GRADES OF AUDITORS

A lecture given on
28 September 1961

Thank you. And this is what?

Audience: September 28th.

It's the 28th. What month?

Audience: September.

28 September 61. Well, you better ask some questions today. What question do you have? Yes.

Female voice: I have a question. I would like to know, earlier you said in a lecture that to be sure that the terminal is flat, you would check it on the Prehav Scale at sensitivity 16. Is that correct?

Hm! It's an exaggerated check, but it's all right.

Female voice: Okay.

The best way to check to find out whether or not a terminal is flat is clean up your rudiments. The more practical way is clean up your rudiments and then check it with a high sensitivity.

Some people apparently have the idea, by the way, on flattening rudiments . . I've noticed one in passing . . apparently have the idea that a rudiment is . . all levels on the whole Prehav Scale have to have been run on a terminal before it can be considered flat. I just wanted to get that one very straight. You only flatten those levels on the Prehav Scale on a terminal which react. The terminal's being assessed with all rudiments in and no level reacts, of course, it is flat.

But when you check a terminal on the Prehav Scale for a level, you ought to get all of your rudiments in and then check your past level which you have been running to find out whether or not it still quivers or merely do an assessment. It doesn't matter what, you see. Your old level that you were running is still on the Prehav Scale. But before you do any changes with regard to the Prehav Scale on what you have been running and what you should be running . . before you do any changes at all . . get your rudiments in and then check.

Now, before you bring a terminal or a goal to somebody else to be checked, you yourself should check it out, find out if that is the goal (in checking a goal that somebody else is going to recheck) and then get all the rudiments in and then check it yourself and find out if it's active. Otherwise, you're . . just a bunch of useless checking and appointments and that sort of thing. But you see, there's another way of going about this.

Instead of having the person throwing the responsibility for checking it off on the person who is going to do the checking . . well take the responsibility yourself for the rudiment factor and then recheck it yourself. Then when you take the terminal over to somebody else to be checked . . or the goal, whatever it is you're going to get checked . . you'll know for sure that it's going to continue to react or not as the case may be.

In other words, you've actually checked it yourself before you had it checked. Because what does a terminal check consist of? It consists of a goals check. It consists of first checking the rudiments, you see and then checking the goal. Or first checking the rudiments, then checking the terminal; first checking the rudiments, then checking the level.

And when you're doing checking on somebody else's goals or terminals, when you're doing this, that is the first thing you should do . . the first and foremost thing you should do properly and at once. The

person comes in to be checked, you check out the rudiments. If the rudiments are out, you don't check the goal or terminal or a level. You don't go that far. It just gives the pc another invalidation, don't you see. See, because you're actually now checking him with the rudiments out.

Now, you as checker do not put the rudiments in. you merely find out whether or not they are out. And then you give the pc back to the auditor to have the rudiments put in. Otherwise, you are violating the Auditor's Code . . too many auditors.

Now, you should know . . in this unit particularly . . you should know how to check a terminal, check a goal and check a level and how to patch them up if they're out. you should know this definitely because an HCO Policy Letter has just come out which grades auditors. It puts auditors into four classes in HGCs and the whole system depends on their having somebody that has had the Saint Hill Briefing Course. That's part of the rundown.

In other words, you could never have a Class III . . grading on up the line, Class I being the lowest class . . you could never have a Class III Auditor unless you had had somebody in the organization on the Saint Hill Briefing Course because the requirement of it is that they be trained by somebody who has been trained at the Saint Hill Briefing Course or of course, had been trained on the Saint Hill Briefing Course.

This classifies . . reclassifies auditors. Classifies them in four grades. This is for purposes of staff use in organizations, which you'll find this gets very widely reflected. Part of that bulletin is your lecture of September 26, 1961. That's part of the bulletin. The lecture I gave you about how to train up auditors in the field.

I'll explain this bulletin to you a little bit because it'll be in your hands shortly.

Auditor comes in. you say, "What have you had success with?"

He says, "Well, I've had success with Rising Scale Processing."

You say, "All right. That's all you can run on pcs."

And you'll get better . . you get better pc gains. That's all.

Now until this person is ready for and can be checked out as and classified as Class II as an auditor, that's all he does. He takes a process that he himself has had some success with, all right? Whatever process that is as long as it's Scientology and that is all he is permitted to run on pcs.

You'll find out it's ordinarily 8-C or it's Havingness of some kind or it's SCS and Connectedness or it's something like this. See, he'll have had some spectacular wins in his own line. So what are you doing? You're making sure that your staff auditor gets some wins and that your HGC pc gets some wins.

You're making absolutely sure of this right at the in . . at the onset.

Now, to get an auditor to audit something with which he is not familiar, on a pc and in which he has no confidence, of course asks for the auditor to get a lose. And it asks for the pc then to get a lose because he's being audited with an auditor who has absolutely no confidence. Right?

Now, a Class II Auditor is one who has been checked out on the fundamental bulletins which you have to be checked out on with a perfect score. He's got to have had perfect scores on all of these bulletins and on the tape of the 26 of September 1961. He's got . . in other words, to know Security Checking cold. And if he can pass all those things with a perfect score, he becomes a Class II Auditor and all he is permitted to do on anyone is security check them. That's all he does. He doesn't do anything else.

And then we have a Class III Auditor. And a Class III Auditor is one who has had some success in Security Checking and has done a good job of it and who has checked out everything necessary to the handling of Routine 3. Knows how to assess, in other words and knows all this cold. And when that

person knows all those things cold . . we don't let him audit these things on pcs while he is learning them, you see . . after he's got them all cold with a perfect score, we call him a Class III Auditor.

All right. Now, he can run, then, SOP Goals on pcs, but part of that requisite to become a Class III Auditor is to have been trained at Saint Hill and have had a course completion. Of course, that's understood and I don't think it's even mentioned in the bulletin or to have been trained, which is mentioned in the bulletin, by somebody who has graduated from the Saint Hill Briefing Course. So a Central Organization couldn't make a Class III Auditor unless they had somebody present who had been here that was training them.

All right. Now, that goal and terminal has to be checked out by the Saint Hill Briefing Course person. We permit none to be run that aren't checked out by the Saint Hill Briefing Course person. In other words, a goal and terminal that has not been checked out by a Saint Hill graduate cannot be run on a . . on a Central Organization pc. That's it, bang.

It's no nonsense about this because it's far, far too dangerous, it's too touchy and you will find that they will run the wildest hobbies you ever heard in doing assessments.

For instance, a guy just can't stand the idea of being a ship captain. So if the pc's goal is to go to sea and the terminal is a ship captain, he isn't going to let him have it. That's it. He's always had an ambition, you see, to be a . . himself, he's always had an ambition to be an accountant. So he gives him the terminal "accountant." Of course, every time you mention accountant, it ARC breaks the pc so you get reactions, so it is obviously the terminal, isn't it?

If you don't think this isn't prevalent in the human race, look at the conduct of so many fathers. Wherever you've had a father or a mother failing in her goals line, she insisted on the child doing a life continuum of that and there it is.

So now that's a Class III Auditor and once more the requisite is a perfect score on examinations. And these examinations . . same type of examination as you're taking here. you get constantly examined on these things. Possibly they won't be constantly examined on these things. They will be asked to study these things very hard and pass their examination on them, but must be a perfect score and the examination must be a minute examination. You know, the niggling, the exact word. you get down to the exact word.

That gets pretty grim, but it's the niggling type of examination of you found some obscure fact, way down in the corner of the bulletin that nobody ever noticed before and you ask him that and he fails it and then he's had it, see.

It's that type of examination. Very niggling, you know. Very, very nasty. "How many lines are there on bulletin of. . . ?"

He says, "I never counted them, you see."

"Well, that's it. you flunk." I mean, that's . . that's going pretty extreme.

But if they failed to answer perfectly any question you ask them, they have flunked it. They have flunked the whole examination. It's very easy to examine this way. Let me point out to you. Maybe you've been examined this way consistently and continually, but you may not have noticed the mechanism. You maybe have been so involved with getting examined that you didn't notice how the examination was being done.

The proper way to examine on these things is the person goes over all of the material as a unit. That is to say, he takes the HCOB on which he's being examined. He studies this HCOB and then he takes his copy of it into the Examiner and gives his copy of it to the Examiner. That's the way he should do it. Or in a case of a tape, the Examiner has the examination. And the Examiner asks questions until the student flunks. And that flunks the whole examination. He doesn't ask any further questions after the flunk.

Well, this makes for very rapid examination. Now, we've all been supereducated into the idea that it was all right to get 70 percent. Well, I'll tell you. you can't get 70 percent of a question on a Security Check clear. You can't have 70 percent of a goal right. So there goes the old traditional of 70 percent, you see. It has to be perfect.

The Security Check has to be perfect. And the goal has to be perfect. And the terminal has to be perfect. And the level has to be perfect. And the auditing command has to be perfect. And there's no compromising with it. So, of course, you can't compromise with examinations. So anyway, that's a Class III.

And then you get up to a Class IV Auditor. And a Class IV Auditor can do all these other things and can run engrams on assessments and runs SOP Goals on pcs, plus engrams.

Now, the rest of this is not discussed in this particular policy letter, but I might as well say a word or two about it since you will probably . . all of you, sooner or later, will receive the full brunt of this thing because we have just launched the campaign which makes Clears in HGCs. This is the first shot actually. The first official, noncompromising, no-more-pep-talk, this-is-what-we're-going-to-do, see.

I think you will agree that that is a very, very practical method of going about it because it permits HGC pcs to come in and get results. And it permits auditors to get wins and it inhibits flubs.

Now, we have grooved training in to a point where it isn't changing. There isn't anything changing about training. Hasn't been for quite some time. There have been some roundups, horse wrangler-type activities. You'll get the full brunt of this when you get back into an area where you are having to train up people and so forth, you will do a lot of horse wrangling. Just make sure you don't Q-and-A with the escaping pony.

Extraordinary solutions: All of you will err sooner or later . . all of you will err sooner or later . . in dreaming up the extraordinary solution to fit the extraordinary case that exceeds all rules. You'll all err in this direction sooner or later. The only thing I ask of you is catch yourself when you find yourself doing it. Because of course, you always get a flub with the pc. Extraordinary solutions are only required when the basics of auditing are violated and that is an extraordinary solution, definition of. That activity which somebody thinks he ought to do because all the basics of auditing have been flubbed. The extraordinary solution.

In other words, we have to do an extraordinary type of process on this particular pc. why do we have to do an extraordinary process? Well, that's because we didn't do the basic process.

This is horse wrangling And you got this crowd of ponies. And it's out on the wide, wide-open prairie and there's no fence in any direction. And you're trying to tell them there's a road here. And they know better than that, see, and they all say, "Well, there's no road here. Look there's just wide-open prairie; there is no track. And nobody knows how to do any of it. And there isn't any right way. And besides there are eight thousand hundred million other ways to do all of these things." And they just invent them all the time, consistently and continually and you have to keep saying, "Well, there's a road."

Actually, there is a road. It's four lanes, it's concrete, marked with sodium-vapor lights the whole distance, you see. But they're odd ponies and they're blind to this phenomenon. They're blind to the roadway and they say, "Well, it's just open prairie." And you have to keep pointing out the road, you know.

And you point out the road until they themselves have a reality on the fact that there's a road there. You don't make them follow the road because they're afraid you will hit them. That's the naval, military-governmental method of doing it. you take all the revolt out of people by beating them down.

No, there's quite another way of handling the whole situation, but only bright people can do it and that is you take the randomity out of the situation by pointing out to people that there is a fact. There is something there. There is a reality to be gained and you educate them until they gain that reality. And you go ahead and work at it and you'll eventually find that they're able to stand up to this and say, "Well,

what the heck. There is a reality here. Well, what do you know? What do you know?” There's something to be found out.

“Oh, well, you know, I never pay any attention to those TRs. I mean, I just audit, you see. I'm just natural. And that's why I have my feet over the back of a chair and....” you know. And finally, in horror, one fine day, finally in horror, they suddenly discover that the reason they don't audit with the TRs is because they can't. That's the first . . about the first great discovery that they make, you see: that they never have gotten an acknowledgment across to a pc as long as they've ever been auditing. There's something there to be done.

Up to this time they didn't think there was anything there, you see. It was just a number. And this type of thing. Well, there is no trick to Goals Assessment. You just ask the fellow, “What do you like to do in life?”

The fellow says, “Well, I don't know. I'd like to have a Pepsi Cola.”

And the fellow says, “All right. Well, let's see, who would have a Pepsi Cola?”

Well, the fellow says, “I would.”

And “Good. ‘I.’ All right. That's good enough. Now, let's assess it on the Prehav Scale, that's fine. All right. Now I don't happen to have a copy of the Prehav Scale right now. Think of doing something.”

“Oh, I don't know. Going. Going to have a Pepsi Cola.”

“All right. That's fine. That's the level we'll run. Where are you . . where are ‘I’ going?”

Yeah, they will do a thing like that if they didn't realize that a person has just one goal and they just have one terminal and they just have one level. They realize that and as soon as they realize that, they say, “Oh, but wait a minute. How the hell do you find these things?” And then, will ensue, possibly, the same cycle that has ensued since February.

Unless you had a reality on the fact that it could be found, wouldn't find it. I mean, that's why they weren't found. I mean, there's nothing more esoteric to it than that.

They didn't think they could be found, you know. And it was just all a good idea. But there wasn't any reason to really do anything very serious about it, because, you know? And you'll find right here in this unit, is . . occasionally, where somebody's terminal has been messed up. you know, somebody wouldn't let him have his terminal, auditor will turn right around and won't let the other fellow have his terminal. You have people auditing, finding terminals . . . I beg your pardon. There was one other condition to Class III Auditors. Class III Auditors had to have had found their goal and terminal.

There's a clause in Class II Auditors that isn't there but probably should be. They have to have passed a full Security Check. That would be a very good one to add in. Probably will get added in.

Anyway, it's a part of Class IV. The Class IV Auditor, of course has to have had an engram run on his goals-terminal line successfully. He has to have had a subjective reality on this here action.

So all of these things are based on subjective realities. And your job in instructing, and your job in handling such people, of course, is to keep them steered and sooner or later, they will collide with one of these realities. You know, up to that time, it's doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, pretended know, pretended know, pretended know, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, pretended know, pretended know, doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt.

Well, that's just a bunch of ponies wandering all over the prairie and they don't think there's any road to travel on and nothing of the sort and any bunch of grass is a bunch of grass and . . no criteria, in other words. It's . . no sensibility. And you just have to keep it rounded up.

And sooner or later one of these here ponies will start walking on the concrete and he will say, "Wa . . whoa, what do you know. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. I got a hoof on something here." And they put it over here on the prairie. "That's different. That's different. Ah, haaaa! Hey! Hey!" Turn around and tell you, you know. "Hey, you know there's a road here?"

And you . . you generally, being of kind heart, you ordinarily respond . . if he hasn't been an exceptionally dumb pony . . and you'll respond and you'll say, "Well, yes, that's right. I'm awfully glad you find it . . you'll . . you'll be very happy with . . found it."

But every once in a while, he's been a particularly obtuse pony. And has been . . kept falling into arroyos and doing other things, you see. Anything but trying to find the road. you almost can't restrain yourself from saying, you know, "That's what I've been trying to tell you. What did you think that was?" See? Kind of make him guilty for being so stupid.

But the truth of the matter is until they find out this one phenomenon, you know, that there is something there to walk on and there is something there, why they . . you'll just . . you just can't round them up, that's all. I mean they have an awful time. They're all over the place.

And that's what normally happens in HGCs. Auditors come in. They pay lip service to all these things that are supposed to exist. And they hope they exist. And they got a fair reality that they do exist. And they think they do exist, I hope. And then there's no reason to do any of them. See? No real reason to do any of them. Because nobody would ever know whether they had done them or not because actually "There are no factors. Are there? Maybe?" You get the idea? It's just all sort of mush.

So this IV scale is based on certainty and a common denominator of it is how certain is the fellow of his mind. And you let him walk on certainties the whole line.

Well, somebody who has been educated HPA/HCA level has some kind of a certainty. He winds up with some kind of a certainty, if he wants to audit at all. He's got some kind of a certainty. Something. Doesn't matter how dim. He ran "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting" on somebody and it turned on a somatic. And so he said, "That's unusual. That's very odd." And so he goes home and he gets ahold of his elder brother or something and he says, "Hey!" he says, "What's something you wouldn't mind forgetting? Sit down in the chair. Yeah. What's something you wouldn't mind forgetting? What's something you wouldn't mind forgetting? Yeah. Good. What's something you wouldn't mind forgetting?" Turns on a somatic in him, you know. "Yeah. Well, there's something here." And all of Scientology becomes "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting." That's the whole lot. There isn't anything else in Scientology but just that one process.

Now, you, as the D of P, take this person, you put him on staff and you say to him, "All right. Now what we want you to do is take this E-Meter. I want you to security check this pc and get this thing all straightened out. And I want you to do this, I want you to do that, I want you to do the other thing. And make sure that you get all the rudiments in and so on. That's enough for you. Now, let's see. Now, Joe, how about you?"

Person walks off, stands in the hall a minute and says, "You want me to do this? Well. . ." He knows what he ought to be doing. See. He ought to be going . . running this pc on "Something you wouldn't mind forgetting," you see.

So he does a very . . he tries. He tries hard. And it's all to his credit that he does try hard. And that he goes in and he actually tries. He tries to follow these instructions and he tries to do these things. And that's fine. He tries. Nothing much ever happens either here. But he tries. Where as a matter of fact, he'd be cocky as a grenadier, if he . . after the winning battle, if he were just told, "Well, all right. Now, you see that pc over there? Well, you just take him up to that room there. And what process do you have a great deal of reality on? What have you had some wins with?"

"Well, it's 'Something you wouldn't mind forgetting'. "

And you say, "That's fine. That's what you run on that pc. you just take him right up there in the room."

Happy as a clam, man. Of course, he'll get some results. He evidently can run it. And most . . most pcs could benefit from it, so what have you got to lose? Nothing

Same way with Security Check. A person who has had no Security Check run on them . . doing a Security Check? Hah!

You'll find people will give you all kinds of reasons why they can't give Security Checks or they don't want to give Security Checks or what they don't think Security Checks are. All their doubt, doubt, doubt, doubt, pretended know and uncertainties and so forth, all come up in a horrendous black tornado, right about the time you say, "Do a Security Check." What's basically wrong is that the individual doesn't have any reality on a Security Check ever doing anything for anybody and of course, has withholds.

You get a person with a lot of withholds doing a Security Check and they do a fantastically oddball job. Very peculiar. A very peculiar job. Let me tell you. They're going to make all kinds of flubs. Well, they're all natural. The flubs are just natural and they will usually leave questions unflat on which they themselves have withholds. All kinds of oddball things occur.

So a person has to know Security Checking cold and also, as should be in the policy letter, should have complete clean hands on Security Checks, before you turn them loose on Class II things. Now you'll find out that they get their best results on pcs by Security Checking. And they can Security Check this way. By the time they're all groomed up on Security Checking and they know . . they've had lots of experience with Security Checking, and that sort of thing, why, they get very fancy with it indeed. And you can do some very fancy things with Security Checking.

Oddly enough, because we haven't pushed Security Checks very hard. Not even you have . . have the . . a total reality on what fantastic things you can do with a Security Check. You've got a reverse reality. You know what weird things can happen to a case who does gather up a whole bunch of withholds he hasn't let go of. See? You've got that reality.

Well, there's another reality there to be found and that is what you can actually do with a person with a Security Check on the positive side of the ledger. And that's pretty, pretty wide. And now that I've pointed this up to you, I'm sure you're slugging ahead and doing something with it and all of a sudden the stars will be dawning in all directions.

And as far as Routine 3 is concerned . . well, what the hell. It's too wild to even contemplate until you've found a pc's goal and terminal. Skip it, man. Till a person really knows his business and has found a goal and terminal on the pc, they will do all sorts of wild things. And the first wild thing they will do is take forever to assess.

Why do they take forever to assess? Well, they know it isn't there. They don't think it's there. They don't really realize it's there. They haven't any reality that they will be able to do it. They get very disheartened. These "forever assessments" are hinged on the rudiments being out. That is the mechanical fact. But the background music to it actually is that they don't think it's possible. Otherwise, they would be in there pitching.

They're wandering all over the prairie, you see and there's no road. And when they get a reality on the fact the pc has one goal, the pc has one terminal, the pc has one level and no other . . doesn't have two . . and when they suddenly get that as a reality, why you'll have people who can do some Routine 3 work.

As far as engrams are concerned, it's absolutely catastrophic to take somebody who has never had an engram run and ask him to run an engram. That is wild. If you want randomity, just set that going. Once you've had an engram run, why, you can run engrams.

Well, I just wanted to give you this particular rundown. I know this will be put into effect by Central Organizations particularly because the first Association Secretary that heard about it at once added something to it and said, "Well, that is an opportunity to . . to change the pay scale of staff auditors."

Very highly practical consideration and that's a sufficiently practical consideration that will back up the . . the sensibilities of it and there we go.

This is our first elephant-solid step in the direction of full HGC clearing.

Now, I'd better say something about the workability of this in running any kind of a clinic or a group of auditors because all of you, whether you like it or not, will wind up somewhere in that direction, whether in Central Organizations or otherwise.

And that is that the auditor who have gone through Class I and Class II and Class III and is now a Class III, you would say then that auditor . . all that auditor did, you see, was do the full of Routine 3. Well, that's not necessarily true, you see. This auditor could do the assessment. Could do the assessment and could handle the assessment factors and handle some of the basic runs, but wouldn't have to handle the Security Checks, because you got auditors around that can handle the Security Checks, don't you see. So a pc could then be audited by two auditors . . one who is a Class II and one who is a Class III.

And then supposing you had one Class IV in the whole shop. Well, when engrams got ready to be run, he'd run them. you see how that could work out? Now, that's apparently at first glance a violation of the Auditor's Code, but it isn't. Because you're not changing the auditor on what the pc is auditing. This is an interesting point.

In other words, if you change the pc's auditor on what the pc is being audited on, you will have trouble. But you can always have somebody else running something else and that happens very often. It's only when that becomes a withhold that it becomes very disastrous . . being audited every night by one auditor and aren't telling the other auditor in the daytime that they're being audited on the same thing and this really gets to be quite a mishmash. And that is upsetting.

But you can do this other one. you can push a pc into the HGC and you would let him be run for a while, until you had somebody who could do something else about it, by a Class I Auditor. And then you get a Class II Auditor devoted to it on something on the order of two-and-a-half hours a day or something like that, you see. And you can give him a general run on SCS and Connectedness or something in the morning and in the afternoon they'd be getting security checked by a Class II Auditor, you see. you could split it up this way.

And then that could move over to where a Class III Auditor was doing the morning, you see and a Class II Auditor doing the afternoon and that way you could handle more pcs with more advantage.

In other words, you could mix up the auditors on a pc and you could straighten this thing out and you keep the pcs moving. And you'd find out this was quite successful and the fact glares now that HGCs must start clearing. And this is a very firm, forward motion in that particular direction and it hinges on this Saint Hill Briefing Course.

Well, if there's anything you don't know about checking terminals or anything you don't know about this particular thing before you get out of here, you certainly better find out because you'll find yourself in a lot of embarrassment someplace or another. Because you're supposed to know.

And of course, I'll help you out. I'll say, "Well, when they leave here, they know all about it. Yes, yes. Well, I know. Yes, Bob was here for quite a while. He was here all summer. Yes, he certainly knows all about that. Yes, well, you just ask him."

And the only esoteric thing that you're going to run into is you're going to run into the imponderables . . the pc who doesn't move, the pc who doesn't respond, the pc who just nothing happens with and your temptation . . because that is what is being urged on you all the time by a Class I Auditor . . your temptation is consistently to dream up an extraordinary solution. There is your first temptation.

I know. I did it for years, and so on. Finally recognized what I was doing and your only fault is not recognizing what you're doing. Go ahead and dream one or two up and lay a gorgeous egg, but recognize what you're doing. You're avoiding the fundamentals and cutting it in someplace else with some

extraordinary solution of some kind or another. It is always a gross auditing error. I don't care what the staff auditor said he was doing. I don't care what the field auditor said he was doing. That had nothing to do with it.

If that case isn't moving, there is a gross error. It is always a gross error and when you think up an ordinary solu . . extraordinary solution, you just perpetuate the gross error. And that's why the extraordinary solution is wrong. You haven't actually found out what was going on. Gross error.

I'll give you an idea. A Clear down in South Africa. Two cases not moving on CCHs. Absolutely not moving. Not moving, not moving, not moving, not moving, not moving, any way, shape or form. Nothing happening, that sort of thing. And this couldn't be called, at first glance, a gross error because the CCHs . . you're just supposed to run the case, don't you see.

Well, actually, the gross error was the CCHs were being run wrong or they would have done it. It was simple, wasn't it? See? We . . so we got a datum in our laps to the effect the CCHs aren't working on two cases. Well, our first impulse is to say, "Well, let's do something else that is new and marvelous and strange because the CCHs aren't working."

Your first job in rounding up ponies is to find out what they're doing. Never take what the pony said he was doing. Find out what he was doing. And that is very often, somebody who has a low reality on his tools, will often tell you with good faith, that he has done all that and you have to have a closer checkup on it.

Now that, by the way, was solved . . down in South Africa, it was actually solved not by doing the CCHs right. It happens to have been solved by the Instructor going in and just asking these people if they had present time problems and just cleaning up the rudiments and asking them with real pressure and going really at it and discovering that they both did have and blowing grief charges off both of them on their present time problems and after that, even these misrun CCHs worked.

Well, that was an extraordinary solution, but didn't necessarily get CCHs working, did it? So, there's a datum sitting there that the CCHs wouldn't work on cases with present time problems. Yes, the CCHs would work, if run right, on people with present time problems. But the easiest way to have done it in this particular instance, of course, would have been to have put the rudiments in, even though you were running the CCHs. If anybody had ever done that, they would have found out something. But that is not a particularly gross error. That's just a mishmash, see.

The gross error, of course, CCHs weren't run right. Of course, you can always do something for a case by putting the rudiments in. So these two things go together. And . . but we have a misunderstanding when we come out at the other end of it. And that is to say, the misunderstanding is the CCHs don't work on some cases. Well, that's the misunderstanding. Yes, the CCHs run wrong, don't work on most cases.

You sit somebody down and pump his hand for seventy-five hours and nothing happens. You're violating the Auditor's Code in all directions. You're running a process that is flat. You're running a process that isn't producing change. Well, there you are.

All right. Let me tell you some more extraordinary solutions.

An extraordinary solution: The pc . . we just can't clue what this pc is doing. We just haven't got an idea what this pc is doing. The pc . . God knows! Well, we just keep running this and . . and it . . just don't know exactly. Actually, we found the pc's goal and we found the pc's terminal and it all seems to be all right, but nothing has happened.

Well, I don't know. There must be some other level to the Prehav Scale that we're not running. Let's see. Let's . . pc responds to "indignity." All right. We'll run the level of the Prehav Scale "indignity." That must be about the way it is. Yes. Well, we'll try that and after we've wasted a dozen auditing hours, well, we try something else and after we've wasted twenty-five more, we try something else. And after we've wasted fifty more, we try something else. What was wrong in the first place? Gross auditing error.

Since finding the pc's terminal, from there on, the pc had never done the auditing command. Now, that is the most gross auditing error there is. There is no more gross auditing error than that: to give a pc a command which the pc does not then execute. Isn't that simple?

So, how do you think dreaming up new levels to the Prehav Scale is going to do anything for this pc who has never done any level of the Prehav Scale even after it was assessed, huh? Now, where is this going to come out? How is this going to make things right? By adding new errors onto old errors, we're going to wind up with what? New errors. So, there is no more gross error than an auditor auditing a pc who is not doing the auditing command.

Now, let's define what is "not doing the auditing command." All right. Not doing the auditing command is defined as: simply not executing it or doing something else . . or executing the auditing command indifferently and then doing something else. you know, they say, "Well, have you ever . . have you ever shot a duck?" You know? And the pc says . . thinks to himself dimly, "Well, yes. I've shot a duck," and then applies it to his lumbosis, which is hurting him today and says, "Well, let's see. I wonder if there could be any shot in the lumbosis. I get the idea of mocking up some shot in the lumbosis. Yeah, all right. That didn't work. Okay."

See? The pc is not being audited. The pc is . . is answering the commands and self-auditing. He's doing two things. You could say not executing the auditing command, technically, could be expressed is: not doing it and not just doing it . . not just doing it.

Now, when a pc has a present time problem of long duration, the pc will have a hidden standard and every auditing command which is given to the pc . . the pc then audits something else in order to affect the hidden standard and they'll do it every time.

The pc had a headache, so you give the pc an auditing command and then the pc has figured out that if he audits the mass against his stomach, that this will affect his head. So the pc then does the auditing command against the mass of the stomach, only and then sits back to find out if it has done anything for his head and no matter what you say to the pc, no matter what command you give to the pc, the pc does these things. He receives the auditing command, thinks about it for a moment, gives you some kind of a response, then applies it to the ridge in his stomach and then checks to find out whether or not it has affected his head. So, he hasn't just done the auditing command. See, he's done a lot of things.

The first time Mary Sue ran into this down in South Africa . . as a very fine example of this and really punched it into view . . was auditing somebody who was . . had been audited for just . . oh Lord! You know, just tremendous numbers of hours. And everybody had been thinking up extraordinary solutions for this fellow. Extraordinary! Absolutely extraordinary. I mean, the most marvelous solutions had been thought of for this fellow's case. A catalog of them would have filled the wall, you know. And just shelf after shelf of books to all these beautiful solutions.

There was only one difficulty. The case had never done anything but audit an electronic incident in an effort to change his sex. No matter what was said to the pc, the pc then audited to the electronic incident because he knew that if he got rid of the electronic incident, then his sex would change. And for literally hundreds of hours, actually, the pc had never done anything else. The pc then had a present time problem of long duration. He did not want to be a man. It was a terrible problem to this pc to be a man, so this was all the pc ever did.

Now, that is more broadly understood by the fact that any pc who has a present time problem, particularly a present time problem of long duration, will use the auditing command to resolve the problem, no matter what the auditing command is. How do you like that? And that's why you can't audit up against a present time problem. And that's why you can't leave present time problems of long duration just floating. Because the pc will never do the auditing command, they always do something else. So that's the most fundamental error that could exist. And you could go on thinking up solutions until your hair was down to your knees and you wouldn't ever have the pc doing anything but just sitting there unchanged. Interesting, hm?

You must be inquisitive. You must find out what the pc is doing Now, if you have to find out too often and too much what the pc is doing, you obviously have no confidence that your rudiments are in. Well, doesn't that follow? Because if the rudiments were all in, the person wouldn't have a present time problem of long duration or short duration. Awfully simple, isn't it?

Now, the pc who applies the auditing command to a specific target may or may not ever apply the auditing command to the terminal you just got through assessing. Isn't that fascinating That is very disheartening The pc with a present time problem of long duration will apply an auditing command, not to their own terminal, but to the terminal which is troubling them. And this may be the wrong terminal. So you think you are auditing a ghost and you are busily auditing a sixteen-inch gun. I mean, that's as stupidly simple as that, see. You're not running the pc's terminal. That's all. And that's the gross auditing error.

Every time the pc answers the auditing question, you eventually find out from the pc, realizing the pc is stalled in some fashion and has been for some time . . . You see, you got a great apparency that you can get going these days, marvelous apparency. You see, the Security Check the pc is getting can give him a case advance. So, you look at the case advance the pc is getting from a Security Check and you attribute it to the auditing you're giving the pc . . because the pc isn't receiving any auditing from you. you see how that could work out?

The pc is receiving auditing from a Security Check, whether you're giving it or not, but you think by running his terminal the pc is getting an advance. Well, the pc isn't getting an advance if he's not doing the auditing command. He might not be running a terminal. He might not have any idea of the terminal. Always a good thing to ask the pc if they can get an idea of this terminal and what is their idea of this terminal as they run it, and so forth. And you'll find out very rapidly that the terminal they are running is not the terminal you have just got through assessing. Isn't that fascinating? Well, we get some kind of a case going where this fellow is auditing . . being audited on a . . on a skin diver, and that's dandy. He's having a marvelous time on a skin dyer, but every time he answers the auditing command, he actually applies it to Mary Ann. Well, he's in a state of non compos mentis. He isn't thinking in this zone. It's not his fault, because he is frozen in this particular zone. He is irrational on this particular point of course, or it wouldn't be his terminal.

So, you ask him one day, you . . you notice he's not making any progress. And you decide it's his Security Checks that are giving him the progress, not the running of the terminal and you get very bright. You have a long, blue streak of lightning, you see. you get this marvelous idea. And you say, "It just may be there's a gross auditing error here." Now, that is the first idea you ought to get with regard to the pc who is not making progress. Whether you're auditing on a via, through some other auditor or whether you're supervising auditing very casually or whether you're doing it yourself If you're not getting progress, you should think to yourself there's a gross auditing error here of some kind or another and the first and foremost one is that the pc isn't doing the auditing command. That's the first thing you should search out. And you get this long, bright blue spark and you say to the pc, you say, "Who do you think of when I say, 'Have you ever destroyed a skin diver?'" And the pc thinks for a long time. There's quite a comm lag.

And says, "Well, I think of Mary Ann."

And you'd say, "Well, is Mary Ann a skin diver?"

And you get another long comm lag and the pc then says, "No, come to think about it. Mary Ann is not a skin diver. Mary Ann has never had anything to do with skin diving."

Now, I know that sounds completely idiotic, but then you're handling a zone and sphere of idiocy. Everyone is very bright until he gets on the subject of his exact goal and terminal. And then he's a complete idiot. So, there you go.

So having asked this burning question, don't say then, snarlingly, "Well, after this, after this, when I ask you the auditing command, apply it to a skin diver!" You know, that would be the wrong way to go about it because obviously the pc is incapable of doing so and you just asked him to spring up to the top of the

Empire State Building in a swan dive from the pavement. He can't do this. So you give him a kind of a lose.

Now, you say, "Well, what cooks with this Mary Ann?"

"Oh, I don't know if I've ever told you, but she and I had a lot of trouble."

All right. That . . that would be the way to go. You're auditing somebody with a present time problem of long duration. You're not auditing somebody's terminal. Your rudiments are out even though they're not registering as out. They don't register as out, because the thing is totally submerged. The thing is completely out of sight. So therefore you have to supplement rudiments with interrogation and what kind of interrogation do you have to do? You have to ask the pc, "Well, what would have to happen to you in order to find out if Scientology worked?" you know. It comes right back to that thing.

"Oh, well, I have to get over this trouble with Mary Ann."

There it is. Present time problem of long duration. This can give you a lot of trouble . . present time problem of long duration . . and could have given you much more trouble a few weeks ago than it would now. Because now with your Security Check aspect of the broad tool . . Security Check is a very broad tool . . you have the rule of the prior confusion and that is one you must remember because he is not fixated on Mary Ann at all. Mary Ann is the solution to a problem of which Mary Ann had no part. And you can audit Mary Ann till hell freezes over and you won't free the pc from Mary Ann. Why? Mary Ann is the one piece of paper that was motionless while all other pieces of paper moved.

It's the rule of the prior confusion. The broken leg . . the broken leg is the solution to the confusion. Believe it or not, it is. And that is hooked and it violates the rule of auditing the stillness. Don't audit stillnesses. Audit motion.

Well, what is there motionful about a broken leg? There it lies pointing the wrong way. It's awfully still and it's sure been still ever since, hasn't it? It's gone on for some years being still. Guy's got a psychosomatic now called a broken leg. Only it's not called a broken leg. It's called an articulo metalosis of the tibia.

Female voice: of the what?

That's very interesting. The one you didn't get is a proper word for a leg.

Anyway, here we go. Chronic somatic, then, from . . viewed from a Security Check basis, is a solution to a prior confusion . . always. It's never considered otherwise. Now how do you get rid of one? I can tell you how to get rid of one today as I told you the other day, but I can repeat it.

It's a very simple activity. What do you do? You find the prior confusion by assessment. What confusion reacts the most on the meter just prior to Mary Ann, the broken leg or anything else the pc is using in running? What is the prior confusion?

You assess it. And you find out that just before Mary Ann turned up, God help us, it looked like the Battle of Gettysburg at high speed. Yeah man, it really was motionful. And whatever it was . . whatever it was that assessed out, you take that series of personnel and run Security Checks on them and you never run any Security Check at all on Mary Ann or the broken leg.

Now earlier, we were making very slow but positive progress by running Security Checks on Mary Ann, or pardon, not Security Checks but running O/W on Mary Ann, running O/W on legs and we were getting someplace. We were getting someplace. That was no doubt about that. Very slow, but very positive.

We could run O/Ws against a fellow's bad ear. you know, "What's he done to an ear? What has he withheld from an ear?" and so forth, we would have gotten someplace. But now, this new data has turned up that the ear . . . Well, the new data that turned up is I had to find out for ever and aye, whether you

ever audited stillnesses and I find out you don't. And of course, this is the stillest stillness you ever heard of. This ear's been floating through time, it isn't even moving on the time track. It's awfully still, isn't it?

So obviously you've got to find the confusion for which the ear is a stable datum and our tools are now adequate and our sessioning is now adequate, with rudiments in, to actually audit confusions. You can hold the pc in-session, which you might not have been able to do some little time ago.

So, what do you do? You find the prior confusion and the personnel and objects involved in the prior confusion and you security check them. you find out what the pc did to them and how the pc tried to make them guilty and you find out all about it. And now when you've done that Security Check, you will find out Mary Ann has blown and the broken leg is now moving on the track, which is quite an interesting thing.

Now, look at what this pc is doing. It's not ever as flagrant as this. A pc who's doing this is having a hell of a time. "Let's see now. If my ear got well, then I would know that the auditing which is being done on me is working."

Every time he does an auditing command, he looks over to see if his ear gets well. He does an auditing command, see if his ear gets well. Then he thinks he'll audit something else in order to see if his ear got well. Then hell audit something else and he'll have something else as a target . . which he doesn't tell you anything about . . and then he looks back to see if his ear got well. Hell, he's not in-session. He's running a self-audit. Also, he must be running some kind of a weird oddball mechanism called "doubt." He must be doubting everything that is happening He must be in . . a hell of a lot of doubt going on of one kind or another for this sort of thing to be going on. He has no positiveness and he has no assurance. Therefore, he has no confidence. Therefore, there's no boost to anything that is happening so therefore, it's all slow freight through Arkansas. I mean, he's not going to have anything happen.

So you got now the rule of the prior confusion. Now, that's his present time problem of long duration. Find the present time problem, confusion. The confusion that went before the present time problem of the long duration and you've got it.

Now, this even might apply to engrams. It might be that the person is stuck in some portion of an engram as a solution to the confusion which went before and maybe it forecasts a new way to run engrams . . which is to say, you don't run the engram, you find out where the fellow is stuck and then you assess the prior confusion. And having assessed the prior confusion, why you could run a Security Check type action on that and the engram would blow. That's . . that forecasts it for engrams, but I'm . . I don't have any experimental data on it. It's just theoretical.

This other is not theoretical. This other is quite factual, that it is the prior confusion which sticks a person into a present time problem of long duration. Now, he cannot confront that prior confusion and so he has his attention stuck, you see, on something he can confront. And you'd be surprised, but thetans can confront busted heads, bad legs, hopeless love affairs.

The Japanese . . oh, the Japanese ever . . . Show you what a thetan will do (the Japanese are too, you know) and I would love to see you . . I would . . I would just love to . . to see your reactions to a real honest-to-goodness, not faked-up for export, but a real honest-to-goodness Japanese movie . . a real, sound movie from Japan, for home consumption. I would love to see your reaction to it, because . . in the first place, I could tell you about it, but you still wouldn't believe it. It's not something on which anybody could have a reality. Because I myself, the first time I ever saw one, I said this is impossible. And I sat all the way through the thing and I hadn't seen it at all because it was all impossible. And it was mostly for practice in understanding Japanese customs and frame of mind and also practice, obliquely, in speaking Japanese.

But the next one I saw . . I'd already seen it happen once, so there was a probability that it could happen again . . and I realized that when I had heard and read of things like this when I was a kid around the Pacific, that I had just not-ised them. They were just total not-is. I didn't believe anybody ever considered this drama and yet there it was.

Well, their fairy tales are very easy to get hold of . . very easy to read. But they don't exaggerate it to the degree that the Japanese has got it exaggerated now in the later days of his civilization.

Oh, I'll give . . I'll give you a plot of a movie in Japan. I mean it runs like this.

The soldier comes home from the wars and greets his girl and then he goes off to the wars and is killed. You are now at about ten feet deep in the film. you may not even have seen him. This we are suddenly collided with . . we suddenly collide with this immediately after the titles. We're . . we're acquainted with this almost immediately after we find out that it was directed by Kobi Mitsuyu. This is totally incidental. And now, my God, we have five reels where she does nothing but wander across scenes and areas where she has seen him before he died and that's the movie.

And of course, the Western mind is educated to a bunch of action. And then finally, why, she receives the news that her lover is dead and she lies down on the bed and cries and that is the end of the film and that's very modern and very something or other. That's . . that's really something marvelous. You know, that's a very tragic picture to us, you see. Very dramatic. Very dramatic. Not to Japan. The whole picture now takes place. Now it takes place, see. you have a hell of a time sorting out who this fellow was. All this is incidental. The action is entirely missing. There is no action.

Beautiful photography. Have these circular bridges and so forth and cherry blossoms. And the cherry blossoms are falling, blossom by blossom, you know and the circular bridge. And she is reflected in the water. And then she's standing on the bank, you see and she looks into the water, and she doesn't see her own reflection, she sees his face. And then she walks on and this goes on for about five reels. Coo, man!

You read about these things, of course, they'll give you a Westernized version of the plot and they'll say, "Well, her lover was an aviator and he got killed bombing the Saratoga and so on. And this broke her heart and she became a geisha girl." That's the plot. And you say, well, there must be. . . You know, and you get the idea of rahahahahah, a-a-a-a, and all this kind of thing. Well, it has nothing to do with the picture. We don't even find out the guy's name, you know.

Well, that's a grief engram stuck after the fact of action and you can run it till hell breezes over, of course and there's no action in it, you're running the still. There's the still.

So, of course, if there isn't any action in it, what's . . keeps holding it in place? It must be the confusion which occurred before the action. Actually it wouldn't have occurred if there hadn't been all that action. Well, the Japanese can no longer face any kind of action. Not even in war could they face action. They went out and did the most suicidal things. They could face death and they could face that very well, because it was good and still.

I know I spent about four years making myself numbers of enemies amongst naval officers in the West by trying to tell them something about Japan and I don't think they've even grasped it yet.

But the Japanese, of course, he's already in a still, and he obsessively duplicates and so forth. They're not a bad people, long way to, but they . . they very easily slide into this particular band. They shudder off of the motion. They shudder off of the confusion and they will pick up some fabulous stable datum and they will carry on with it. And their attitude toward war is "What is war for? Well, war is to get killed in." That's some kind of a wild stable datum, isn't it, for a war? So they lose.

And if the Japanese cannot succeed with their first pound, why, they've pretty well had it and they almost did succeed with their first pound at Pearl Harbor. They almost did. And after that you kept wondering why the hell don't they push the attack home? Because they really never did. They never . . never really pushed the attack home.

And American marines were absolutely fascinated with the conduct of Japanese marines. Japanese marines would line up in a company front formation and march down an open beach against machine guns . . at routine marching pace. What can you do about something like this? Well, you can kill them, that's all. And the Japs go and hole up in caves. And then they just had to go on killing Japs in caves and

killing Japs in caves and killing Japs in caves. Very tenacious. Very tenacious while holed up in a cave and that sort of thing. Because it was still.

I'm just taking up this one particular racial side just to give you an objective view of what a . . what a person is doing with a psychosomatic.

He couldn't confront any part of the motion which proceeded this. And it was all too confusing for him and he had absolutely no datum of any kind whatsoever. So, he holds on to a twisted leg.

Or domestically . . domestically, he says, "Well, my . . my first wife did me in." He says, "She did me in." That was it. And he's got stuck pictures of her and so on, and it's just all stuck. And he's stuck in the first home they lived in. And it's all miserable and it's all stuck. Ah, come off of it. To free it . . Why did he get married? See the kind of question you have to ask? It's not "What did your first wife do and what did you do?" Because you're Qing-and-Aing with him to that degree. You are interrogating the stuck. "Well, why'd you get married?" Well, of course, this sounds to him perhaps flippant. You know, like, "That'll show you," you know. So you have to ask the thing rather diplomatically.

"What was going on before you were married?"

"Oh, well, I didn't know her very well. I knew her for some little time."

"No, no. I mean with other people," and so forth.

"Oh, well, that. Oh, well, no, no. Nothing there."

The E-Meter goes mad.

"What was happening before you were married?"

"Oh, well, uh . . th . . that's, uh . . well, actually, that has nothing to do whatsoever with the marriage."

"Well, okay, but . . ." Your meter will be going mad. And you say, "What was that confusion? What was that confused area of life? What was going on during that area of life? What were you trying to do?" And you get some wild tales, man. There's the drama. There's the action. There's the confusion.

"Ah, oh, well, there were five . . there were five girls. And they were all cross-suing something or other, but it was all kind of involved and it got me in a lot of trouble with my parents." You get the idea? "And I was this and I was that, and so on. And it was all very rough. And we really shouldn't go into that."

And that will be his immediate reaction, is "We really shouldn't go into that." And you'll get that constantly. Why? Because he wouldn't be stuck on what he's stuck on if he could face what had happened and you're asking to face what's happened. So I could see that if you weren't alerted to this other thing, you might Q-and-A with the fact that it's nonconfrontable, which it isn't at all. It's perfectly confrontable. But he will keep telling you . . and down through the years, if you run this trick, you will accumulate enough people telling you that it is impossible to confront it, that you'll eventually start running the stuck again, unless I warn you.

So what do you do? You take the personnel . . the rule of the prior confusion . . is you take the personnel involved with the confusion and you security check on this basis. Now, you could run broad O/W on these people. You could do a lot of things about this and maybe shake it all out. But it's a longer route than a direct Security Check.

So he had trouble with this girl. she was down in New Orleans and actually, he had to pay for an abortion and so forth. And actually she didn't really have a child. And he found out about it later, but the same time she was blackmailing him. This is not his wife, you see. This is somebody else! And unless you tailor up some kind of a Security Check to find out what this person did do to them, they're liable not to own up and it's liable not to come up on an automaticity, you see. You're not checking against specific questions. You're just letting him wander and he won't face it because he can't. But security questions . . yeah, he'll

face it. Just by getting it off, why, it'll free up. That's the anatomy of a stuck point on the track and we've searched for it for eleven years and there it is.

What is a stuck on the time track? What is a chronic somatic? What is a stuck engram? What is any of these things?

Now, this also predicts . . and don't bother, don't . . don't take this very seriously . . it also predicts (and I'm sure you're not going to reach it by this technique) that a hell of a lot of confusion went on in the case before the person picked up the valence which is his terminal. See? I've already given you some lectures on that last summer sometime. To reach that is possible, maybe it's not possible. It's not been tried.

The reason why it hasn't been tried is we have other routes that are successful. But you possibly could blow that valence. You possibly could blow that goal. There's a possibility of doing so. So I'm . . would be dishonest if I didn't tell you there's another prediction. Just like you could blow an engram . . a piece of an engram . . you might blow the last hundred trillion years by finding out what was so confusing before them.

But my experience with cases has been that that all gets very unreal and bucking them into it is asking too much. And the earlier they go on the track, the beefier they were as thetans and the messier the ridges are and the more velocity things have. And boy, for the last hundred trillion years they haven't been able to confront an electronic machine gun, you see. And the type of machine gun . . if you turned it loose in Trafalgar Square, it'd knock down all the buildings for a quarter of a mile in all directions with one swing You see? And that is an awful lot of motion. That is an awful lot of action.

The idea of a hand grenade in those periods, you see, was something that flattened a city. Be a lot of motion. When a thetan stared you in the eye, you lost your eyeballs. You know, this kind of thing. And you get going on early track stuff, the fellow has no acquaintance with his bank. He's not worked up on it and there's plenty of motion surrounding this terminal. So my feeling about it is, is you ought to be satisfied with that.

If the terminal isn't blowing a gross auditing error exists. Gross auditing errors . . I gave you one gross auditing error which the pc is not doing the command. Other gross auditing errors is the rudiments are out, way out. Another gross auditing error is the auditor's attitude toward the pc is such as to drive the pc out through the bottom. This is a very gross auditing error. It's almost too gross to even be admitted, but you must discuss it and you must realize that it can exist. Fortunately, not in any majority. It's very rare, but it . . it can be a very gross auditing error. The auditor just hates the living guts out of the pc. He just hates the pc like poison. He's just not going to see that pc get anyplace. And all he does is make the pc guilty and try to trip the pc up and all of this kind of thing. Gross auditing error.

Another gross auditing error would be to try to audit a Scientologist who has been around for quite a while without getting the auditing Security Checks like 6 in hand . . the last two pages of Form 3 and the Sec Check 6. And if you haven't got those a bit in hand, why, you shouldn't expect anything to be happening, because they can be quite wildly out. And if they're out, just because they are overts against the exact activity which the person is performing . . not . . you might get the idea that those are . . the reason why those have to be free is the worst thing you could possibly do under the sun would be to have an overt or withhold on the subject of Scientology, see. Or the worst thing that you possibly could do anywhere from horizon to horizon would be to injure Scientology or some of its personnel, or something like that. you get an idea that that has an order of magnitude.

Well, the only order of magnitude it has is to stop a fellow's case advance. Because it's an overt act against the exact thing that they're expecting benefit from. That is why it is a rough one.

Now, of course, that incidentally does work out to be the most horrible overt act that they can pull. Because it's against themselves, because it stalls their case, but it's only an overt act to the degree that they now don't recover. You see how . . how this thing all works out?

You find all kinds of weird attitudes. You find all manner of weird attitudes amongst field auditors. Here, there, they've been gone out of perimeter, out of touch for a long time. They've been nattering around and . . and so forth.

Of course, they haven't had . . made very much . . such a person hasn't made any progress because his overts would stop him from making any progress in auditing. The fact that he doesn't make any progress in auditing then makes him hostile toward auditing, you see. And then because he's hostile to auditing, you see, he has more overts against auditing. So, of course, he makes even less progress. And eventually he stalls down and then all of his fake ridges key in, you see. All the times he's infraudulated people . . key in. And all his doubts key in and he goes kind of spinny.

All right. Well, this person finally . . he hears that somebody has gotten some results and you find yourself auditing him. This is an extreme case of this sort of thing. Why, he isn't going to make any progress . . not until you get the last couple of pages of a . . of a Form 3 flat and not until you get a 6 pretty flat. You're actually wasting time doing very much with him until you do those things.

Oddly enough, you can, if you're very good, find his goal and terminal while this is being done . . if you're very good. But it makes it very rough. It makes it harder to do.

It's quite interesting. You look at mail coming in from such people, and so forth. And they . . they look down the line, and it's quite . . kind of horrifying, you know. you say, "Boy, this poor guy. He's got himself stalled in a box," huh. There he is. There he is. Sitting there in upper Kokokomo and he's having himself a ball.

And as I told Robin today, I said . . somebody had said, "Well, we've just . . just got through having our sessions." And I read the rest of the letter, you see. And the rest of the letter is rather insouciant and insolent and . . and so on. We know the past history of this particular couple, and it's not good, and . . see, why are they getting audited?

Because I'm sure the last thing that they would do in the area that they are in would have anything to do whatsoever with a Form 6. It would be immediate tacit consent. See, they . . they both would have so many overts along these particular lines, you see, that there wouldn't ever seem that there was any overt to it, don't you see. So therefore, they would say, "Well, there's no sense in running that because. . . You know, well, you can't do anything with that." And, well, why are they getting processed? See. Why are they . . why are they fooling with it? Because they have overts against what they are expecting benefit from.

And I suppose you can have overts against castor oil and still get medical benefits from it, but unfortunately Scientology doesn't work that way. Ah, me.

Well, all right. I said T was going . . you were to ask questions, but you had one propounded here which I thought I had better cover and then I had that news about this policy letter I thought I'd better give you and give you some rundown because it does have an effect upon you. It does have a rather broad effect because you run into it more than once. Even if you aren't even near a Central Organization, you're going to run into it.

Well, what do you have to do . . . I just brought up this hypothetical case and how desperate it all was about this couple who were way off some place or another and with nattering overts and yippety-yaps of one kind or another.

Just today I . . we received some interesting news about another Clear, and, all checked out by one and all. Oddly enough, the person was (quote) cleared (unquote) and then took an HCA Course, but no engrams had been run and ran into a mishmash of engrams that took twenty hours to get rid of And then checked out Clear as a bell.

In other words, engrams . . completely outside anybody with any advice that they had to run them . . they had to be run, that was it. This has happened twice now on Clears. They get cleared and then nobody has cleaned up any of the engrams on the chain. And these engrams key in and they have to be run out and

then they eventually straighten up and that's it. So the stabilization . . what's in the road of stabilization is the engram.

So, anyhow, discussing the couple as I've just discussed there, what do you have to have in order to . . to handle a situation like that? Well, in this particular case we had a couple that weren't on the line by a long way and I got a hold of one of them and put him in an ACC. And I rode that right straight down and taught that ACC hard, myself And I made sure that that person got straightened up.

And I devised . . . we were at that time running O/Ws and I made sure that this person got off his O/Ws on the subject. He went home. His wife came in. And his wife got Clear. She went home and they started clearing people. They're lying a wonderful life. Everything's going along fine. Everything's just gorgeous in all directions.

So what do you have to have to straighten anything like that out? You have to have a positive assurance that in a Central Organization or in centers around the world, when you tell such a couple, on . . one or the other of them, to go on in and get straightened out, that they go in and they get straightened out. And their engrams are neglected until their Security Checks are square. And their Security Checks are handled and all that's flat. And then they get some results, and they get a subjective reality on what they're doing and they go home and they can do something And this has a great deal to do with the future dissemination of Scientology.

There is a modus operandi. We have to have Central Organizations in which we can base a total security that this will happen. And we can tell such . . such people to go in and . . one or the other of them . . and get run through the mill. And when they have been . . to ourselves have a total security that all of their overts, their Security Checking has been done, has been done well, has been very effective and what has been run on them has given them a good subjective reality on what they are doing . . they go home and they sail. They have done it every time. And we have . . do . . this . . these are not isolated cases.

Now, up to this time, I myself have had to do it. So you just better be getting geared up on the subject of being able to do it. When you get some of these people and they've been Pattering around and they've been having a hell of a time on the fringes and so forth and they've been trying to get audited this way and that way and they're auditing each other, but they don't like that "Well, that Hubbard and that Central Organization . . they're pretty terrible people and everything's all bad, you see. But we're going on with it," you know, this kind of a thing Well, they're got . . getting no place. What do you have to do?

You have to furnish the areas of the world, you see, where you can pick up such people, straighten out one or the other of them. Give them good, sound Security Checking. Make sure that's all in the groove. Make sure they got good subjective reality on what they're doing. Then turn them loose and then all of a sudden you will see action.

So we do have the formula more or less worked out. our task is to make sure that there's a total security . . that when we tell these people to go in and get straightened out, that where they arrive and where they go into, does straighten them out and straightens them out very expertly and well. And when we've done that, you're going to see dissemination take place by the cube over what it is doing now. You'll see that with great rapidity.

Okay. Well, I've given you a lot of odds and ends. I hope it is of some value to you.

Audience: Thank you.