willing to sit there and tell me that in the last two hundred trillion years you have never committed any single one . . or is there one of the crimes, see, that you haven't committed that is listed on the Security Check, you see? Well, I doubt it. I doubt it. I'll go into doubt for you about that.

And the other one is, an increasing number of present time problems which have to be handled at the beginning of session. Those are the two: Increasing liveness of response to a Security Check and increasing liveness of response to the question, "Do you have a present time problem?"

Now, there is another factor which mitigates the horrors of that exact situation. And that is as the pc increases his ability, he blows these things faster. So although you have more by maybe triple, you have less time being occupied because it only takes a quarter as long to clear them, you see. So if he's making progress at all, they clear faster. So that would be another little cross-check. He has more present time problems, he has more withholds, and they clear up faster.

And if that isn't happening to your pc as you audit him, then you're probably auditing a pc with the rudiments really wildly out. There is something wildly wrong in this auditing session, and the most wildly wrong thing there can be is just wildly out-rudiments. Simple. Rudiments aren't in. Pc isn't making progress . . rudiments aren't in.

You're dealing with processes today which can only be stopped by the rudiments. And the only thing that could happen is that the rudiments aren't in, that's all, or the pc didn't report for the session, or the auditor isn't giving one.

Now, on the general subject of auditing, an auditor who expects the pc to be doing something besides being a pc, of course, is inevitably in trouble. If you expect something else of the pc besides pc-ing, you of course, are in trouble. It's like auditing somebody who is supposed to be doing the cooking at the same time, you see. And you have to . . this is an odd beingness to grant and it sounds very difficult. It sounds very . . doesn't sound difficult, it sounds Simple Simon to say that this is a beingness that has to be granted.

But an auditor, in running a session, has as one of its essential parts, granting pc beingness to the pc. you know, the auditor is not willing to have a pc so much as the auditor is willing for a pc to be sitting there, you see. Willing to make no demand on the person sitting opposite him beyond that of being a pc. And if you check it over you find out some auditing difficulties you've had in the past very possibly may trace to an expectancy of the pc being something else beside a pc.

Now, all a pc is supposed to do . . there isn't any such thing as laying down a code for a pc because he's just a pc, but actually what does a pc do? Well, a pc does the session which the auditor is auditing You see, he does the session. He does what the auditor says, and he answers what the auditor says, and so forth. This is what the auditor expects of him. We're not laying restrictions on the pc. But this is what you as an auditor expect of the pc; that he follow your auditing commands, that he do the things which you said, that he furnish the information which is required of him. That's what you're demanding of him.

Now, if you grant this beingness of being a pc to the pc, and that is all you expect him to do, why, you will find out that your auditing enormously simplifies. Because you, then, don't expect him to volunteer information, or be a walking encyclopedia of something or other, or tell you if something is going wrong, or something. This is nothing. This is no part of his bargain. It's not up to him to tell you this thing is going wrong. You see, that's up to you. It's up to you to find it out. You've got a meter and you've got your pair of eyes and your observation and the pc, types of answers. You've got innumerable ways to find out. But it isn't up to him and there is no rule anyplace that says he has to tell you what to do. Nor is there any rule of telling you what is happening, unless you ask for it.

In other words, it's just grant the beingness of being a pc to the pc, and he's sitting there being a pc, and that's it. you don't expect anything else of this pc but to answer your questions and to furnish information, that is, answer the questions and follow the auditing commands and stay there in-session and do what you say. That's all you expect of the pc. Now, if that's all the beingness which you're granting, and that's all you expect of the pc, you see at once that it is necessary for you to find out what's going on, because there's no responsibility on the pc's part to tell you what's going on. Got the idea?

I notice you're looking at me a little puzzled, but I think that's because you're not puzzled, you're just digesting a fact. I wonder if you've ever expected a pc to be something else beside a pc. At any time have you looked to a pc to be anything else but a pc, while being a pc from the beginning to the end of the

session? Because if you have, I will guarantee that at that point your session broke down. In some mysterious way it would break down.

Now, Scientologists are very prone . . understandably, and nothing wrong with this at all; me too . . prone to run a big ought-to-be. Well, run an ought-to-be on anything under the sun, moon or stars. Run it on the revolutions of planets, the evolutions, so-called, of governments, or anything else. Run any kind of an ought-to-be you want to, except in an auditing session. See, just delete that ought-to-be out of the auditing session and you'll be much happier.

I know, because . . I know this personally, you see, because you run a horrendous big ought-to-be on me. I'm the most ought-to-be'd character. It's marvelous! It's absolutely marvelous! And I'll tell you, if I was no saint, you're going to make me into one!

Anyway, an ought-to-be actually doesn't belong in any part of the auditing session. It's like the Upper Indoc student who was saying, "Well, pcs don't act like that, so therefore, I shouldn't be doing this wrastling around the floor," don't you see. Well, a certain feeling like that could get into a session, you know. There are your horrified aspects. Sometime some pc comes up with a string of withholds that would lift the hair of a priest, you know, with all they listen to. And "Coo!" you know, you say.

Well, you're actually running an ought-to-be. You say, "This person ought to be a well-disciplined, well-behaved person, and should have been well disciplined and well behaved for the last two hundred trillion years." Well, if that's the case, how the hell did they get in the pc's chair? And this ought-to-be is joined up with a "probably-is". It's not only an ought-to-be, but there's also a probably-is. You have a supposition about this pc and then you operate on that supposition. And this supposition, of course, is liable to find you way out in left field, or it's liable to find you sailing without sails in the middle of the Antarctic. You're not quite sure what happened to you or how you got there.

Give you an example: Perhaps, two weeks of auditing were wasted on a course once, on a dear lady who was the most disarming-looking probably-is you ever saw. she was a real probably-is, you know. Because she looked like a dear, sweet, unassuming lady, just the very kind that you would cast for 'Aunt Mary" in some super-saccharin play of 1900, you know? Just marvelous! The most marvelous casting you ever saw in your life, you know. And everybody for two weeks audited her that way. And it just never occurred to ask her for any blood and guts. Most marvelous thing you ever saw.

And when the curtains finally fell on this particular case, an auditor had just simply become sharp enough to go past the probably-is, you see. And instead of buying this mock-up complete as a package, noticed that all of the efforts to get this person to improve in any way, shape or form were all failing, so there must be something else there, and began to really sweat over this case. I think Mary Sue was behind this push.

Get some of the withholds off and, of course, this dear, sweet, perfect casting for Aunt Mary had made a specialty for the last fifty years of stealing everyone's husband that could possibly be stolen, and engaging in nothing per se but flat-out adultery in all directions. And there are probably something on the order of four hundred different incidents of this particular character on this case. It's marvelous! When they finally got that Security Check going, man, it went like a prairie fire! This read like something 'Bouncing Betty the Gun Moll," you know?

And I remember another one in an HGC one time, and they had looked in vain . . this was when we were doing dynamic assessments . . and they'd looked in vain for any kind of a terminal on this lady. And she was dear and she was sweet and she was everything, but she was a rough, tough space commander. And that was her valence. And for some reason or other when people get into the position of the loneliness of space, they tend to keep the valences. Because of the coldness of space, and that sort of thing. But how about the loneliness of space, and then the isolation of command added in on top of this, you see. And that really makes a honey!

But everything about this case belied this valence. There couldn't possibly have been any such valence of any character whatsoever. So nobody Looked for it. And I'm sure she must have said it. I'm sure that meters must have said it. But nobody could believe it. Don't you see? This was a rough, tough, blood-

and-guts, bucko master, you know. Why, she probably made Captain Bligh look like a patsy! But the only role any auditor could see her in would be making cookies for the kiddies in the neighborhood, you know? So they just bought the mock-up and never asked for anything else.

Well, I'll tell you, if the mock-up is factual, and the case isn't advancing, don't blame Scientology, just blame the estimate of the situation. This (quote) factual presentation must have some fantastic unknowns concerning it which must be in wild disagreement.

Now, for instance, I'll give you an idea here m technology, how wild a wild disagreement can fail to resolve things. Jealousy immediately and at once must have to do with the terminals of men and women. Because men and women are jealous, obviously, so if we run men and women we solve jealousy. That's for sure. Only it won't. So it must be something else.

Cases resolve on the isness of the case. No matter how hidden it is, it's still the isness of the case, not the might-be's, ought-to-be's or probably-is's. See, it's the isness of the case. And the isness of the case must be totally unknown to one and all, if it fails to resolve at once. It must be just totally unknown. It is not what the pc is telling you, if the pc is making no progress.

If the pc is sitting there saying complain, complain, complain, complain about this, that or the other thing . . his lumbosis is just killing him and you handle his lumbosis, and his lumbosis is just killing him and you handle his lumbosis, and his lumbosis is just killing him and you handle his lumbosis. Well, now you've bought one of these probably-is's, you see? You said it's probably his lumbosis. But obviously, if you haven't cured his lumbosis don't blame your auditing skill, just blame this one fact alone: You haven't gotten down to the isness of the situation, that's for sure.

Let's begin a very tight series of questions that isolate what this is. Is it lumbosis or what? This person says to you all the time, "My feet are cold, my feet are cold," so you audit him for cold feet. "My feet are cold" so you audit him for cold feet. He comes up with this problem: cold feet, cold feet, cold feet, and you keep auditing cold feet. And I can tell you by actual test that you could do that for seven years. I know such a case. you could do it for seven years without ever making a happy pc or getting much of a gain. And we must assume after a while that it isn't even cold feet. We have to assume after a while, it just isn't cold feet. Because we're not auditing the isness, see. We must be auditing something else. We must be auditing some kind of an alter-is of some kind. If auditing cold feet then doesn't resolve the pc's cold feet, that he's complaining about, then the pc doesn't have cold feet.

What does the pc have, for pity sakes? So your line of questioning should go in on the line not, what makes cold feet, cold feet, cold feet, cold feet. Your line of questioning should go in on the basis, "Just exactly what are you complaining about? What is the isness of it?"

And you generally find out, well, it wasn't cold feet anyhow. The person just said cold feet, and really it isn't cold feet. It's because they burn all the time, and it isn't his feet, it's his ears. But he's afraid it'll go into his feet and so forth, but that isn't what's really wrong. It's because of the disconnections of the spine that they're liable to cause cold feet. Because you can't get circulation in the feet, you see, if you have difficulties with the spine, and that sort of thing And you get right down to it, and you find out it's . . they're afraid they have a disease. And that's the isness of the situation. How fascinating! Yet they were complaining about cold feet. you get how far afield this thing finally went?

So your test is simply this: If something isn't resolving, you haven't got the isness of it. It's just, if a case isn't going Clear, the first isness of it that you would test is the session. You wouldn't be worried so much about the valence before you had the session straight. Got the idea? You got to have the session. That's the first isness, and the next isness are the rudiments, and the next isness after that would be what you're addressing in the case. And those would be the isnesses in more or less order of importance.

Now, if you've got in the isness of the session, and you've got in the isness of the rudiments, and the person continues to complain, and you continue to try to help them with a certain (quote) "isness," it's just a "probably." It is never it if isn't responding rapidly. It is some other isness. Because you're looking at an alter-isness of some kind. So if the valence is wrong, well, it's wrong, that's all. Find the right one.

The most problem you're going to have with a case is going to be in the realm of the long-duration present time problem. And that is going to be the most suspect as far as its isness is concerned. Is that the problem? And the best test is, if it doesn't surrender rather rapidly as a problem, then you haven't gotten the pc to state the problem. That isn't what the problem is. In other words, it isn't necessarily true that you are handling it all badly. It just might be true that you are actually handling something which isn't there. And that something else is there to be handled, and you just don't happen to be handling that. But this isn't a good enough reason to change processes.

We now have a test that tells us whether or not a process is working. Anything aside from two-way comm which is totally limited to just asking . . this is the three things I gave you yesterday . . it's just you say to the fellow, "How are you doing?" and "Tell me," and "What is it?" and that's the end, you see. There isn't any more to that. you can ask those many times, repetitively, in numerous ways and so forth, but that's the end. You're not running anything. Anything else is a process.

So don't try to say you're two-way-comming somebody's problems out while you're asking them to describe the problem, because you're running a process called "Describe that problem to me, please. Thank you." Got it?

You say, "Describe the problem." You would say . . you can ask a pc, "Well what is the problem there that you're worried about?" And the pc says it's so-and-so and so-and-so. And you say, "All right, I will take that up," or something of the sort. You're right on the border between two-way comm . . and you're still safely inside two-way comm . . and running a process. And that's where the border crosses . . right at that point. Because if you once more say, "Tell me the problem," you're in a process and you're committed to flattening what you've started. And the moment you leave two-way communication you are committed to flattening what you begin whether you began it in a process form, Model Session, or not. If what you began produces tone arm motion, you're going to have to run the tone arm motion out of it, whether it is a rudiment or anything else. you got it?

And therefore, you should not be very adventurous about what you begin. You better get a good grip on what you're going to start before you start it. Because the careless woofity-bap launching madly into . . . Well, the guy says, "Well, I'm stuck in . . I'm stuck in, uh . . I'm in . . stuck in this, see, 'Mother.' It's all about Mother. And I'm stuck in this about Mother."

And you say, "Well, is there something unknown about that?"

"Eh, yes, as a matter of fact, yeah, I never knew my mother." And needle moves.

And you say, "Good. Is it all right if we go on?" Boy, have you goofed! Oh, God! That is a goof, you know! Something on the order of the biggest British dreadnought firing on Windsor Castle, you know. That is a goof, man! That's shame, blame, regret.

I used to know this, that you could run three commands of a process without getting into serious trouble. But that was yesterday's processes! Today's processes commit you, right now, with the first command because they are hot. They are hot. You're auditing with sabers and it's hot. you start something . . finish it. Don't go shifting it off. And if you find yourself in the unlucky position of three days later still running, "Which side of a girl is up? Thank you," just look back at that moment when you unluckily started it. That's your only choice. Your only choice is to complete what you begin. Otherwise you leave a pc with unfinished cycles and these begin to hang up and make auditing itself a problem.

Now, when there's too many unfinished cycles on a case you've got the remedy of Prehav 13. You can take auditors and that sort of thing, some such generalized term, do a Terminal Assessment of some kind, run them on the Prehav Scale. That's got a liability too.

Supposing you only had four levels live on the Prehav Scale and you decided . . you know, and you were assessing auditors. You only had four levels Live, and then you run "Fail to abandon." "The auditor failed to abandon the case?" "What auditor didn't abandon your case?" "What auditor did?" you know, 'What auditor did you fail to abandon?" you know, and back and forth and we Jot it all set. And we run

that kind of flat and there's no more needle action because you run those out on needle action), and then you assess again and you have seven levels live. Where do you go now? What do you do now?

Well, this is the one exception which I will give you. you get off of that train even though it's going 125 miles an hour, you hear me? You just get right off of that train. You go down to the bottom step and throw yourself into the brambles because that's the time to get off! Because obviously you are running a terminal which is in wild disagreement with the pc's case and you are living up the whole Prehav Scale. And if you continue to do that on your next assessment . . having run "faith in auditors," . . on your next assessment you've got twelve live . . twelve live. And if you ran it again now (this is just a Funny peculiarity, you see), and you ran Serene, "What auditor was serene?" and "What were you serene about auditors?" and so forth, you're going to have twenty live . . twenty live levels.

Well, don't get the whole Prehav Primary and all the Secondaries live before you find out that it didn't pay. you get it? Because the difficulty with running rudiments, and running random processes of any kind whatsoever, the difficulty of it sums up only and totally to this: If they are in opposition to the pc's goal and terminal setup, the case will not progress at all.

Now, that's very interesting, isn't it? So that any process that you adventured upon in the rudiments, any process that you adventured upon to straighten out the pc so he could be audited, any process that you adventured on, if it happened to be counter to the goal and the terminal of the pc, of course was something that is better deserted fast. you got the idea? So it does have that reserve on it.

In the first place you're trying to set up somebody to be run on Routine 3. There is no other clearing process, you might as well make up your mind to it that is broadly working. I can think of several processes that would undoubtedly clear people and all that sort of thing, but these are not on the assembly line, and remember these processes in the hands of other auditors have not cleared people. So you are left with Routine 3.

So the job in running anything and getting the pc into session is just getting the pc up to the point of where he can be assessed and run on Routine 3. See, that's all you're trying to do. So all other actions are preparatory to this action, because that's what's going to clear people. And as long as that one is followed out and as long as you eventually get up to Routine 3, and as long as you get Routine 3 well done, you're going to clear people. And anything else is dross. It could be thousands of hours of dross, and it could all be entertaining, but it would not resolve the case or produce a Clear.

It could cure psychosomatics and it'd make bank managers into bank clerks and you could do almost anything. Make janitors into presidents. You could do all kinds of things with these things, you understand, and have rather spottily and sporadically, because sitting there all the time is the goal and valence. And it's the valence situation.

So, get a good reality on this Routine 3, and get a good reality on where it goes and what happens and what stops it from running And of course, what stops it from running is basically the pc, before he's audited, is not in-session. So you've got to get him into session, you've got to have a session, you've got to have a pc, you've got to have your rudiments in and the thing well straightened out, and then you've got to do a Goals Assessment, and then you've got to do a Terminals Assessment, and then you've got to get over there to the Prehav Scale, and you've got to run it. And doing anything else, skip it!

Anything which you do . . I can tell you bluntly now . . anything which you do which is not contributory to completing Routine 3 is a waste of time.

Now, there is only one process type and class which does not violate the goal and terminal and Routine 3. There's only one that does not violate it, and that is Routine 1A which is very, very contributory to it.

Now, there is another one which probably won't, and which runs on very low-scale cases, and that is Routine 1. And there's another one which won't get you into too much trouble, and that is Routine 2. And that gives you your total bag of tricks. And there's the total bag of tricks. And beyond that there is none.

So you got Routine 1 . . runs very low, and probably doesn't mess up somebody too badly as far as their goals and terminals are concerned, and certainly progresses them, and is very slow, and it's the only thing that you could run on an unconscious person, and a lot of other stuff. The pc won't talk to you and the pc can't be put in-session at all. Well, you got Routine 1. And it's long and it's arduous and it's hard for auditors to do, but it is successful and it shouldn't be thrown out of the bag of tricks. It's too good. It probably won't interfere with the goal and terminal.

Routine 2 . . well, you can normally get away with that. you can do various broad general runs on the case and you're normally running against the terminal. Think this is quite amusing And you're sort of running the terminal blind. You don't know what the terminal is, and yet you're running the case anyway. And that's very functional. There's nothing wrong with doing that. But it certainly is no substitute for finding the goal and running . . and the terminal and running them, see. That's no substitute; there's no comparison. It improves your eventual run, but not to the degree that you might think it might. You don't lose. You don't lose on it. That's about all you can say about that.

Then you've got Routine 1A. And Routine 1A is the one thing that will not interfere with the Goal and the Terminal Assessment, but will improve it enormously. Routine 1A. This also improves the living daylights out of your rudiments situation. And if your rudiments keep going out, why, you had . . really haven't got much of a choice, except Routine 1A, that's all.

Routine 1A Processes could be entered in upon the first time that the pc is found to have a present time problem that didn't clear with the three types . . questions of Two-way Comm. You know, all right, Routine 1A, that's it. Well, you'd never get in any trouble if you did that. It's a rather arduous look at the situation. Then you bring up Routine 1A to a flat point and twenty-five hours later continue on to the point of asking, "Well, do you have an ARC break? How do you feel about my auditing you?" See. Twenty-five hours later we get to that rudiment level. You get the different look at this situation. Never did run a session on the fellow. You're still there on the brink.

Well, that would certainly be a safe way to go about it. And I can tell you if you did this you'd almost never have an ARC broke pc. It would be a thing that would become very foreign to you. Somebody doesn't have any ARC breaks, auditor. Well, obviously if this auditor never had an ARC break with the pc, the pc never ARC broke on the auditor, you'd have to assume about the auditor that the auditor took care of every problem that came up. See, so therefore the pc was very solidly and always in-session. You see how this fits together as a pattern?

Well fortunately, it does fit together, which is quite remarkable in itself That's interesting, isn't it? That there is a road out. That's what's interesting, that there are some blazes on the trees. And of course, these blazes now . . there's getting to be a pretty well-trodden path past them, and it leads straight out into the clear and has been doing so, consistently.

And picking up all of the elements of the, oh, God, hundreds of thousands of elements, and millions of them perhaps that I've reviewed in the past thirteen years that just about sums it up. And as far as processing is concerned, those are the safe things to do and those are the various things which are reliable, and those are the things which get you there, and those are the things that produce results.

So this leaves you with what? This leaves you with the fact that on anybody, anyplace, at any time, you could run and flatten any Problems Process . . great security. Never had any difficulty holding them in-session or anything else. Flatten the Problems Process, just flatten it, and run it out. Unless you do something really wild, like run two commands of it and skip it or something like that, you know. But you run . . just run it and start your session, "Do you have a present time problem? What was that?" Fellow says, "Well . . ." You say, "All right, good. We're going to run a little process now." And you just pick up one of the processes from Routine 1A.

All right, your dissatisfaction with trying to clear rudiments would evaporate if you laid down this particular rule: that there were no rudiments processes. That's fantastic, isn't it? If you just said, well, there were no rudiments processes, when you got the fellow up to a rudiment and so forth, then you audited the case toward Clear, and that wouldn't be no waste of time at all, would it?

Well, how to do that? How to do that? Well, that would be the way to do it. You'd start the session. You'd say, "You have a present time problem?" You'd find the guy has got a present time problem. Well, you've had it. Now let's just go on with Routine 1A. Eventually it flattens . . twenty-five, fifty hours later it flattens . . and that's out. That's gone now, you're not going to have too much trouble with problems. Now you say, "Is it all right if I audit you?" It sounds kind of odd to introduce it at that particular stage of the game, but that's actually where you've arrived to. Guy looks up for the first time, you know, and he says, "All right to be audited . . ? Well, what do you know? I thought it'd be a problem, you auditing me and it isn't," and that's that. So that clears that rudiment. Got the idea?

All the time you're doing this however, you could be clearing Security Checks. Takes care of a lot of ARC breaks and withholds. So a Security Check could be done at any time and a Routine 1A could be done at any time, and how to keep out of trouble, well do 1A and Security Checks. See? And pretty soon you can't even squeeze anything out of the E-Meter on the subject of problems . . in all of its various ramifications and unknowns and everything else that goes with it . . you can't squeeze a yip out of the E-Meter. The guy is consistently sitting at the Clear read and the needle isn't clear, it isn't swinging . . don't expect that it will, either . . but it'll be fairly loose. There it is. you say, "Well, it's time we took up me as an auditor." Might be adventurous up to that time, mightn't it?

Sort of non sequitur. The fellow's sitting there in this little cage of problems, you know, with all the demons of existence poking despatches and sabers and small atom bombs in through the bars and this disrelated item suddenly emerges: "Is it all right if I audit you?"

"Who, you? Where? Who? What? Huh? Audit? Audit? Who? Audit? You. What? What's this?"

And this just looks like another despatch, or another saber, or another small atom bomb which is shoved in the cage, don't you see?

So if rudiments are that important, if you're having trouble handling rudiments . . which is obvious . . all right, just take a broad, long look at the rudiments. And say, "Well, the rudiments aren't three seconds long at the beginning of session, the rudiments are fifty hours long at the beginning of session" and you'd certainly have it. And your dissatisfaction with a bad rudiments process, such as Responsibility and so forth, would vanish of course, because you're going to run the best processes that can possibly be run on problems in general. And you've had it. There it is. You're not going to have any trouble with that rudiment afterwards I'll guarantee. You're not going to have any trouble at all with that rudiment. This fellow's up to a point where he can confront unknowns and wrap problems around his heads and give people problems and take problems, and he's no longer sitting in this cage, don't you see. He's no longer in a totally interiorized state, even though this has been run against his valence.

Well, you see, the valence . . the trick behind this is . . the valence was adopted to solve a problem and therefore any valences the person is sitting in tend to resolve when you lessen his concern about problems and you lessen the tension of the valence. You don't even have to know the valence to do this. See? All you have to do is lessen these things.

It's very funny. I wrote over to Washington from London, I think, in 1956, and told them to lock it up in the safe that the road out certainly contained "problems," and that was the most reliable road out on the subject of it. And that's just a valuable piece of technology. Probably still in the safe in Washington. But anyhow, I just didn't want to lose sight of that one because this obviously measured up to the various things that a person had and which way they were going.

All right, it is very true that it is very difficult . . very, very difficult . . to handle problems at the beginning of a session and then go on to something else. This is true. Unless you can say to the pc . . if you can't say to the pc, "Well, tell me about it," "What is it?" and "How you doing with it now?" You know, that sort of thing And you ask him, "Do you have a present time problem?" and look at the meter, and there's no response on the meter whatsoever . . unless that condition could occur, then if this can stop the whole parade and if this can submerge the goal and if this can submerge the terminal and if this can make assessments impossible and if you can waste weeks on doing a Goals Assessment, and all this thing, why then, we have to come to the inevitable conclusion: If it was that important, well, we'd better roll up all of our very best guns and just take care of it right there. You know, just the whole thing

And therefore if the pc begins to have a large spate of problems, or a pc apparently has problems, or there's bunches of problems around, or if a pc after being audited for a while all of a sudden starts to run into lots of present time problems, you know, he goes out and gets busier. Well, you go back and flatten 1A. How long does it take to flatten 1A? Oh, it's not . . it's been taking about seventy-five hours, fifty hours, thirty-five hours, time periods of that character. Yeah, but look, all that time is saved off the assessment. And if you're going to waste a hundred hours on assessment, you certainly better spend fifty hours on 1A. That's all that amounts to. And then you know where you're going and you have a certainty on it and you're not fumbling with the dissatisfaction of running an inadequate process on present time problems. Look good?

Audience: Yes. Yeah.

All right. That would be a way to approach this situation.

Now, we get up to the auditor, as the second rudiment. And of course, if the fellow can have problems and he isn't going to have a lot of trouble with problems, certainly ninety percent of what would be charged up on this particular auditor would have vanished by that time. Certainly, even though the auditor's been auditing him, it'd just be vanishing all the time. But there might be a little bit left, so you would take up the subject after 1A; you could take it up, and hit your next rudiment. Do you see? And you've already been hitting withholds, and so forth, consistently and continually. And in that you should be running the Havingness and Confront Process of the pc, you have been remedying the fourth rudiment all the time. Oh, I haven't necessarily got the sequence straight; I'm talking about end rudiments. But you've been handling this so that's out, so you haven't got a worry about that. So it looks like these things could be handled rather easily just on their own ground, but given an importance.

If these things are that important to a case, then they are all of them worth handling. If you find a fellow who is flat on Problems, he isn't going to have much trouble with the auditor. And also an auditor who's been sitting there pulling withholds off of him, he's certainly going to be willing to talk to the auditor, so that's solving that too.

So you could go at it in these various ways, and you would wind up at the other end with your rudiments in. And I would say only after you've beaten them totally to death . . since we've been having trouble with this. I haven't been, but you have. And let's look at it on the reality of the situation and not curse and scream in our beards and break the china, and so forth and say, "You aren't doing your jobs." Let's get practical about the thing, and let's just take up rudiments as a preliminary to clearing and say that rudiments are not a preliminary to the session but a preliminary to clearing and just upgrade them. Until such time as all rudiments are in and will stay in, and so forth, why bother to assess.

Now, as far as somebody staying interested in his own case is concerned, you can be absolutely certain he will be on Problems, because that's what's got him mainly interiorized. So that'll answer up, as well as assessment. This is a way of approach, isn't it?

Audience: Yes.

All right.

These things, the whole subject of auditing, is a subject of practicality. It is not a subject of theory. It is what works. The philosophers of the ages had been trying to drive shiny coaches down nonexistent boulevards. And the screams of the dying multitude were dinning in their ears, because their philosophies didn't work. But they were pretty. There's no doubt about it . . no doubt about it. We should take our hats off to Nietzsche. It's certainly pretty . . until you go over to Germany and France and start looking at all the graveyards and things like that. You'd say, "Well, that isn't quite so pretty, you know. Looks messy!" And you start looking at the pillboxes that still are extant around Nantes, Nancy, and so forth, and you say, "Well, I don't know, they're not good architecture. There's something missing There are no subtle curves. But it was awful pretty." Thus spake Zarathustra. But he didn't give a damn whether it worked or not, you see. Never entered his mind for a split second. Workability, pooh!

The gorgeous example of the nonexistence of the eighth planet. For years! For years and years and years and years, the eighth planet did not exist. It had been observed in a telescope. It'd been plotted. People in astronomy knew its name, rank, serial number, mass, density, course and spin. But Hegel had said that there were only seven because seven was a perfect number. Beautiful coach! Lovely! Had big springs, so forth. Only the road it was traveling on was built on nowhere. And the end of the road went off to ignorance. There was no workability with regard to this.

Whenever you look at auditing, whenever you look at Scientology, you should just look at that one fact. Does it work? We have actually been condemned because we're interested in whether or not something works. And current extant philosophy knows this has no bearing on the situation whatsoever. It is a crude attitude. It is absolutely crude. I've had a person object to Dianetics simply because they said, "Well there was more to life than survival." Well, nobody said there wasn't! I certainly said it was a common denominator of existence. Yes, but they couldn't take Dianetics because there was more to life than survival. They liked to think that. They liked to think that. And they didn't like to think of this other, and also it was obvious that man was not good. And so of course that washed up the whole subject.

And you say, "Well how did you come to these conclusions?"

The fellow says, "Well, I just thought it over." He didn't bother to look at anything, you know. He didn't bother to go outside, open the door and take a look at the world. No, it was perfectly adequate, utterly adequate to sit there, you see, and have a couple of errant thoughts, be distracted by the ticking of the clock, and say, "Well, no. Well, I'd like to think of higher things."

Well, man has been very interested in thinking about higher things until he began to suffer from anoxemia. He's up there in the rarefied air. But it certainly has nothing to do with . . well actually, it doesn't even have anything to do with man. I think it would be a sad day . . I think it's been a sad day every time they've tried to connect ancient philosophies with man. They have nothing to do with man, they have nothing to do with life. They're just pretty.

The Greek, of course, in his terrific worship of the integrity or the thinkingness of man, himself went into a terrific figure-figure. And his various schools and so forth that he formed were all more figure-figure and more figure-figure-figure. And Greece lost her empire, lost this, lost that, everything was caving in- in all directions and coming down. The Greek race was becoming less and less effective. Things were going to pieces. The Turks finally came in, took over the whole lot, burned practically everything, destroyed the Greek language, knocked everything all out, and Greeks still figure-figure . . 1961, he still will figure-figure. Quite interesting! Nevertheless he did have an idea that man was a subject of study. And to that we owe him some hat-tipping.

But I'm afraid I don't owe very much hat-tipping to a lot of these philosophers, because they would say that it was a total betrayal of a philosophy to alter anything in it that had been laid down. And tell you, of course, that you're perfectly . . . All you've got to do . . all you've got to do . . is make a Clear by some other route, which is workable and practical and other people can do, and that follows up to all the tests of Clears of course, and we'd abandon every trail we've got, you see, if that was much easier and faster. But it hasn't happened. Hasn't happened.

Thirteen years, everybody's had a large, wide opportunity . . the last ten, eleven, certainly, they've had a wonderful opportunity to figure out brand-new routes, ways and so forth. And I've had them mailed to me and telegraphed to me and cabled to me in far parts of the world. And I've seen them on boards and fixed up, and they've been applied this way and that, but they didn't clear people. All right, right now we're clearing people so my whole attention is upon the workability of this one fact because I am a man of ambition. I am a man of very, very vast ambitions. And the vastest of my ambitions right now have this particular zone and area: is every time somebody walks in the front door of the Central Organization or up an auditor's front steps, that, at the end of the auditing he will turn around and walk out Clear.

That is a considerable ambition. And we are right there on the threshold of achieving that ambition. As a matter of fact we're more than on the threshold of it, we're actually taking the practical steps to effect that very thing. When we whistle up somebody from a Central Organization and say, "Come on in here," we're not kidding. And when I send a cable to somebody in some far place and say, "So-and-so is

expected at Saint Hill," we're not kidding. See, it's not nonsense that we're talking, because that's what we want to have happen. I think that'd be a very interesting thing to have happen. And when you see these Clears, and they start into their immediate areas and they start polishing everything up and everything goes into action and everything's very busy and so forth . . the horrors of the ancient philosopher. I imagine the man could have nightmares over this! He knows what a Clear is supposed to do, he's supposed to sit on a mountaintop and regard his navel.

But anyway, we're interested, therefore and thereby and only, in the practical steps necessary to it. And my conclusion as of right this minute, is that if you are having trouble keeping rudiments in, in order to do Goals Assessments, and if you were totally capable of actually using up two or three months in trying to find somebody's goal, well it'd be simpler to get the rudiments in first. And it would be simpler and timesaving if each rudiment required something on the order of fifty hours and was simply taken separately, one after the other, and fifty hours were devoted to each one. It would still be a time economy. Because naturally at the other end of it you'd wind up with his goal, bang! Right now, you see. You'd wind up with his terminal, bang! Right now. You'd do his assessment, bang! And you wouldn't lose a single minute of his run. And probably if you took two hundred hours to get in the rudiments, you'd probably clear a fellow in five. you got the idea? I mean it's that ridiculous. And as I look at it, that is the practical way of approaching the thing.

So watch those rudiments and turn up that sensitivity and if your pc has got one consistently out, go back and flatten 1A. Okay?

Audience: Mm-hm.

Thank you.