PROBLEMS INTENSIVE

A lecture given on
10 October 1961

What is the date here? The 10th of. . . ?

Audience: Tenth of October.

Tenth of October 1961, Special Briefing Course, Saint Hill.

Now, supposing, supposing just for fun, supposing that Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing Dianetics and Scientology did everything they were supposed to do. Supposing that was a fact. And supposing this was all perfectly true. And when you got processed, why, all of these problems would resolve, everything would straighten out, and there was no vast difficulty of any kind. And this was the answer. And man hadn't had the answer before, but now we've got the answer. Now supposing all that were absolutely true. Now, just a moment now; supposing that were all true, completely true, and that was totally factual and that was it. Got that?

Now just supposing that were all perfectly true: What would your problem have been before you came into it? What would your problem have been before you came into it? Just before you came into Dianetics and Scientology, what would have been your personal problem in existence? Can you answer that question? Hm-hm. Is this a new look? Have you just suddenly realized something? Hm? Have you? Have you just suddenly realized that there was a problem there immediately before you came into Dianetics and Scientology?

Do you get a somatic at the same time? No?

All right. Now let's sort it out again. Was that really the problem you had? Was that really the problem you had? Has that problem been carrying along since?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now I've just been giving you the approach you should use on a PE. That is the approach you should use on a PE.

Supposing Dianetics and Scientology were everything that they were supposed to be . . and you can go on, of course, ad infinitum, and add it all up. And there's one old bulletin I wrote about a year ago, or something like that, that give all of its firsts. What is Scientology? And that gives a tremendous number of firsts that Scientology had . . for the first time this, for the first time that. Supposing all this were true? And then you ask the people after you had carried on this way for about a half an hour and described Scientology to them completely, and give them the broadest possible description of it, then ask them what would their problem be that would make them come to this?

Now, of course, you're old-timers. You've been processed a long time. Most of these things are dead and gone and long buried, but not with a group you'll get on PE. It will take their heads off. And that should be the first lecture given on a PE course. I got that taped. Take it from me. That is a piece of technology, not a piece of propaganda nor administration.

Why? What exactly are you doing? What exactly are you doing You're giving them a stable datum. You're punching it in. You're making a conditional stable datum. And then if you carried it on that this was a very desirable stable datum, if it were true and if it existed . . you keep adding that in . . this is a very desirable stable datum, you, of course, have restimulated that basic problem of continued, long-time worry and agony up to a point where it's ready to blow their heads off. And then you ask them, "What was your problem? Why did you come to Scientology? What problem do you have that has driven you to this?"

Now, every other group in the history of man would at once conceal this tremendous mechanism, because it would hold a group together endlessly just because they're pressured in. If they never gave them the answer, if they never had anything out of it, they would be pushed together by the duress. They would be told all the time that this was it, and this was the exact thing, and so forth, and there they were, and it would restimulate that problem if processing or something of that sort was not adequate to relieve it. But we are rich in technology, and we have a little more nerve than that, so you could actually ask them the first crack out of the box.

A lot of them there for the first time, you could ask them just bang! "What is the problem that would cause you to accept this? What problem do you have in your personal life that would bring you to us?" Well, of course, you've keyed it in, only they haven't noticed it being keyed in. And when you ask them, of course, the problem is just staring them in the face.

And on a certain percentage of these people, you will produce a fundamental and startling change in case. Just like that! Bang! You'll turn on somatics on them in many instances, but they will be happy to have them, because they'll say, "Oh, is that what that is? Oh, is that what this is all about?" And they will have a personal recognition.

Now you can go on and describe to them what processing is, how problems are relieved, that sort of thing, and go ahead just from that point of view.

You could send them into a co-audit or into the HGC. And it would be better, actually, to send them to the HGC than into a co-audit. It's always better, in spite of the fact that they can fool around for a long time in a coaudit . . unless you've got a co-audit running that is going to do something about problems. And if we're going to use that kind of an approach, then we had better doctor up the co-audit so it takes care of that exact situation.

We're not dealing with what the co-audit would do about this. We're dealing, actually, with what a Class II Auditor would do about this . . a Class II Auditor.

We have a new series of classifications. A Class I Auditor is simply an auditor who runs anything, and that Class I exists for just two purposes. First and foremost, it lets an old-timer, who has a stable datum that a process will work, actually do auditing for you without training, so as to give him an opportunity to get trained while he audits. That is an administrative problem in HGCs, and is an administrative problem in any clinic or any center. You have that basic administrative problem. You have people around, and instead of training them for nineteen weeks, or something like this, before they do a speck of auditing for you, you give them something on which they have reality and let them go ahead, because they will win with it, and they will get some wins, and it'll be a passable show. And this gives you an opportunity at the same time to train these auditors up to a Class II. And we're talking now about, really, Class II. I've just given you the key question, disguised as a PE question, that will take apart any case, providing you go at it right. And there is a new rundown, which you will see very shortly. It's just like a Preclear Assessment Sheet. And it has two new sections on the end of the Preclear Assessment Sheet.

Now, you know that anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet . . anybody can do a Preclear Assessment Sheet. You can sit there and ask these questions and fill out these forms, and you can get the data from the pc and there it is. Do you agree with me that that's a fairly easy thing to do?

Audience: Hm-mm. Yeah.

All right. Now, what if you had a process which added a section on top of that, which asked them simply some more similar questions and got you a list of things; and then you had a new section on top of that which you just filled in as you process the exact processes given in that new section? That would be a very easy thing to handle.

There's your O section, and that asks a certain series of things and asks for a certain series of circumstances, and you get . . you just write down this new series of circumstances from the pc, and then when you've got those, you read them off to the pc and notice the needle reaction of the E-Meter for each

one. And you take your steepest or most reactive needle reaction. You don't do it by elimination. You just read it off and you say, "Well, it fell off the pin or wobbled more than otherwise."

You just take that one, and then with that datum which you've gotten out of the O section, we move over into the P section. And in that section we take that one datum and we just do this, and then we write down we have done that; and we do this, and we have written down we do that; and then we process this exact process for a while, and then we write down that the tone arm isn't moving anymore on this process; and then we do this, and then we do the next, and we write down each time we've done one of these things and we come down to the end of it.

Now, that is one P section. And the P sections are interchangeable . . I mean, they're additional. So we take the same form that we've got now, including the O section, and we do this assessment again down through the O section, and we get the biggest read we get this time. And we move over and do a whole new P section. And we finish that whole new P section, and so forth, we lay that aside, we go back to the O section, and we go down the whole list of the O section, and then we write down what was the steepest reaction now; we take that one and we move over into the P section, and we do it down the same form of the P section. We just keep doing this. That is a Class II action, and that is a very easy one to do.

It includes the rudiments, Problems Process, and it includes a Security Check on the people in the prior confusion.

Now, I'll give you the modus operandi by which this is done.

O section simply asks for changes in the person's life. It asks for them specifically: Times their life changed, and it makes a list of each one of these things . . whether that life changed because of death or graduation or anything else, we don't care. We just write down this particular point of change.

And now, because the pc has not noticed the most significant points of change . . if he has, it's all right, but if he hasn't, it's all right . . we've got a series of new questions: "When did you take up a certain diet?" "When did you join a certain religious group?" "When did you decide you had better go back to Church and go back to Church?" You get all this type of question. We fill out a whole bunch of these questions. And they're all what? They're all major change points in a person's life.

Here's the sleeper: Each one of these change points must be eventually taken up in the P section, because the P section asks, after the assessment is done, for the problem which they had immediately before the change . . and you knock their heads off. That is the prior problem combined with the prior confusion. And the two things are deadly.

You find each time they had a problem just before that change, and that the change was a solution to the problem. And therefore, the problem has been hung up ever since because they solved it. That is the sleeper. And of course, just before that problem, there was a hell of a confusion. So you're going to take up the problem. Now let's see how this would be done. O section . . we ask them this long list of changes. It's just very simple. It's "When did your life change?" you see?

And well, they say, "Well, life changed pretty much after I got out of that prep school."

"Good. Prep school. When was that?"

"Well, I guess that was in uh. . . oh, well, that was in 1942 . . no, that was in 1932. No, that was in 1952. Uh . . . that was in um . . . it's sometime in the past."

Well, you don't ask the auditor to date it particularly. All you want is an approximate date. That's why I'm giving you this lecture, is to give you the gen on how to run one of these forms, and I'll tell you why in a minute.

The date can be very, very approximate. It can be ten years ago or anything We don't care, see? And we'll say, "All right. When was another change in your life?"

"Well, when my mother uh. . . ran off with the iceman. That . . . that was a big change in my life." Or whatever it was, see?

Well, so we write down, you know, Mother ran off with the iceman. "About when was that?"

"Well, I guess that must have been about, uh . . . fifteen, twenty, thirty, forty . . I don't know. Twenty-five, six, eight, fifteen. No, I was a small child at the time. Uh. . . no, I was a small child at the time, and I'm so-and-so now, and so on. And I must have been about. . . I was either five or fifteen or something like that."

Because all of these things, you're asking for stuff that is floating on the time track, so you don't care about the accurate date. you just get him to make a statement on it. you just get him to make a statement. You put down, well, it was twenty years ago, something like that, see?

And you keep getting these changes. Now, these other changes have missed him usually, but every time he took up a diet, a fad, changed his clothes, all of a sudden changed his methods of living in some fashion, you get all those as changes in his life, too. And you actually will have, by the time you finish an O section, most of the changes in the life. Now, of course, it's going to occur, later on he's going to remember new changes in his life. And it's a moot question whether you bother to add those onto the O section of this particular questionnaire or not. We don't care whether you add these

new changes on or not. You'll wind up with a lot of changes, and they'll be the most significant changes in the fellow's life, and you'll hit it.

This, you see, is not a very precision activity, is it? You got to ask questions and you got to get the answers to the questions. The truth of the matter is, no pc is going to kick the bucket because you miss.

In other words, this is a very safe activity. So this is a safe activity, and that would be a very happy day for the Director of Processing in any organization, to have a safe activity.

See, that compares tremendously different than Routine 3. Routine 3 is not a safe activity at all. you get the wrong goal and the wrong terminal, and you run it and you've had it. Oh, you can patch the case up and hang it back together again with sticky plaster, but this is a very precision activity, Routine 3. Well, we're talking about Routine 2, so we've got an imprecise activity. What I have discovered, actually, just as a side comment here, is an imprecise activity that will change the living daylights out of a case. and not exaggerating now. you run this and you'll see. And it can be done rather imprecisely, and it can be done rather skimpily, and they can forget to flatten things, and they can do other goofs, and they can have the rudiments out, and other things can happen, you see, and they're still going to get results. So that's a good thing to have around, isn't it?

All right. You see, you've defeated me down here.

Now, anyway, here's . . . this long list of changes. Now just reading off these changes: "All right. Your mother ran away with the iceman, and so forth. And later on . . . and you joined the Holy Rollers of God Help us, and. . ." this and that. And you just read each one of these changes you've written down. And you've written it down in his language and he can spot it. That's the thing. It's just a communication that he can spot. And you read your needle reaction; you put your needle reaction down. But you're doing the P section, you see, by the time you do this.

And you get the needle reaction. And then it's number so. And you'll find all these changes are all numbered over here. It's easy. So it's number so-and-so. And you write that down in the P section, and you put a descriptive note on it if you want to, to make it very plain. And now we spring the big question.

And it's written right there in the P section on about the third line, something like that. And it says, "Now say to the pc, 'What problem did you have immediately before that change?'" Now, you think I'm being sarcastic, but I am not being sarcastic. I'm showing you that this is an easy one to get across. And I'm trying to ease your mind, because you will be administering people doing this one, you see? And I'm trying to give you an easy mind on doing it.

And they're going to have worries. And I'm just telling you, now don't have these worries. I'll tell you the only . . about the only two things they can do wrong in the test. We will take those things up, and they're rather minor.

All right. So we say now, "What was your problem?" And we get him to state the problem. Now, this is the first thing that can go wrong, is that he states a fact and the auditor writes it down as a problem. He's got to state a problem, so you've got to keep him stating it if he persists in stating facts instead of problems.

Now, the difference between a fact and a problem is simply this: A problem has how or what or which. It has a question, it has a mystery connected with it. It is not a fait accompli. A fait accompli, a fact, is this: "My head hurt." See, that's not a problem; it's a fact.

So you ask now . . . you ask that change, and you say, "What problem did you have immediately before this?"

And he says, "My head hurt."

"Good." You say, "All right. Now how would you state that as a problem?"

And he says, "Well, my head hurt pretty bad."

And you say, "Well, did you have a problem about it?" You see?

And he said, "Well, also my head uh . . . sometimes didn't hurt."

And you say, "Yes, well, good. But did you have a problem around this?" And it finally drives home to him that you're asking for a problem.

And he says, "Well, yes. Sometimes it hurt and sometimes it . . . oh, well, a problem. Yes. Well, it's 'when my head was going to hurt.' Yeah."

And you actually have to work at this point until you get the person to state the problem . . as a problem, not as a fact. And you're going to find some auditors that are under training in Class II that will have a rough time doing this, because you'll get the slips back and they will be saying on them "My head hurt." What is the problem? And then the fellow has run an hour and a half of processing on this fact, you see? And he couldn't fit it in, because it isn't . . . so on. And it's very all . . . very complicated. And he couldn't run the right process. He didn't do anybody any harm, but he didn't get very far either. You want a problem, not a fact.

All right. Now having gotten that, it says right on the next line that what you ask is simply your problem process. It gives you the wording of the rudiment for problems. Of course, you're running what? You're running a present time problem of long duration. Naturally, you're into it with a crash.

Now, your next point is that you're just going to run that till the tone arm quiets down. Now, that doesn't say how long. Supposing they leave it unflat. Oh, it doesn't matter. It'd be nice to get a nice, neat, workmanlike job done on it, where "unknown" was run against the problem until the tone arm no longer moved for twenty minutes. That would be nice, but it is not vital.

Now, it ceases to be vital after the somatic that turns up with it has disappeared. It ceases to be vital. But if a person just backed off of it while the somatic was in high gear, there possibly might be a little repercussion.

When we first gave, oh, I don't know, let's see, "Is this a withhold from Scientologists or is it an overt to say so?" You know, you come against that all the time. Would it be an overt to say it, or is it a withhold if you don't?

We gave Mike Pernetta the gen on how you flattened a level, and we said you ran it until the tone arm didn't move, you see? He got the tone arm into motion and then left it. And that was his interpretation of it, and he did that on three consecutive levels on a pc I'm looking at right this minute. I had his head and dried his ears, but it didn't do any good. This is what he had done.

So you see, that can be badly interpreted even by a relatively good auditor. That tone arm motion, on just an old point like that, you know, everybody knows "Well, you run it till the motion goes out of the tone arm and it finished," and 90 forth. And you'll get somebody that'll turn it square around and say, "Oh, you get the tone arm so it's moving, and then you knock it off."

I know this sounds utter idiocy, but I'm telling you something that has happened. So you have to do a little police work on that point. And that is the other point you have to be a little bit shy about. Just make sure that the problem gets flattened, the tone arm motion disappears, on that rudiment command.

Now, you're not running that rudiment against the needle, as you ordinarily would, because this has directed us to do what: This has found for us the present time problem of long duration which will produce hidden standards. And I've just shortcut the route into hidden standards here with a large, wide knife. So it's a present time problem of long duration that you're running, so therefore you'd better run it by the tone arm.

So you run the tone arm motion out of that. Now how long is that going to take? Well, at a conservative estimate, I would say that it was two to five hours of auditing. I would say it was something on that order, two to five hours of auditing.

Now you say, "Well, what happens to Model Session while you're doing all this?" and so forth. Well, we assume that some kind of a session was set up at the time they started the assessment. We assume this, and we assume that the next day that they start auditing, that they're going to do a Model Session and move into it. But what if they hit a present time problem?

Well, you're running a present time problem, so you are running a rudiment. So a nice, precise job of auditing would include running the pc on this particular rundown with Model Session in full play. Yes, that would be a nice, neat job of auditing. But let me tell you something. It doesn't much matter if the whole rudiments and Model Session are omitted. That's a nice, sloppy process, isn't it? I designed a real sloppy one here. That's real good. you can make lots of mistakes with it.

All right. Now what happens when he's got the tone arm motion off of this problem? Now, he asks, it says right there, the sixty-dollar question: "What was the confusion in your life immediately before that?" "What confusion was in your life?" And it does an assessment of the people in the confusion. You write down then all the names of the people connected with the confusion in his life, see? And the idea of listing and asking for another person in the confusion of the life will keep putting the person back into the confusion, and stop him skidding forward, and you will wind up with a list of personnel. And now you security check this personnel.

Now this, of course, perhaps could require a little bit of acumen and alertness, because you've got to sort of make up a Security Check. But at the same time, there are other Security Checks, and so on, and there will exist a Security Check that matches up to almost any person, you see? You know, the idea "What have you done to him?" and "What have you withheld from him?" is about all it is.

Now you could put in at this point . . run overt-withhold on that person and get some result out of the thing. You actually could do just that. you could run O/W rather than security check, but it is much slower, and it doesn't get you anywhere near as far as it should, and it is running against a terminal for which they have not been assessed. And so it has a point of danger to it. It is better to security check the terminals. Now, that question is going to come up, and you're going to be asked why you just don't run O/W on each one of these terminals. Well, it's because you're using a terminal process on a terminal that has not been assessed on the goals line. And if the terminal is not on the goals line, it can beef up the case. The only thing you can do is security check it. That won't beef up the case, and all you want to get off are the withholds, and you don't want the overts at all. Simple, huh?

All right. This is the kind of a list you've got: "Now, what was the confusion immediately before that?"

"Oh, my God, I'd forgotten all about it, but there was an automobile accident, and this and that happened, and so forth. And uh . . . my father was very upset, and there was a terrible confusion. And uh . . . uh . . . actually, I had to pay for the car and I borrowed some money from my uncle George, and then they all . . . oh, that's just terrible."

You say, "All right. That's fine. That's the confusion area. Now, who did you say, now . . your father?" and you write that down, you see? The people in the confusion . . it provides a long list there for the people in the confusion. You write down, "Well, the people in the car. These were so-and-so and so-and-so. And there's your father. And this was so-and-so and so-and-so. And this was . . . and your mother was part of this, and your sister and . . ."

"Oh, yes," he says, "and my . . . my . . . my boss. He was part of this, too. Yeah." So you write down boss, you see?

And you just take this list . . . Now, if you were doing a very workmanlike job, of course, you would assess that list. But again, it isn't important. You could just take them in order of rotation, and you just get the withholds off on each one of these people with this type of question: "What were you withholding from your father at that time?" You see? "Good. Well now, had you done something else that you didn't dare tell your father about?" You see? "What didn't your father find out about that?" You see? "What hasn't your father ever found out about that?" You know, just keep plugging this type thing to get the withholds off.

Now we get the withholds off of Father, and that seems pretty good; and then we get the withholds off of the next person, and that seems pretty good; and we get the withholds off the next people, and that seems pretty good. And it isn't done thoroughly, it doesn't have to be done thoroughly. It's going to resolve the confusion. Why? You got the problem off the top of it already. And you can just take a sort of a lick and a promise at the thing

Now, it'd be nice if it were done thoroughly, and it would produce a much better case gain, and all of this, and you would for sure have this thing out of the road if it were well . . done well, but you understand that if it were done at all, why, it's successful . . you'll have success on every hand just doing it at all, don't you see? So that could be kind of sloppy too. you try to get them to do it well, but they do it sloppy and they still win.

All right. So you go down the end of this list, and that is the end of that P section. And you put that over here, and that is that.

Now you take up the next item assessed off of the O section. Now you assess the major changes in the person's life . . you've got a new P section form, see . . you assess the major changes in the person's life from the old O section that you had, and you write down the one which you now find produces the biggest needle action. And you go through the same routine on it: Find out the problem that preceded it, run the rudiments process on that problem, find the prior confusion to that thing, get a list of personnel involved in that prior confusion, get the withholds off from those people.

This is kind of a, kind of a different Security Check, in that it's withholds from those people specifically. It's the not-knows, actually, that he's run on that personnel. And you got that nicely cleaned up, and then you, of course . . that's the end of that P section.

And you get a new P section form, and you go back to the old O section and you do a new assessment. And you just run the whole thing down till you can't get any needle motion anymore on that old O section.

And at that point, we could say at that point, with a considerable amount of truth . . when we have finished up this activity . . we could say that the person was a Release. We could say it just like that. And we could also say, with some security, that the person had no hidden standards and would do auditing commands.

All right. Now you could go ahead with general Security Checks. You could go ahead with checking against any lingering chronic somatics, using Model Session, getting the rudiments in and that sort of thing, and you could finish up the activities that a Class II Auditor could do. you could do all of them. But you know these things are going to be fairly functional, because you've gotten the hidden standards out of the road. You've gotten the basic problems of a lifetime, the hidden standards have been swept away by this particular packaged activity.

Then you'd go ahead, now, and you would assess for goal . . you turn him over to a Class III activity. The pc would have to be turned over. After all the Security Checks anybody could dream up, or any Security Check published anyplace had been given, why, that would be as far as you could take him at Class II. But you've gotten quite a ways. You've got Security Checks done. You've got hidden standards off. You've got chronic problems of long duration off the case. And that seems to me like that would really be setting one up, wouldn't it? And the case would have an enormous reality! Let me tell you, some enormous reality can greet this particular activity, because this is a sneak way of finding the present time problem of long duration, which I've just dreamed up for you and squared around, and you'll find it very functional and very workable.

Now, a case that had had this done to it, coming into a goals terminal assessment and a goals terminal run, of course, would run like hot butter, because the only thing that's getting in your road in clearing is the hidden standard and the withhold. That's all. The present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards . . let me say that . . and the withholds that you get off in Security Checks: those are the only things standing in the road of people going Clear. And if you could handle all of those, why, bang! that would be very profitable. And it isn't just turning somebody over to an auditor, because you haven't any auditors that can do anything else. It actually is very profitable to set a case up.

Now, this would be a much more profitable way of running 1A, and it supplants 1A in full. This is how you get the problems off a case. you find out this is more workable, and it will work on people who have not had their goals and terminals found . . even better than 1A. Short. It's very fast. Produces a high level of reality in the pc. Produces a tremendous amount of interest. The interest goes way up on this particular activity.

Well now, just look at the assessment alone. Let's go back over the points of improvement now. Look at the assessment. You mean to say that somebody is going to sit there and actually have spotted for him all the changes in his life without getting a case gain? He'd cognite. He'd cognite on some things, because these things will start turning up, you know?

And after he thinks he's given you all the major changes, you ask him when he went on a diet, or something screwball like that, or when he started eating special food, you know, and he . . .

"Special food? Yes. Well, you know, uh . . . well . . . I've just been doing it for so many years. Actually, I'm not any vegetarian or anything like that, but the doctors put me on uh. . . a diet, and I actually haven't ever much exceeded it since. It's no salt and uh . . . so on. It's a very mild thing. But come to think about it, guess I am on a diet, and uh . . . Well, good heavens, when was that? Must have been about '50 or 1935. No. I wasn't born yet in 1935." And all of a sudden, a new area of track opens up. So this type of assessment just keeps opening up track . . in this lifetime, you see; opening up track in this lifetime . . just the assessment all by itself.

Now, you've already asked him earlier than this, on the straight Preclear Assessment Form, for his operations, and for everything, and you've noticed that that sometimes opens up track on PCs. Well, an assessment of the major changes of a person's track, that certainly does. And now we take these things apart, because every one of them sat on top of a problem. And don't be surprised.

Now, here are the limitations of all of this, and things you shouldn't be surprised about in doing this particular rundown.

Don't be surprised at all if it always turns out to be the same problem before each change. And if it again turns out to be the same problem, what do you do? Now, you will be asked this. you will be asked this

pleadingly and burningly. "This is the second assessment we did. We've already got the personnel all 'hidden confused' out, and we got the thing flat with the rudiments process . . and it was flat. And we had an awful time because he kept going back into a space-opera engram. And we kept him out of that." (Knucklehead.)

"Um . . . and we guided him as well as we could, and all of a sudden we find this 'left school,' 'left prep school,' and he comes up with the same problem, and it's still alive on the meter! Now how about that?"

Well, your proper answer to that is, "What came up on form of the P section? What came up on that form?"

"Well, this problem . . same problem. Uh . . . he had the same problem just before he left prep school."

"All right. Now what is the next line on the P form?"

"Well . . oh, well, I see what you mean. All right."

So he goes back and he runs the rudiments process on the same problem again. Of course, it has changed aspect and shifted over into a greater or lesser intensity of some kind or another. And he'll run that thing down. He'll find the area of prior confusion. And of course, the whole of the fellow's schooling opens up this time. And that had all been closed in. And so on. And he has a win. Everybody has a win, you see? But it'll worry people because the same problem will turn up, as it will often do. And it'll now turn up live all over again because it's got a new aspect.

Of course, the joke about this is, is he's had this same problem for the last hundred trillion, you see? So, it doesn't matter. It doesn't matter. You just get some more running on the same problem, and then get the application of that problem to this life by getting off the area of prior confusion, don't you see? And you're just unbaling the case and unbaling it and . . naturally, and so forth. But it'll worry people. You mark my words.

Now, sometimes the person is dispersed off the main problem and nothing happens with this; nothing will happen, I guarantee you, for the first four sections that you fill out. The first four P sections that are filled out, there's nothing . . nothing really happening The person is just plugging along and . . . Find the areas of prior confusion. The problems are wildly different. And on the fifth one, you get the problem. And it almost blows their head off. You get the idea?

So that may happen in the first one you do, and it may happen in the fourth one you do, and it may happen in the tenth one you do. It's going to happen. Sooner or later he will move onto this, because the other problems are simply baling off the center-line problem. And he'll recognize that all problems are this problem, and so forth, and he will run it.

Well, after you've addressed this problem for quite a while, this problem will move out into another perimeter and he will feel freer and more in communication in this lifetime. And more important than that, you will have keyed out his hidden standards.

Now, let me warn you about something: Until you have the goal and terminal of the pc, all you can do with a case is key it out. That's all you can do with a case until you have his goal and his terminal and start running them. You say, "Well, then it's unfair to the case." Ah, well, but this is a double sort of a package. You can have his goal and terminal without getting off his hidden standards and problems of long duration, and they won't run.

So, you could find his goal and terminal, and then go back and do this problems straighten-out . . I've been calling it a . . Problems Intensives. You could straighten out all of his problems and hidden standards, and so forth, and then go back and run the thing; or you could do the Problems Intensive and then assess him and then go back and do all the thing. But you're going to have to, in any case that's going to hang up . . and that is something on the order of 90 percent of the cases you'll audit . . you're going to have to do something like this to get the present time problems of long duration and the hidden standards off the case, anyhow. So it doesn't matter whether you do it before the goal and terminal are

found; you will certainly have to do it after the goal and terminal are found if you do that first, you see? So it doesn't matter which side of the thing you do it on. It really doesn't matter very much, except that the pc cognites faster if he knows what his goal and terminal are. He gets a little bit more zip out of this particular activity. That's about all you can say about it.

If you haven't got the pc's goal and terminal, and you aren't running Prehav levels on the pc, all you're doing is keying things out. you are keying things out.

Now, the funny part of it is that when he gets his goal and when he moves over into his terminal and when you go on down the terminal line, the Prehav runs, and he collides with engrams as he goes down the thing, this headache that he thought desperately was turned on by having left prep school, this difficulty he has had with women, and all of that sort of thing, are suddenly found to be resident when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. There they sit. And it's there in full, and the somatics come back on in full, but this time they run out. A somatic is where it is on the track, and it's no place else.

But you've put him in shape to be able to function without the somatic for a while, don't you see? And then when he runs into it, it runs out rather easily. Otherwise, you're always running him in the engram when he was a telegraph operator on the Mason and Dixon line. See, that's the silliness of it all.

You can't get anyplace if you don't key it out, because he's in 7,762 engrams, various kinds, and your goals preparation keys out the hidden standards and fixes these things up and gets this life so it's functioning, and so forth. And then you've got a pc who can stay in-session. And then you can run him on down the track and really find where they are. Otherwise, you're only going to run into locks anyhow, and you're going to do a key-out and a key-out and a key-out as you run with the Prehav Scale, and so forth, see? You're going to do key-outs, key-outs, key-outs, then all of a sudden he goes into the engram.

And on a Class IV proposition, don't be too surprised to have somebody almost Clear, or actually reading Clear, that moves over then into a Class IV activity. And the reason they came into Dianetics and Scientology is because they had terrible pains in their appendectomy . . the pain is not in their appendix, it's in their appendectomy. And all of a sudden, they find out this has nothing whatsoever to do with an appendectomy. Actually, it wasn't that type of thing, but earlier on the track they used to install meters in people at about that period of time, and so on, and somebody's screwdriver slipped. Something real goofy. And it comes off . . right where the somatic went in, the somatic will come off. Somatics are where they are, and they are no place else.

So this is a key-out activity so that you can run a pc. Of course, he gets very happy about all this and straightens out his life to a remarkable degree, and you are making case gains, and they are stable case gains. No doubt about that, because it'd take him another lifetime to get him keyed in this nicely again, see? But if you just left him at this point, that is what would happen. Next life, why, he'd just stack them all in again, because you haven't got them out at source. Got the idea? So this is the value of it. It actually sets a person up to be audited, and incidentally makes them much happier with life, and also gives them a reality on Scientology.

Now, the reason you are handling hidden standards should not be hidden from you.

You are handling a hidden standard not because the individual has his attention stuck someplace, you are not running a hidden standard because the individual vias auditing commands through it, although that is one of the things that it does; you are running a hidden standard only for this reason: it is an oracle. Every hidden standard is an oracle. The pc has got an oracle.

Now it may look to you this way: The pc every session takes off his glasses and looks around the room to see if his eyesight is better.

"Well," you say to yourself, "well, that is a test he is making to find out whether or not his auditing is progressing" And that's what you think is going on, but that is not what is going on at all. His eyesight somatic knows, and it's the only data there is. That is all the data there is. Observation and experience have no bearing on his knowingness. Airplane crashes in the front yard: He sees if his eyesight is worse.

If his eyesight is worse, he knows that the airplane crashed in the yard. If his eyesight isn't worse, he knows it isn't there.

The fact that the airplane crashed in the yard hasn't anything to do with his knowingness. It does not much influence his knowingness. This you have to get straight. A hidden standard is his present time problem of highly specialized import, but is in highly specialized use. And when you first collide with a hidden standard, when you first begin to study a hidden standard, you think of it rather loosely. You think of it as, well, it's just a specialized present time problem of long duration of some kind or another. And the pc is viaing his auditing commands through this thing and he hasn't therefore got his attention on the session, and therefore anything that would disturb the pc during a session would be a hidden standard. And actually, then, aren't the pc's hidden standards all expressed in his goals for the session? And therefore, isn't it true that a person who is trying to find out if he is brighter or not after a session is over would be operating from a hidden standard? And therefore, isn't it true that everything the pc ever gains is basically a hidden standard? And isn't it true, then, that everything, every change the pc notices in his case would be because of a hidden standard? You see, you can get the hidden standard is no longer hidden, man. It's "any change is a hidden standard."

Well, that's not its definition. That is not what a hidden standard is, by a long way. And you at right this present instant are labeling things "hidden standards" which are simply, oh, little bit of a present time problem of long duration, or a goal for the session, or it's something else and it hasn't any real influence on the auditing, see? A hidden standard is a pretty vicious proposition. It is not a tiny, light proposition at all.

The fellow does it every command or every session. And if he does it every command, every session, it's constant . . then it knows. Then you must assume this about the hidden standard: The hidden standard is, it knows and he doesn't. So he has to consult it to find out. But because you're not auditing him out of session, you don't notice that he does this all the time in life. Ear burns, it's not true. Ear doesn't burn, true.

What a way to adjudicate a piece of music. Now, most music critics are pretty badly spun in, but here'll be a music critic: All right. He listens to the medulla oblongata in E-flat minor, and he listens to this.

I was listening to some music critics the other day on BBC. They were criticizing jazz, and I thought this was very amusing, because they were all sitting there, and every once in a while they'd talk about "being sent," and so forth. And "it didn't do something," one of the fellows said. you know? "It didn't do something," and he touches his chest, you know? And these people weren't judging music at all. They were reading their own somatics. The poor composer. If the composer knew this, he would pay less attention.

Well, let's take a music critic and actually he listens to a symphony orchestra or something tearing off a long chunk of the Overture of 1812. And afterwards he says, "Well, actually, it was not a bad performance but it lacked impact." What does he mean? Now, you go back over his criticism and you'll find out that every time things are pretty bad, they lack impact.

And if you, the auditor, were to ask him what impact, he would say, "Well, here, of course." And then if you searched a little bit further, you would find out that when he heard a piece of music, he knew it was good if he got a pressure on his chest, and if it was bad, he didn't get a pressure on his chest, so therefore he knew it was bad.

And this tells us (hideous thing) that this person actually never really hears the music. He is paying attention to a circuit which gives him a pressure or doesn't give him a pressure on his chest. Now, you're going to teach this person?

All the composers in the world could hire all the symphony orchestras in the world to play all kinds of music to him, loud and soft and so forth. He would not notice any of this music. Something else is listening to the music and reacting And if it doesn't react, he knows the music is no good. That's why you get these wild criticisms on art.

You know, some kid has stumbled over a paint pot in a kindergarten and spilled it on a piece of canvas, and somebody has come along and put it up in an exhibition. And you have a number of critics, then, all of a sudden raving about the beauty of form and rhythm and impact of this particular painting, don't you see? It was when they walked by it, did it restimulate an engram or didn't it? Had nothing to do with the painting. And so you get off into wild schools of bad draftsmanship, bad music; you get sudden popularity of somebody who goes flat on every note. you know, she always wears green dresses when she sings, and this adds up to certain producers getting a restimulation from green dresses. You know? And so here's this great singer. And then they put her on TV, you see, and the eggs pour out of the television screen like mad, and she gets no Hooper rating, and they say, "What happened?"

Well, you see, her impact wasn't singing, it was a green dress. And television is in black and white. You see, it's as screwy as this. Just as crazy as that. It's just as far offbeat.

All I'm trying to punch home is that the person's knowingness is not a result of experience; the person's knowingness is as a result of circuit. And now you're going to prove to him that Scientology works? And Mamie Glutz is going to get well? And everybody is going to get happy? And everybody is going to live better lives, and they're going to make more money, and that sort of thing. And this character goes on, and he knows it isn't working Why? Well, you see, it lacks impact. Well, what impact? The impact that moves in and out against his chest, of course. You see how this could work?

Now, I'm not berating anybody who has a hidden standard, particularly, because it's too easy to knock these things out. But recognize what they are. They're consultation mediums with which one knows.

And I think it'd be a highly risky thing if, flying an airplane, you knew you were on the right course if you had a pain in your right hip, and didn't have to pay a bit of attention to the instruments. I would say that . . .

This is the lower mockery of the great pilot who has a homing in . . . pigeon built in and actually can fly a straight course and wind up in the . . with tremendous accuracy, and so forth. But he does that because he's a great pilot, not because he's got a circuit.

You see, anything a circuit can do, a thetan can do, and do better. Any knowingness which can be imparted to the person is the mechanism of Throgmagog, which was handed out in Dianetics: Evolution of a Science. You can set up an independent intelligence alongside of you that tells you right from wrong

Now, most criminals are the product of circuits. It isn't true that people who have circuits are criminals, but a criminal is a specialized part of this. Now let's look at what a criminal does: A criminal knows right from wrong because a circuit is active or inactive. In other words, because something is restimulated or not restimulated, he knows right from wrong. And therefore he knows the cops are crazy, because they don't agree with his circuit.

They say, "You shouldn't have stolen the car." Well, he's got a little green light that lights up, and when he's doing right, why, the green light lights up, and when he's doing wrong, why, the red light lights up. And it happens inside of his skull, and when he passed this car the green light lit up, so he knew he should get in the car and drive off and that that was a right and proper action.

And the cops pick him up, and the cops tell him that wasn't a right and proper action. Well, man, they're crazy, if they're observed at all. And he is very puzzled as to why he's in court. You never saw more baffled people than criminals. I've studied this breed of cat and found it a very interesting breed of cat, because it's a type of intelligence which isn't generally credited with being insane. But it isn't there. And they are very baffled.

They say, "People pretend that you can tell right from wrong Talk about silly. Nobody can tell." That's the extreme one, see? Or, "Yes, of course I can tell right from wrong. When I'm doing right, I feel well, and when I'm doing wrong, I get a terror sensation in my stomach. And as long as I only do things that make me feel well, that is right, such as murder babies and steal jewelry. And if I do those things, that's fine. But if I become . . . if I get a job, this terror sensation turns on, so it's wrong to work." And if you

went into it closely with one of these characters and had a conversation of that depth and that searching type of questioning, you would learn some of the most fantastic things you ever heard of.

Well, to some slight degree, anybody with a hidden standard, you see, is no blood brother to this criminal . . that's just a lie . . but he's doing this to some degree.

So the auditor says, "Are you in-session?"

And the pc looks inside to find out if the little white bulb is burning. And the white bulb is burning, so he says, "Yes, I'm in-session."

"Now, did you get any result from the processing"

Now he looks at the little white bulb, and it's not on, so he didn't get any result from processing.

But what during the auditing did he do? He would do the command on a sort of a via. It'd come from the auditor, and then he put the command over here, and something over here gives him the command and then he follows the command. He's on a selfaudit. It knows, he doesn't.

Now this is the way people get that way: First, they're a thetan as themselves, actually, and then they become so invalidated, or they invalidate people so much that they get overwhelmed with their own invalidations, and they pick up a valence. Now, everybody's got a valence . . everybody's got one of these things. Even people with hidden standards have valences and you can find them.

But the steps are two more than this. There are two more steps of overwhelm. The next step to the valence overwhelm is the somatic overwhelm. While being the valence, he got a hell of a somatic. Now, an impact is easily substituted for knowingness. Impact, knowingness . . these can integrate in a mind as the same thing. Impact and punishment can also integrate. They don't necessarily integrate as knowingness, they sometimes only integrate as punishment.

So the fellow is walking down the street, and something is thrown out of an airplane and a wrench hits him on side of the head, and after he gets out of the hospital he has a definite sensation that he must have done something Well, the only thing he was doing was walking down the street. But he got a definite sensation he must have done something. Now the truth of the matter is, he doesn't even have to go back and pick up his own overts, but he must have had them to make the thing hit him, but he doesn't even have to go back and pick up the overts to feel that he must have done something. The fact that he was hit meant that he was being punished.

So the punishment must have had a crime that goes with it, and he's got a terrible problem: What has he done? What has he done that caused him to be punished? And he doesn't know. Well, of course, the answer is very often he hasn't done anything. But he can't separate this thing out.

Now, an impact, then, can go into that category, and people with guilt complexes . . which is a small section, by the way, of mind. you say everybody has a guilt complex, it's like saying everybody has an inferiority complex. It hasn't any level of truth, you know, at all. It's just taking a small class of cases. There are a small class of cases have guilt complex. There are a small class of cases have inferiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have superiority complex. There's a small class of cases that have complexes that tell them they can never do anything wrong There's . . . You know, there's classes of cases. But this is not a broad generality at all, that everybody is guilty or that aberrations comes from guilt. That's a hangover from old psychotherapies. Sometimes they ride along and you've given them credence at sometime or another, and it takes a shake of the head to get rid of them.

Well, now, an impact can interpret as knowingness. Because the person's been hit, he feels he now knows something You'll sometimes have a person coming out of an operation telling you he knows something. Well, the odd part of it is, two things can happen: He can come out of an operation knowing something, or he can come out of an operation feeling that he knows something. In the second case, he doesn't know anything.

For instance, if you take a thetan, you operate on his body and he blows out of his head, and during the operation he finds himself outside, he will wind up later on knowing that he can exteriorize. That's a perfectly valid piece of information. Because this other thing happens so often, that gets invalidated. Lots of patients wake up out of the ether and then now they know something. Only they don't know what they know, see, and the more they search for it, the less they find out. They don't know what they know, but they know they know something. Got the idea?

Well, a circuitry can get set up in more or less that fashion. The person himself has been invalidated . . his own knowingness, as a valence, is invalidated . . and so he's got an impact knowingness that he keeps around, which is part of an engram. The engram is actually on his goals-terminal chain . . that's where it comes from . . but it is not reachable or attainable because it's right in the middle, and you can't audit him down to the goals-terminal chain because he's got this thing in the road. But it's on the chain, and you can't audit him through it or past it, but you can't audit him because of it, and yet unless you audit him he's not going to get rid of it. This is the kind of a problem one of these circuits sets up.

So here he is . . here he is with this thing, and it actually . . his own knowingness has been terribly invalidated. As a circuit, then, he can go on being validated in his knowingness, but he has to be careful because this thing knows more than he does, and it's a somatic of some kind. It's a pressure ridge. It's a sensation. It can be almost any one of these things. It's a difference of light. It's an occlusion. It's a singing in the head. It's bubbling in the beer, you know? Doesn't matter what it is, it just is. And he's going to have bad luck tomorrow.

Well, actually, all of Roman superstition, and everything else, stem out of this circuitry. Rome had a circuit called the auguries. And they used to shoot down birds and gut them, and they'd examine the entrails and then they'd know whether or not tomorrow was going to be a lucky day. Well, that's a circuit. You'll find in superstitious peoples that have very little and have been knocked around very badly, you have just absolute huge catalogs of superstitions. You've got some superstitions yourself, and so forth. Well, this is just a hangover on the third dynamic. That's a sort of a third dynamic circuit.

They were looking at the moon one night on some planet way back when, and it was half-full. And they get a restim on the thing every time they look at the moon half-full. And it was half-full this particular night, and a couple of spaceships came in and blew up the planet. So they know that a half-full moon is dangerous. And this kind of gets established somehow or another. So you have to be careful when the moon is half-full. What are you saying Well, the moon knows more than you do, because you couldn't find out what happened. But the moon obviously knows what happened because it's a symbol of what is happening so now the moon knows, and you can set up a whole moon circuit. Quite interesting.

The circuit knows, the pc doesn't; the circuit can observe, the pc doesn't; the circuit can give auditing commands and the auditor can't. All kinds of these things happen.

Now this moves out into a secondary state, which is the fourth state up the line, and it becomes an audible, dictational circuit. It's worst off. It's where the ideas come from. It dictates to a person. It speaks. It gives him his orders aloud. All kinds of wild things go on with regard to it. But the person never does anything unless he's told by this particular mechanism. Well, what is this? This is the total, final result of a valence that has been overwhelmed by a somatic, which has been overwhelmed in itself by some other thinkingness, and you've got just continuous, consecutive overwhelms.

Now, of course, there can be many cases after this where these conditions are consecutively and continuously overwhelmed, but they will all be of the same character. They will not be more personalities; they will be circuits, from the acceptance of the first valence on out. And that's something to know. you haven't got an endless number of valences on the pc, but you can have a near-endless number . . it will seem to you sometimes . . you can have a near-endless number of hidden standards. You can have a lot of them on a case, if they're real hidden standards.

Now, what is the test of a real hidden standard? It's whether or not the pc consults with something each command or each session. Consults is the clue. Now you see, he could look around to find out if his eyes changed. But does he always look around to find if his eyes changed?

Now, the change in his eyes is not particularly the hidden standard. The hidden standard lurks in the vicinity of that. And it moves on and off his eyes. The day is bright. The day is dull. This is the way life goes. It's going to be a good day because the day is bright. It's going to be a bad day because the light is dull. There's going to be something going on like that to make that a real hidden standard. And then it becomes a consultational circuit.

Now, that is a rather mild form of one. That is not particularly a very bad hidden standard; possibly a person could even be audited through it without much trouble.

But now let's take this one. This is how bad a hidden standard can get: Pc sits down in the auditing chair, and the hidden standard says to him . . says to him . . "Uh . . . well, that auditor is going to do you in today." So he relays all the commands through the hidden standard, because the hidden standard will give him the safe commands. So he can do some commands and he can't do other commands, because the hidden standard will only relay the safe commands. And oh, wow. you haven't got a pc under control. You haven't got a pc there. You're not auditing a pc. See, this is all vastly removed from the thing.

But these hidden standards key in with problems and areas of prior confusion. And that is what kicks in a hidden standard. It comes in because of a problem of magnitude or an area of prior confusion. Now, I've put in the or there just in case sometime or another the guy got a problem without a prior confusion. But the usual course of human events is that the individual went through a lot of trouble and a lot of confusion, and he couldn't quite figure any part of it out, and it left him hung with a problem.

Now, he's an active cuss . . any thetan is a fairly active thetan . . and he will up and solve it every time. He solves that problem by changing his life in some way. Now, this can get so bad that the effect I talked to you about the other day, the effect whereby, because something happened, the individual felt . . and I've mentioned in this lecture . . because something occurred, then the individual must have done something. He didn't do anything, but something occurred.

So some of these changes in his life are going to be red herrings. That is to say, there was a change in his life, so he figured he must have had a problem ahead of it. A person could have a change in his life without having a problem before it.

He's got a couple of very active parents that go flying around to every place, and so on, and they change his location rather continuously, but one day they stopped moving around. And he finally finds himself sitting someplace, and it was a change in his life because he was now in one place. And you ask him for a problem before this, and he'll almost beat his brains out trying to dream up what problem he had that caused this to occur. Well, actually, he didn't do anything to cause it at all.

In other words, the change in that particular case is other-determined than by the person. So there can be other-determined changes, and they, however, do not assess by an E-Meter reaction. So, therefore, assessment becomes necessary in doing the O section of this type of Problems Intensive I was telling you about . . necessary to assess . . because it eliminates those changes which occurred without a problem having preceded them.

All right. So there's the one, two, three of the hidden standard. The hidden standard develops out of problems of long duration. Individual solves the problem with a hidden standard, has solved the problem at some time or another with a hidden standard, and says, "Well, I just won't think anymore. I will let this think for me."

Now, I should say just one brief note on, where does a circuit come from? Well, frankly, you'll find circuits first mentioned in Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health, so they're not very hard to find. They're quite obvious. They're quite visible. You could go around looking and asking people about circuits. You'll find plenty of circuits. You'll find talking circuits and pressing circuits and color circuits and all kinds of things. They're how-do-you-know things. This is circuitry as different than valences.

Valence answers the question "who to be" or "how to be right with a beingness" . . "how can you be right with a beingness?" A circuit answers it entirely differently. That is, "Without changing the beingness,

how do you know whether you're right or not?" They are two different aspects. A circuit furnishes information. A valence furnishes beingness.

Now a circuit, from furnishing information, can step upstairs to furnishing orders. And then it can step upstairs to furnishing orders and commands which are below the level of consciousness. But they always express themselves to some slight degree in terms of a somatic. One knows they're there if the somatic occurs.

Most people live in haunted houses. There are a lot of people around will tell you there are other thetans inhabiting their body. These are just circuits. You will occasionally run into somebody that after he got a bad shock, why, just thousands of voices turned in on his body in all directions, or a dozen, or six, or something And they all spoke to him, and so forth and so on. You'll run into an experience of that character in somebody else.

All right. A circuit can be . . . is very easy to set up, and you actually think and use circuits all the time. A circuit isn't a bad thing. It's only when it goes out of a person's self-determinism, is no longer in the individual's control, that a circuit becomes a bad thing.

A person is totally knocked in the head as far as a circuit is concerned.

He has no longer any life or reason of his own. Only the circuit has life and reason. And when a circuit is in this particular condition or state of ascendancy, it, of course, furnishes a hidden standard. It's right or wrong according to the appearance of the circuit, or according to its behavior. It tells the individual right from wrong, and the individual himself never differentiates, never experiences, has no criteria, and so on. That is a circuit in operation. And this circuitry is set up by a thetan very easily, and is set up by him every time he turns around, and is one of the easiest things that he does and there is no reason he should stop doing it.

We're only talking about the obsessive, out-of-control circuit. Circuits are very often completely reasonable, that a person sets up. But he's still totally in control of the circuit. He set it up and he knows it, see? And it's gone. He doesn't set it up forever.

Well, you look at . . . look at a motorcycle, and you say to yourself, "What's wrong with the motorcycle?" You see? And you sort of set up a computer that is like a motorcycle engine or something, you see? And you say, "Gosh, there it is, and it goes this way," and you kind of mock it all up. "And it goes this way," and so on. you go to bed that night, you no longer got the motorcycle engine in front of you, you see?

And . . . Tesla, this great character Nikola Tesla, who invented alternating current and tremendous numbers of other things, set up the alternating current motor and let it run in his head. It wasn't in his head, of course; he probably had it out somewhere. I wouldn't want an alternating current in my head . . motor in my head, see. Because if he set it up right, of course, it was greasy. But anyhow, he set up an alternating current motor and he let it run for two years just to find what parts of it would wear. That's right.

So that was kind of a long time to let a circuit run, wasn't it?

Well, it was to tell him something, wasn't it? So he set up a mock-up in order to find out from it, and there's nothing wrong with this. This does not mean that Nikola Tesla, as a result, had a hidden standard. He didn't have any hidden standard. He knew he set it up and he knew he took it down, and he knew when he set it up and he knew when he took it down.

But you'll find circuits are not in this degree of control when they're obsessive, you see? Now the person doesn't know when he set them up, he doesn't know why he set them up, he doesn't know why he's listening to them, he doesn't know where they came from. All he knows is that he has a total slavish obedience to them. See, that is the difference.

You can set up circuits that'll answer mathematical problems for you. You can do all kinds of wild things with your mind, you see? There's nothing wrong with doing this, you see, as long as you're doing it. If you're doing them, why, you can't hurt yourself any. But when you start burying them, and when you say, "I'm no longer responsible for that thing," and when you say, "This thing will now from hereinafter and aforesaid tell me which side of all electrical circuits will go this way and that way" . . . The individual looks at a house and he hears a buzz-buzz-buzz. This is eight lifetimes later, see? Buzz-buzz-buzz, he hears in this house, and he knows there's something wrong with its currents.

You get an electrician sometime and you say, "Well, how did you know the house was old?"

"Well, I get this sensation," or something. "I knew the wiring was off," or something like this.

And you talk with him, "Well, how did you know that?"

"Well, I don't know, but I always get this sensation right under my left rib, you see, and so on. And I can kind of hear a buzz-buzz, and so forth. It's very easy to tell." That's a knowingness circuitry on the subject of electricity, you see, which he doesn't know anything about. He just told you so.

A thetan, you see, is totally capable of this operation . . of permeating the whole house and finding every short circuit in it. And says, "Zzzzzzit! Well, that was one. Zzzzzzit! There's another one. Zzzzzzzit! There's another one." See? "Oh, well, guess we'll have to rewire that." Thetan is totally capable of doing this, so, therefore, it's one of his skills.

The basic on this is setting something up on automatic and taking no responsibility for it at all. And out of that you get trouble. You always will get some trouble. And it becomes a hidden standard, and so on. But to have set one up and put it on total irresponsibility and let it run totally automatically, the individual had one God-awful problem just before he did it.

And just before he had that awful problem, he was in a fantastic amount of confusion. And just before he got into that fantastic amount of confusion, he had plenty of withholds from all of the people connected with the confusion. And those conditions must have occurred. And all of those conditions need to be present to unravel a circuit . . to have a circuit set up this way . . and you've got to pay attention to all of those things to unravel a circuit.

All right. So how would an individual get into this sort of state? All right. Life would be pretty active, and he would start withholding from everybody he was in contact with, about everything, or about some special thing, or something like that. He isn't free to communicate in any way. He's withholding from here and he's withholding from there, and he does an overt here, and he's got a withhold there, and he does another overt someplace else, and things start running a little bit wrong Naturally, he's out of communication with it. You're answering the first requisite of a circuit: going out of communication.

You see, the individual who has a circuit that tells him about house wiring never has to permeate the house. Well, he never has to communicate with the house. All he has to do is communicate with the circuit. The circuit does all the communicating for him, you see, and he doesn't have to do anything about it. All right.

So he had all these withholds and all these overts against all these people, and life became pretty confused, and it got more and more confused. And it finally wound up to where this confusion added up to a distinct problem. Whether he could state it or not is beside the point, whether he's aware of it analytically at that stage of the game or not, but it got to be one awful problem. And it's a statable problem. Blang! it went, and then he had a problem on his hand. And then, of course, he solved the problem.

Now, if you got enough withholds and overts, you'll blow. you get enough overts and withholds against any one person, or any one thing, or any one area, you'll blow out of that area or off that course of existence . . if there's enough.

All right. So the individual had this awful problem, and he blew. He blew that particular life channel that he was on. And of course, this brought about a change. And the only tag that is uniformly left in view for the problem, the confusion, the people, and the withholds and the lot, is the change. "When did your life change?" So, of course, by tracking that back, you can find the problem. You get the problem more or less handled, you find the people. You get the people security checked out . . this individual security checked out about the people . . he comes off of the nervousness of the confusion which was, after all, yesteryear. But his withholds have got him pinned in that area of time. He's stopping and not communicating in that area of time, so nothing as-ises in that area of time, so he's stuck there.

And this, of course, tends to turn on a circuit, because it's a withdrawal. Now, the point of change, of course, is a withdrawal. The point of change of life is a withdrawal from his former change of life. So the whole story is out of communication, out of communication, out of communication, and then out of communication.

Now, if he wants to remain out of communication safely, he has to have a periscope up. So that the periscope is very dangerous to approach the eyepiece of, so he has to have a periscope that not only looks but tells him. And that is a hidden standard. And when an individual has gone through that cycle violently, he comes up at the other end looking at life through a circuit. He never looks at life, the circuit looks at life; he never gets audited, the circuit gets audited. That is an experience. Experience must not approach this individual. And remember, auditing is an experience.

So, if the individual is living a life on a via called a circuit, then of course, your auditing is only part of the via, and of course never reaches the person. And you are trying to audit the person, you are not trying to audit the via. And when auditing takes a God-awful long time, it is just because you are not auditing a pc, you are auditing a circuit. You haven't got an Operating Thetan, you've got an operating GE, or an operating circuit. And so all experience is filtered through the circuit, and it is true of auditing, too. Auditing also filters through the circuit.

Now, the trick in supervising auditors is to give them some type of a rundown that hits all this, and knocks all this out of the road. And they can do it rather sloppily, and they don't have to finish it up in any terrific way, and they'll still knock the circuitry out of the road so the person can be audited. And that is what this Problems Intensive is all about. And this thing is tailor-made for a Class II activity. And people can be trained to do this much more easily than they can be trained to locate goals and terminals. Why? Because goal and terminal operation, and Prehav Scale running, requires a precision of auditing which is a very, very high, hardly won precision. And you know that because right this moment you are struggling up the line toward that precision. But it requires a terrific precision. There's only one goal; you must never get the wrong goal. There's only one terminal; you must never get the wrong terminal. There is only one level of the Prehav Scale live; you must never audit the wrong level. The auditing commands have to be exactly the right auditing commands. The individual going up and down the track has to be run precisely against the E-Meter. Precisely. When it is flat, it is flat. And when it is not flat, it is not flat. And furthermore, the individual cannot be run with rudiments out, much less assessed when the rudiments are out.

So that is a highly precise level of auditing, don't you see?

You have another level of auditing, now, in Class II, which is imprecise and will get the job done.

Now, this has an additional advantage. Where you are shy about an individual coming in off the street, this has to solve this problem. The individual is coming in off the street, he doesn't know very much about Scientology; without giving him a broad, general education, you cannot easily sit down and open up a Form 3 on him. you won't find auditors doing it very glibly.

And the individual, not knowing what it's targeted at, is going to feel that he's being suspected, and he's going to get some kind of an ARC break with the people who are doing this to him.

Ah, well, on such a person, very simply, you run this Problems Intensive. It is what? It basically goes back and makes the most fundamental Security Checks that can be made on the individual, without getting very personal about the individual.

Now, when he's opened up and is expressing himself a little bit better, and you've got the hidden standards out of the road, you can, of course, uncork a Form 3. Now the individual knows what it's all about. Now he'll go for this now, he'll stay in-session with this now, and he'll get it off. And he'll know where he's going because he has a subjective reality of what he's been doing to himself with withholds. He got that out of this rundown.

So this gets you over the bridge of "How do you take raw meat and audit it directly?" And actually, you could get somebody up here that just was walking down the road, say, "Have you ever had any changes in your life, and what has your life been all about? Have you ever had any operations? Have you ever had this? Have you ever had that?" . . it doesn't matter. It'd be any of the data. you could ask this individual any of the data on any part of this form right up to O. and the individual will be pitching right straight with you. And now, of course, part O. why, he'll be happy to tell you all about the changes in his life. Everybody is very happy to talk about all of their troubles and difficulties and changes. They're very happy to tell you their problems. That's for sure. And of course, the Security Check is not between you and the person, it is between the person and people who aren't there. And he's perfectly willing to give you withholds from people who aren't there.

So this is the answer to raw meat. And you take this particular rundown, which will be released to you shortly, and you will find out that an individual is then processable. Practically any level of case becomes processable if you approach it that way; requires no specialized address of any kind whatsoever. And the most self-conscious auditor would be happy to sit there and do that.

I developed this from this reason and this way: I found out that auditors will fill out forms. That is not a sarcastic thing. That happens to be a common denominator of all auditors. They will all do it, and they will do it very well. All right.

Let's build on that cornerstone, and let's move it on up, and run some processes up along the level and you've got it made. How could you miss?

Okay. Well, it's taken quite a bit of thinking to get this squared around, and quite a bit of looking, and so forth. I hope you make good use of it.

Thank you.