

## HANDLING THE PTS

A lecture given on  
8 June 1965

Thank you.

Well sir, this is the 8th of June. Yes! The 8th of June A.D. 15, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

Well, very good. I am speaking to you today in the voice of somebody who knows we've got it made.

It's a very funny phenomenon: Somebody who's had a successful run on Release, and so on—I wouldn't do this lightly—but walk up to him and infer Scientology doesn't work. He'd probably spit in your face. You're walking against an unshakable certainty, don't you see?

As long as you've got something which is partially working, and it's doing him some good, and he didn't have too many problems and it made them a little bit easier—you know, that level of certainty—why, you can get pretty reasonable about the entheta kid, you know? And he walks up to you and he says, "Nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank, bank. Bank, bank, bank, bank," you know? "Dramatize, dramatize, dramatize. Kill everybody, kill everybody, kill everybody," you know.

And you say, "Well, maybe he's right, you know? Because the results I've had, you see . . . I had a little present time problem one time, and it eased up a little bit in a session." No certainty. So, of course, person's got no certainty, why, he can be lied to. However, what's happening at this particular present time is I was listening to Mary Sue the other day, and somebody had inferred something or other about Scientology. There were sparks coming eighteen inches out of each eye. It was a remarkable phenomenon, you know? I lit a cigarette on it and thought about it.

I notice now that there's a lot of doubt and wonder about ethics and so on, here and there and so forth. What is ethics? I just heard one from Chicago, just before I came to the lecture and so forth: "Scientology is to help, not to punish people." How the hell would he know? He's never been helped by it. He'd made a lot of dough with it, but he's never had any tone arm action I've ever been able to find out. Suppressive.

So, we are developing, simply, systems by which to handle the public at large, is all we are doing. And right now it goes in with a thud against some staff members and so forth and students collide with it and that sort of thing. Good. Get used to it. Because the action is actually intended for the public, don't you see? But until you have a familiarity with law and order amongst yourselves and some experience with how it works and what seems unjust and what seems just and that sort of thing, you never can grab ahold of it.

Now, you can't go nonchalantly knocking off the United States government or something like that without at least issuing an HCO suppressive order, you know? I mean, it wouldn't be fair! Now, let's come down to cases. Give them warning. Give them a chance to recant. What's interesting about it is, if you don't have a system of law and order you will never have law and order. You will just have cruelty, duress, suddenness, revenge, these sort of things.

How about one of these Releases and that sort of thing? Supposing you had no system whatsoever with which to handle an impolite, entheta or suppressive person? Well, he, of course, is thinking on a broader number of dynamics. Now, let's just move it up a little bit: This guy goes Clear and he goes OT. It's part of his experiential track that people are nasty to him occasionally. Part of his experiential track that the Melbourne parliament is filled full of dingos. Don't you see?

Now, I hate to go whole track on you, but you've been a lot more active talking about it than I have. And the truth of the matter is that don't you think that person would get a penchant for turning that parliament building upside down? Don't you think he'd think that was an awfully good idea? If he didn't have anyplace to step that day, don't you think that he'd think that was an excellent place to step?

Now, with his brilliance and effectiveness returned don't you think for a moment that when this subject came up he wouldn't turn his effectiveness in the direction of knocking it out? Regardless of whether he could handle the masonry or not—let's leave that as an unreality; you might not be used to handling masonry lately. But let's supposing he got very bright and very able and that sort of thing: don't you suppose he'd shoot that Melbourne parliament down in flames? Hm? It can be done. We've got the U.S. courts now talking in our language. Didn't take much doing.

All the findings about Scientology now are couched in Scientology terms. They define an E-Meter with our definition; not with the FDA's definition—ours. That's the courts. Those are hearings. So you can make a penetration one way or the other. But supposing you just went for broke on this? Supposing you decided that the Melbourne government parliament down there in Victoria wasn't good for people. And you decided you were going to wipe them out. I can assure you, you would be perfectly capable of doing it.

Now, that gives us a problem. If you don't deliver into the hands of executives and Scientologists and Releases and Clears a method of uniform justice, and a procedure by which it can be accomplished, you're going to have chaos. You won't have a new civilization, you'll have some rubble. Because of this fact: Two or three of them would have to get together to decide what they were going to do before they did it, in order to have anything just about it or work it out in any way, and that wouldn't be the way they operated if no system existed. That wouldn't be the way they operated at all.

One guy would say, "Let's do Ron a favor"—that's the end of parliament down in Melbourne. Boom! Well, at least declare them suppressive first.

Now, war was defined by a fellow by the name of Clausewitz. I don't know if you ever knew him in any past life. He was a philosopher on the subject of war. And Frankie the Limper—pardon me, Franklin Delano Roosevelt never read Clausewitz. He never read Clausewitz. He would have taken a vocabulary or something. His vocabulary ended—began and ended—with "My friends" and "give us another appropriation." I think that was the end of his . . . Just to be suppressive about it.

So, Mr. Roosevelt did not know Clausewitz's definition of war. And I can shorthand this—it's in horrible German, and if you quoted it completely and so forth it would break your brains. And you'd have to go look up in a dictionary and it would all be misunderstood and you'd commit overts on him. So I'll give you the shortened version, which is simply this: "War is a means of bringing about a more amenable frame of mind on the part of the enemy." And that's what war is. And that's all war is.

Frankie, however—he wanted unconditional surrender. Now, would you please figure out what unconditional surrender has to do with that definition of war by Clausewitz? Unconditional surrender is not a more amenable frame of mind on the part of the enemy at all. It's an obliterated enemy. Now, that sounds more like Ghengis Khan talking, to me, than an enlightened statesman. Unconditional surrender.

So he continued the war with Germany two years, and he continued the war with Japan one year. They were trying to surrender. They already were in a more amenable frame of mind. The end of war had been achieved. But the machinations of war had to move forward in one case two years, in another case a year, smashing everything in sight, knocking out Lord knows how many of the other people and how many of ours. And no telling how much of that last period—

when we were trying to get “unconditional surrender”—how much that cost in terms of rehabilitation of the country. I think most of the damage in the country must have been done during the last period of the war, not the first period of the war, see?

In other words, that was a very costly and stupid thing to do. Unconditional surrender. Uncle Joe Stalin and the rest of the boys wished it off on him down there at Casablanca, and he went along with it and so they decided that Germany had to unconditionally surrender and Japan had to unconditionally surrender, and that was going to be the end of war. Well, that is not the end of war. War is simply “Bring about a more amenable frame of mind on the part of the enemy,” and that is all war is. And when you fail to halt it at that point and then negotiate and fix up the differences, why, you’re a fool.

What are we looking for here? Now, there are certain elements in the society that declared war on us some time ago. If you don’t believe it, it’s not my imagination, so on. They said, “There won’t be any E-Meters, and there won’t be any anything, and nobody must get better, yeah! Down with those people!” You know? And just about in that level of intelligence, you see? They declared war.

Of course, we know the mechanics of such people. Those people are caught somewhere on the track in a trap of an engram. And they’re fighting whoever has got them there. They’re fighting the Sioux Indians, or somebody like that. So everybody in present time, to them, with a terrific generality, you see, are Sioux Indians. That’s right!

If you ever looked into their anatomy, you would find out that they were fighting enemies that no longer existed. And they’re imagining enemies that don’t exist. They bring, then, a discreditable mockery situation into a place where you have some enemies, and if fighting enemies is paranoid, you see, then if you fight anybody then that’s paranoid. That doesn’t seem to be very logical to me. Somebody walks up to you, he’s going to bash your head in and steal your wife; and because you’re afraid that it’ll make you look paranoid, you don’t take any action toward him.

Well, that’s not logical. That’s asininity moving up to the nth degree, don’t you see? And people don’t think like that as they get Clear and so forth. They tend to work on the greater good for the greater number of dynamics, don’t you see? And some guy walks up and starts clobbering everything in sight and knocking everything around while you’re trying to do your job and so forth, take some suitable action. But how much action should you take? Now, that’s the question. How much action?

Let’s put it in the area of war. For some reason or other some man somewhere or some government bureau or some parliament or something suddenly declares war on Scientology, see? Well, they aren’t educated enough to know why. They’re usually doing it from the basis that they once upon a time were jumped on by implanters, and they’re still fighting them, you know. Or they’re being born and they’re fighting the doctor or . . . We don’t know what situation they think they’re in. We’re in the immediate advantage of we know they don’t know what situation they’re in. Well, we jolly well had better know ourselves what situation we’re in.

And the situation we’re in is, our people get chopped up and our organizations get enturbulated by certain actions taken in the environment against Scientology. Well now, how much reaction should there be to that? And it should be just enough reaction to bring about a more amenable frame of mind. That’s all. That’s on the broad, broad public view.

Now supposing, when anybody walked into an organization, started chopping up the Registrar, that sort of thing, she simply sent for the Ethics Officer, the Ethics Officer came over and took the person’s name and address, and moved it on down through CF and Central Files and parked the guy in Dead File, and that was the end of his communication lines. Supposing that happened? You know that they would have a better frame of mind with regard to us. We would have enforced one little point: Be polite. Just be polite to a Scientologist, see?

Well now, if that's all you were intending to bring about, why, it would win, you see? It'd win very easily—"Be polite to Scientologists," see? Because they're impolite, don't you see? And by that impoliteness they're declaring a sort of a cold war, don't you see? Well, all you'd have to do is reverse that situation, don't you see?

Somebody writes you a nasty letter—I'm not talking about somebody who is simply enturbulated in class or in the HGC or something like that— but somebody writes you nasty letters and "You dogs, you bums," and that sort of thing. You mean everybody on staff has got to read this thing? What's the popularity here for entheta?

Because there's only a maximum at any given time of 20 percent. Twenty percent is the absolute maximum that entheta or impolite letters go. You mean you're going to concentrate on this 20 and you're going to neglect the 80? You mean you're going to let everybody out there rot while you have a marvelous time playing ball with this 20?

It doesn't seem to me to be the greater good for the greater number of dynamics. That seems to me to be a sort of a reverse, superdefensive look. And yet you'll find uniformly that as these letters, entheta letters, come through the line and chop up people that they, rather routinely, get handed in to the highest executives in the place, because they always require special handling.

But this funny frame of mind results: The highest executives in the place never see the other 80. They don't realize that 80 percent are just happy as clams with Scientology. So, they don't gauge their service for the 80 percent. They gauge their service for the 20 percent. So therefore, you've got to give them some method of handling that 20 percent. You got to give them some way to handle it so that it doesn't tangle up their lines so they don't service the 80. Do you see?

All we're trying to do here, you see, is bring service to the greater number of people. Well, that's very simple to do: Take the 20 off your lines. They get too bad and scream too loud, why, issue an order. Make other people disconnect from them. Other people do.

The very funny part of it is, as soon as a ghost of a system goes in by which one can enforce a slightly greater degree of politeness on his environment, whether as an executive or an auditor and so forth—you'd be very amazed what immediately happens. His reach is increased. And what has happened is he doesn't have to sit back here and hold it all in, you know? He's got a route to put it on. This is what you do: you do one-two, bang! Zzzt! That's that.

Well, after that's worked out and grooved in, and so forth, then this person's reach is better. He doesn't have to stake for this nonsense because he's got something to do with it, so he won't argue with it, so therefore he won't stick into it, don't you see? Therefore, he and an organization can go uptone, not keep getting pulled downtone. See, it's all sound technology as far as we're going here.

All right, our next approach to the situation, then, is to bring it about where the individual can reach the 80 effectively without being entangled by the 20. And it's just the percentages of it. Now, that means, then, that you've got to keep the auditor and the executive in the frame of mind that services the 80, not that tangles with the 20.

Something is very interesting here; I'll give you two very good examples here at Saint Hill of very recent times: It was quite a shock to some people to find out there were literally thousands and thousands and thousands of letters in Central Files, coming in from founding Scientologists. Those applications were just pure theta. These people were satisfied right down to the ground. And the only ones the executives knew about were the sour ones that had come in, and they were just a little tiny handful. I think that's fantastic. I mean, here's this whole ocean of terrific letters, you see, but the ones that had been forwarded through and that they knew about were this very little bunch. See? Pretty wild. Pretty wild.

Now, I'll show you how this comes in more intimately. Right at the moment I'm doing forty cases—forty, meself; forty folders a day. That's no trick. But out of those forty folders there will be a maximum now—due to ethics and other actions which are taken and so forth—there's a maximum there of three to four cases that are not running perfectly by the book, out of that fantastic number of cases. You can chalk it up against the process. We can take a guy that's all enturbulated and spun in, going backwards and upside down and so forth and still stretch him out straight so he sounds—zung!— like a violin string pulled at both ends, you know? But nevertheless, you see, there's those three, let us say, folders, and there's something bad about those folders.

Now, I look at those because there's a maybe on them, you see? You don't take a fast action on it. And you fall into this kind of a trap: You forget the thirty-seven. Thirty-seven cases running perfectly by the textbook to an exact desirable result. See, there was thirty-seven auditing sessions there that just ran smooth as grease. And you look at those three. What are we going to do about those three? Well, worry, think, look for data and so forth. Well, if I'd do something like that, I'm sure that any D of P in any organization would do something like that. I'm sure that an auditor practicing by himself someplace would forget about those twenty that ran so beautifully and remember those two that didn't—do you see?—and worry about those.

In other words, you tend to get fixated on the maybe, which is very interesting. And this is the other thing that brought ethics into view. There are only two sources of difficulty with cases. Only two. The auditing comm cycle, and PTS—potential trouble source. Those are the only two difficulties that really get in your hair. You can make mistakes every place else and still somehow get by. Just those two.

The auditing comm cycle—now, of course, we could have the gross auditing error of he didn't even run the process. We could have the gross auditing error of there was no session took place at all. I don't mean that by descriptive; I mean the pc never appeared and the auditor never appeared. You see, these are gross errors, but let's not look at them quite so gross.

This auditing comm cycle—well, the auditing comm cycle might include a bit of alter-is or Q and A or something; it might include some other devious things. How do you police this thing? What do you do, just go on as a D of P, saying, "Well, I hope all the auditors do all right"? See? Because amongst any such body of auditors there's going to be two or three auditors that are showing their teeth. And their teeth will show in some fashion along this: They're having some personal trouble or they're doing something or other. Don't you see?

Well, who looks at all this? As D of P or something like that, what do you do? Go charging down to the HGC personally, and grab the fellow and say, "What the hell's the matter with you for telling your pc not to answer the auditing question? You know, that didn't seem to me to be a good thing to tell your pc and so forth. What's all that about?"

Well, actually, you never as a D of P get a chance to do that. Your lines are long, the work is many, there's lots of cases; you never get a chance to do that. Well, you've got something you can do with that. You, in the first place, would have a Review Division in an organization—that is a Qualifications Division for which you'd have a Department of Review.

If you wanted to know what was really going on with this, you could send your auditor for a checkover on the comm cycle. You could send the pc for a checkover on his case. Immediately you're going to get lots of data that you weren't able to have before. You don't have to solve this thing by hit or miss, hunt and punch; let's get both of them checked over. Now we know where we stand.

Well, now supposing it's just a case of "I ain't gonna better my comm cycle!" Well, I'm afraid that there has to be another place to send them to bring about a more amenable state of mind, because he's declared war. We can't have this. And the place to send him, of course, is Ethics.

And he goes over to Ethics, and Ethics says, “What’s the matter with you? Why, why aren’t you. . . what’s this complaint I’ve got here from the D of.P?” and so forth.

“Well . . .” so forth, “Rrr-rrr-rrrr-rrr.”

Well, they straighten it out. They find he’s a PTS, or they find it this or that, or something’s going wrong, or they find out he’s never had a case gain. You know, they turn up something, and then they give some sort of an action with regard to it. And eventually this gets back onto your technical lines and you eventually get technical in, don’t you see?

But you don’t keep that one going-going-going, busting up case after case after case, you see? You can stop that right there. So you can get technical in by just the simple expedient of taking that one out of the lineup until it can be straightened up. And that’s advantageous too.

Are you going to use the United States Navy principle on which to do this? The way the armies and the navies of the world do this is, one guy goes AWOL, goes over the fence after taps, so the whole regiment is instantly put on half rations and hard marches. You realize that they always apply these general regulations. Most of your government regulations take place because some guy has goofed. The ordinary citizen never really has to be policed. But he is policed continuously because of the goofs of three or four criminals. Do you see?

So it’s an “everybody bears the burden of a couple of crooks.” Do you follow? And you’ll find that most of the arbitrary laws and savageness on the part of executives and officers and so forth stems from the fact that they are unable to handle the couple that goofed. And if they have enough loses in handling these guys then they get savage toward everybody.

If you want to keep them in a sweet frame of mind, you have to permit them to isolate the guy who is goofing and do something effective about it— by the number. And then you don’t have an executive getting into a savage frame of mind. That’s how your governments turn into suppressive organizations and so forth, because they really can’t handle the criminal at all. They’re quite incapable of doing this.

All right. So you get a broad punishment of everybody in sight! All the HGC auditors are suddenly turned over to every night, all night long, why, they’re going to have to do the Comm Course all over again, while . . . You get the idea. Well, it’s all right to give them a Comm Course once in a while, when you’re brushing them up and getting them on the line. But now, well, let’s not have them—”Everybody in the HGC must do a Comm Course because one HGC auditor has been goofing on the Comm Course.”

That seems to me to be awfully wog type of management, see? No, let’s fix it up so this one auditor can do the Comm Course, and he knows what’s going to happen if he doesn’t do the Comm Course and straighten out. Do you get the idea? He’s suddenly caught between two fires.

Well, there must have been something going wrong with him or his lifetime or something like that if he wasn’t on the ball. He must be in some frame of mind which is grim. Well, is there any reason to visit your reaction to that frame of mind on all the other auditors who are doing their job? Definitely not.

So, our action with regard to the pc now—let’s take up the pc. You’ll be very thankful for this mechanism, because the auditor doesn’t just get sacked and forgotten about and mauled and that sort of thing. No, you can straighten him out this way.

Let’s take this pc. I found uniformly that when a pc does not run under average—not brilliant, but under average—processing, he is a PTS or an SP. And those letters mean “potential trouble source” or “suppressive person.” Inevitably and invariably. He’s PTS or SP.

This doesn't include the fellow who thinks the process was flat, and the auditor wants to run it some more and the pc revolts for a while, something like that. No, no, we're talking about the guy whose case just isn't running.

You can't seem to patch this case up.

Now, you just mark this down in letters of fire and you'll never miss. And you'll also have all kinds of O and I and II Level auditors who will be able to audit, zoom! And they will be getting results all over the place, and you will see needles going free and so on—on these processes, if it's D-of-P'd this way. PTS, SP.

Now, of course, in the Case Cracking Unit at the present moment we simply do not give a damn if somebody's an SP. Bah! So what? Bah! If we can hold him down long enough to answer the auditing questions, why, he's no longer an SP. You understand? It's that sudden, see? PTS—that's a different thing.

We now, with the new lineup of processes there, are also incidentally handling the PTS. It took me a couple of days to get that technology. I found out this datum: We couldn't handle the PTS—potential trouble source.

Well now, that is simply somebody who's connected with an SP who is invalidating him, his beingness, his processing, his life. He's connected with a suppressive person. And the real trouble that you get into is by handling or trying to handle the potential trouble source with auditing. Now, all this data applies definitely to the processes below the Power Processes. It applies to all the processing that we have ever had. And this was why—if you keep this comm cycle in mind as the other factor—but this was why processing didn't work. Do you understand? It's as elementary as this. It had nothing to do with the fact that it would or would not bite the case. You could apply it badly.

It was falling down on the PTS. Now, the people who are more likely to come to you for help are PTSes. So you have a greater number of PTSes, potential trouble sources, walking in on you than any other particular type. And unless you handle it by ethics or ship them to Saint Hill and get them Power Processed . . . You can Power Process right over the top of that factor now. But not with anything else.

Unless you handle him as a PTS as given by Ethics, your processing, no matter what you do, is going to fail because he's going to rolley-coaster. Didn't matter how good you made him in the session, he's going to come back to the next session on his face. And even if you patched him up in that next session, he's going to come back to the next session on his face. And you're actually processing him into the ground. Because somebody is ARC breaking him faster than you can patch him up.

Now, it was this factor alone that we sensed, but didn't totally describe, when we started giving twenty-five-hour intensives—thirty-six-hour intensives earlier. Consecutive processing fast in a chunk got the guy up before the environment could knock him down. Now, that's what we were looking for when we said the environment could knock him down; we were looking for the SP. Who's the suppressive person that's keeping that fellow from functioning in life? Who is it?

Now, that person was out of our view. We had our hands on this girl, let us say, and she'd rolley-coaster. She'd get better, she'd get worse, she'd bleah- blah. Processing would work for a moment and then wouldn't work, and next day you wouldn't have anything functioning. And all kinds of wild things were occurring with this case—and the D of P just racking his brains, driven into unusual solutions, driven into inventing new processes to run. "Anything, everything. What are we going to do about this case?" Worry, worry, worry, worry, worry. Now, he was handling a potential trouble source. He couldn't audit this person up faster than the environment was knocking the person down.

Well, what do we mean by environment? We mean an SP. There's an SP somewhere around that pc, and the funny part of it is, very often the SP is never even spotted by the PTS. The potential trouble source does not know the suppressive is in his environment.

Now, the reason for that is quite interesting. The mechanical fact is that suppressive persons commonly speak in total generalities. They use "everybody," "they." They hear one catty comment, it in the next few minutes becomes on their lips "everybody says." Do you see? They broaden and generalize entheta, and their identity broadens and generalizes. And if you want a picnic sometime, just ask a person this question: "Who has invalidated you?"

Don't run it. I'm not recommending that as a process. You might use something like that to clean up the beginning of a session or something like that, but lightly, lightly!

Supposing you tried to run that as a process? Let's be more fundamental: "Name a suppressive person you have known." Hey, you know, the person you're trying to run that on will go absolutely bug-eyed. He'll try to remember, and he won't be able to grasp it, and he can't quite figure it out, and he can't answer the question, and he's getting into a terrible confusion, because you're running almost straight "Tell me an ARC break" or . . . Here's the process you're running: "Tell me the source of your ARC break. Thank you." And it just won't run as a process because the generality around the terminal— this continuous use of "they" and "everybody," and so on—has masked the terminal, and he can't pick them out.

And, therefore, don't think somebody wants to be punched in the head all the time because he still, although fifty years of age, is still living with Mother. He's just never spotted the fact that Mother's a suppressive. You can watch Mother, you see, who's now an old dowager of seventy-two, knocking this bird appetite over tin cup and preventing him from being married and telling him what he has to eat for breakfast and so on. My god, he's fifty years old. And you can watch this, and he comes to session, you know, and he's dressed in a weird looking dull gray suit, you know, that's a terribly— about 1890 cut and so forth and. . . If you ask him, "Who made you wear that suit?"

"Well, mmm. I just have to."

But you could have heard his mother say, "Now, George, don't you ever wear any other clothes than that," you see? And it's perfectly visible to you, see, that Mama is keeping this guy under a hydraulic press. It's not visible to him! He can't spot her anymore. She's invisible in the environment. She's a terrific duress, like a bank.

Now, you try to process this fellow. And he'll go zzzrrr-zzzzmmm. And he'll go up—oh, he had a wonderful first. . . oh, but the next session, troubles. Doesn't matter what you're running him on—0-0 or anything else. We're not just talking about Power Processes. And if you sit there trying to figure out new processes and trying to figure out this and trying to figure out that... You say, "Has anybody been invalidating your processing or anything?"

"No, no, no, nobody."

That's right, he answered correctly: "nobody"! That person doesn't exist. He didn't even hear it! Yet it registered, total.

Now, you could drive yourself around the bend trying to handle his case. But Ethics tells you how to handle it. Let's look this person over. Let's ask a few indicators. This is not processing.

Put the person on a meter. Just, "Who do you know?" "Who do you live with?" "Who are you connected with that's against Scientology?"

"Oh, well, Mother doesn't like it very much."



“Thank you.” And it falls off the pin.

Well, that isn't all it's been doing. Now, PTS, you say, “All right, here's the policy letter: handle or disconnect.”

“Handle or disconnect from Mother? Oh, no! Oh, no!”

But, “Oh, yes.”

“No!”

“Yes!”

“Gee.”

You actually haven't given him the force necessary to make the decision. You have actually pointed out what's wrong with his life. And the funny part of it is, if you name the wrong suppressive person, this ethics technique doesn't work. So when the PTS doesn't handle or disconnect and instantly go bang, then you can assume that you have named the wrong SP. You've named the wrong suppressive person. That's about the only trouble you have with ethics.

And frankly sometimes they give you so much trouble that you don't bother to call him back and name the right one. He's given everybody around the place a headache, as far as we could see, and that generality is intentional—there wasn't a single soul he didn't give a headache to that was in the place. You don't get fascinated, see? You're not in a big state of quiver of “Let's help this person!” Well, you didn't make him that way, don't you see? You've given him the out, you've shown him what the score is.

Your responsibility, however, should extend far enough, if you're dealing with ethics and so forth, to punch around and watch for the person's face to lighten up. Say, “Well, all right, I found out that you're connected with a suppressive person—your mother. And here is the Ethics Order, and you've got to handle or disconnect.”

He says, “My mother? Handle or disconnect? Oh, yes. Oh-ho. Well, what do you know! My mother? Yeah, that's right, you know. I never thought of that, you know.” Zoom-zoom-zoom-zoom. You're getting tone arm action. You've never seen it on his case before, you see, to any great degree. Here the tone arm's running, and everything's going at a mad rate. Fabulous! Big case change right there. Handle or disconnect. Yeah, he'll handle or disconnect.

Next guy—why, it's Hoshiah somebody-or-other, and you're saying, “All right, we've been having trouble with you in processing. Now, you must be connected with a suppressive person.” Or the guy's gotten tone arm action in the past, so you know he's not a suppressive. It's, oddly enough, terrifically in our favor that . . . It isn't because—we don't call them suppressive because they don't get well. I'm sure that you'll hear somebody saying this sooner or later. The indicator is no TA. And when they didn't get TA, you've always got yourself a suppressive, by definition. You don't have to look at his conduct; you just look at this case behavior of no TA, see? What's no TA? Well, it's less than ten.

Now, this individual, then, could himself be a suppressive or he could be a roller coaster. And this is the other technical aspect. And the roller coaster aspect is, he gets better, he gets worse, he gets better, he gets worse. He's connected with a suppressive. So he is a PTS.

So all the question you ask of the case folder is, “Let's see, this fellow have any wins in processing? No, he's never had any wins in processing. Suppressive. All right. Has this person ever had any wins in pro—Oh, yes, he was doing all right, last summer, yes, and he was doing all right when he came in for the intensive this fall. Yes, and he seems to collapse between those two times. And here he comes in now, this winter here, and—oh, he's flat on

his face and he's in terrible condition. Why? He didn't leave here in that condition. Oh, look, he's in terrible... Ah! PTS." See? That's all you need to know.

It doesn't take any vast technical acumen, once it's been reduced to the ne plus ultra, the simplicity of all simplicities. That is the simplicity. And you'll find these things will carry out. Now, you've got tremendous other ramifications with regard to this, you understand. Oh, you could find out all kinds of things about conduct and this and what he did, and continuing overts, and you could find this and that. And you could just stack these items up to hundreds, see? And the PTS—oh, you could get the data on that endlessly. More data and more data, and you could find out the trouble you had in Spokane was because this PTS got better, and that made the suppressive on the other side of him go to the police. And we never knew that before, don't you see? All these things.

You start pulling on one of these little lines—you start pulling up the PTS line—and you get one little tiny flea comes out of the line, see? If you started to investigate it and you pulled on the line a little bit further you'd find out there was a dog. And you pull on the line just a little bit further and you find out that there's a giant starts walking out of there. You pull on it a little bit further and you'll find an elephant. And you pull on the line just a little bit further and you got a General Sherman tank. Never fails.

This is the wildest thing when you start investigating. But all you have to know on the surface of it—all you have to know on the surface is PTS or SP. That's all you had to know.

With that data, you can make Releases. And if you don't have that data, you can't. You can handle students' cases. You can handle Free Scientology Center cases. Supposing you're mucking around in a Free Scientology Center and they're walking in off the streets, you know: "What's this Scientology? I haven't drunk any yet."

You're going to find 80 percent of those guys, some rough figure of that character, bang! Boy, they're right with it! They go straight on up the line, providing you don't get all tangled up with the other 20 that go thud. Now, that 20, a certain number of them, are going to go appetite over tin cup. The student auditor gave them a little session; they felt much better. They came back the next day and, "I felt good last night, but today I feel terrible."

Where do you send them? You send them to the Ethics Section, that's where you send them. Now, look, if you haven't got any place to put him, he's just going to keep on standing there. And you can't process him any further because you're liable to kill him. Why are you liable to kill him? Well, there's two different ways you're liable to kill him. The higher he tries to rise the more somebody is going to smash him down. You've doubled up the attack on him. You can process him practically into his grave. And if he got good enough . . .

Let's supposing this guy was married to some girl that had counted comfortably on his kicking the bucket when he got to be sixty-five because he has thrombosis of the yumbussis. And here he is sixty-four, and he walks in to the Free Scientology Center and there went his yombosis of the thrumbussis. And he comes back home and he says, "I don't have that horrible pain in my head now, Gertrude."

Well, if this sort of thing kept up very long, she'd slip him a cyanide. You think I'm kidding? When you get into those situations, they'll go to extreme, see. You're dealing with life in the raw. These people would be totally uneducated, totally unindoctrinated. They wouldn't know about anything from anywhere, don't you see? But they run into all these phenomena, just one-two-three-four, see?

Now, this fellow comes back in and he says, "What are you people doing around here anyway? I came in the other night, and some fellow talked to me, and I don't feel any better, and srrarr-frrar." What do you do with this guy? Stand there and talk to him? Or you do you go process somebody or get somebody processed that will get a gain? You send him to Ethics.

What happens to the PTS when he gets to Ethics? (You've got to have an operating Ethics Section, then.) What happens to the PTS when he gets to Ethics? He simply sits down and says, "All right, now, do you have somebody who's invalidated your processing or invalidated Scientology? Oh, is that so? Your wife? All right. Very good. Did you ever recognize your wife was a suppressive person?" I don't care whether you use the terminology or not, see?

"No, no, I nev—I—Ooooh."

"Yeah, she's apparently got it in for you one way or the other."

"Say, you know, you're right. I often wondered why I've left so many jobs. I always seem to be able to do good and then all of a sudden I would do . . . Hey!"

Well, then you'd all of a sudden get a blowdown—see, Ethics would. You're not processing him. And they hand him a policy letter, and they say, "All right, here you are, handle or disconnect. And when you've done that, why... so forth. And here's an order which you already have. . . so forth. And we'll put this in the file. When you've cleaned this up, why, you come back here, and you tell us what you've done, and it's all set and you can get some more processing."

You haven't slammed the door in his face. Otherwise, you're going to slam the door in his face. And if you want to see all hell break loose, deny the world auditing.

Now, how about the SP? Well, actually, you don't slam the door in the SP's face. Right now Power Processing is only available at Saint Hill. It'd never be available, I don't think, in a Free Scientology Center. But someday it'd be available in your org. So you could say to this fellow, "All right, we know what's really wrong with you. You have a very rough case." Now, that's talking the truth. He also wants to bump everybody off, including you. Don't bother to tell him. "You got a very, very, very rough case, and there's only one place in the world at the present moment that could handle that. That's at Saint Hill. They can handle these; that's over in England."

"Go to England?"

"Well, you have a very rough case. If you don't watch it you're going to die."

It's true, too! Tell any human being on earth that—perfect truth. "We've got to get you on to an auditor quick. You're going to die if you don't." The doctor's gag, but this time with some truth, because the doctor killed them.

Now, the main action there is you haven't denied this guy anything. You say, "You're a very tough case. You're very easily upset about things. You fight a lot of things." I don't care what you tell him, see? And "We're not enemies of yours. We happen to be friends of yours. You can be processed at Saint Hill. In a couple of years, we will have a type of unit here which is sufficiently skilled and so forth to handle your case. But up to then, why, no, and we're just going to have to ask you to stay away. We'll have to put this tag on you, and you can either do one of those, but in the meantime, why, just stay away because it's very restimulative to you." Makes sense as far as he's concerned—all makes sense.

All right. Without these tools and tricks, you can't process the world. That's for sure. You're handling life in the raw. And if you don't have channels and if you can't keep edges on those channels, you're just going to keep a mish-mash from here on till hell freezes over, why, you're just never going to make it, that's all. You're going to take the 20 and fall all over the 20 percent and neglect the 80, and get enturbulated by the 20. And the organization's lines can't hold because it's all being enturbulated this way or that, and your pcs don't gain, and so forth. Well, supposing you can handle these two factors. The organization stands together very neatly, things stay in a very orderly fashion, and in addition to that even your most elementary processes don't fail on the pcs. Because, you see, a process has rolley-coastered—Ethics.

Actually what you do is send them into Review and Review sends them to Ethics. It's a one-two, bang! Everything on its route, everything with its label.

And the other thing is, it's a terrible, terrible unkindness not to label somebody. And we're perfectly willing to be that unkind occasionally. If somebody keeps writing us letters or talking to the people in a nasty fashion all the time, or trying to chop us up, and we don't seem to be able to do anything, we know the person is a suppressive and so forth; believe me, we're never going to always issue an order, always go to a full panoply of dress parade: "This is a suppressive person and post the orders on him." Nah, nah, nah. We've got another system to handle them: Dead File. It just cuts his comm, that's all.

Now, when he wishes to straighten himself out with regard to the Dead File, he, of course, will have to have a more amenable frame of mind. You've won your war; he can be processed or trained. It's elementary, don't you see?

If he declares war on you, if you don't handle it in the framework and definition of what's happening, why, you're in a mess. So you've, of course, got to bring about a more amenable frame of mind on his part. Don't you see? He's declared the war, you haven't.

Now, if you want to fail, all the way down the line, just keep on auditing PTSes without ever recognizing that they are, keep on having to use only Saint Hill graduates in the HGC, because the newer auditor coming in, the Class O that could just as well be sitting there auditing pcs and so forth, is insufficiently indoctrinated and also needs discipline. Don't furnish him any discipline—just don't hire him.

That doesn't sound to me like any kind of a solution at all. He doesn't think that it's important that he does this or that; first time he's been up to see Ethics he'll begin to realize that there's some importance in doing what the process said. Well, that's fine. So that's all right with him. Well, that's what you do. He'll get some results this way.

What are you supposed to do, stand around and give him a full HCA Course while you're waiting for this important datum to sink in? Or are you simply going to be able to use him? If you don't have discipline, you can't use his services. So you won't hire him. So therefore, you won't get a lot of people processed. You see how this thing is figured out?

And the bigger look—the bigger look at all this, of course, is the fact that you know you're going to raise hell with this civilization. There's going to be organization after organization is going to go down before this onslaught. It doesn't matter how nice we are, how mild we are, how sweet we are, how theetie-weetie we could possibly be; it'll still happen. They'll fold up. Well, I'd rather they folded up on an assimilable basis. That is to say, they fold up on the basis of "Send us some auditors so we can straighten the place out," rather than fold up at the blistering-hot muzzle of a gun, you understand? Or under the crack and roar of lightning. I'd say that's very dramatic. That will undoubtedly occur. I'd just like to cut it to a minimum. There's no reason to have any more dead bodies around than is necessary.

You can inject a certain positive technology into a civilization of this particular character. You could almost at this moment sit still and do nothing as far as promotion is concerned. You really wouldn't have to reach at all. We're on the other end of the flow here at Saint Hill. We're going to have to resort to such mechanisms as dodged prices, you know, reservations way up to hell and gone—this sort of thing. If we were to try to handle the traffic which we have right now for case cracking and so forth, if we were to handle it all in one fell swoop, without putting some brakes on the traffic line of some kind or another, we just wouldn't be able to make any part of it.

So we've got to hold the line and give service while we're expanding the service. And we're doing that very easily. Furthermore, we've not only got to expand this service at Saint Hill, this has got to go in to other organizations under heavy raps. That is to say, it's got to go in, in a highly disciplined fashion—what we're doing here.

Because you can't turn this loose in the middle of the Kansas prairie, man. Whoever would try to do anything with it, he'd just go appetite over tin cup. No, an auditor running what we're running now has to be a well-backed-up auditor. And he has to be well backed up by the D of P, and he has to be backed up by an Ethics Officer, and he has to be backed up by Review, and if he's backed up all the way along the line he could run this.

You could get away with running the lower-level processes without such perfection of organization. But you couldn't get by with the Power Processes.

The horrible trap that's waiting for some auditor who's going to get ahold of the Power Processes someplace and go out in the middle of the Chicago wilderness and start to Power Process some people . . .

Oh, it'll look good, you see, for a couple, three weeks. It'll look all right. Then he starts to run into all the other hats connected with it. And he won't be able to handle these hats. Even if he had a couple of friends, they wouldn't be able to handle these hats. And the next thing you know Chicago starts to beat his door down. So, then what's he do? He would try to train some people who also wouldn't have . . . He wouldn't recognize that his failure on this was not having an organization that could handle it. And he'd try to train some people to do it to relieve him, and next thing you know people will be knocking his blocks off.

There's nobody nastier than somebody who's been dished by the Power Processes, by the way. It's a two-edged sword. God, people go natterly! You never heard the like of it.

So what we've run into here is organizational technology, not individually administered technology at all. If a guy has got an organization that can back it up, he can take the world. Done by a bunch of individuals sitting unprotected and alone against the whole onslaught of the society and so forth, there'd be nothing but one solid mass of casualty. This you could be sure of So your organizational look has had to be worked out.

Now, let's take a look at what this does to processing offered. This is very important—important to organizations, important to individual auditors. If it takes an organization to administer the Power Processes effectively, it isn't the D-of-P'ing that's hard to do, it isn't the auditing that's hard to do; it's just the whole crashing demand line, the channeling, the lines, the this, that and the other thing. Because you're a manufacturing plant the second you go into this, see. You think, "Well, we're just going to audit one pc, and then we'll audit another pc," and the next thing you know the thing tries to put itself into an assembly line. And your waiting list starts stacking up.

Well, if you don't have this all planned and grooved perfectly, and there isn't somebody wearing each vital hat that is on each vital post, and so forth. Woo! Rrrrrr!

All right, so that requires a high degree of perfection of organization. Ordinary processes, to be successful, also have to be backed up. Now, you can get away with auditing an occasional pc, but why don't auditors stay in longterm practice? Is it because they get tired? Oh, they make lots of money in the field. Is it because they wear out? Is it because of this? Because of that? No, they're just not enough of a team to handle pcs.

Remember, we've already seen a psychotherapy go by the boards. I've gotten results with that psychotherapy; it's called psychoanalysis. Why didn't it ever take the world? I think they were so busy trying to handle PTSes and SPs on an individual-practitioner basis, with absolutely no rundown, that they could never complete their research. Now, they might have found some of our sub-O material, if they'd continued to research. But psychoanalysis had a certain degree of workability. We shouldn't snarl at Papa Freud, because he was a very bright man. But it was the world that kicked Papa Freud's head in, and Papa Freud was not quite strong enough or able enough to take it.

But he, nevertheless, got across to the world the idea that psychosomatic illness could stem from the mind. He got across several other points, all of which are very interesting. His technology is sufficiently workable that I wrecked a Navy project, which wouldn't have amounted to anything at all, by sitting under a tree and psychoanalyzing their research patients. See, I wanted their data for myself And they weren't going to do anything with their data anyhow, except file it, so I threw the book.

You say, how'd you do this? Well, I was sitting up in the middle of Oak Knoll Naval Hospital. I didn't have anything to do. They had a project running by which they were testing people with endocrine hormones and so forth, and they kept book on it, of course. And I was a very good friend of the doctor who was running this project. And they would take these people one after the other, and they'd run them through this lineup. And the doctor would tell me enough about this—we'd sit around and chin-chin—and he'd tell me enough about this that I finally got interested. And I started studying up on what he was studying up, and studied up on a few things off my own kick and found out what his project was all about—and had been interested in it before that anyhow. And I thought, "What a beautiful tailor-made experimental line."

So, I merely looked at those patients that he wasn't getting any result on to see if I could change it by a mental shift. And, boy, I sure fixed it up! I didn't put his project out of action because I told him—after a while. But I found out a datum which is absolutely invaluable to us: That the mind has dominance over structure. Structure does not dominate the mind. And that differentiates us from the medico.

The medico believes that structure monitors the mind. And it doesn't.

It's the mind that monitors structure. Because the endocrine, which is the midway point—you might say the switchboard of regulation and so forth—won't monitor structure as long as the mind is unaffected. That is to say, if the mind is left alone, in a large number of cases the endocrine treatment will not monitor structure, including the glands or anything else. There it is.

But when you remove a few psychic blocks—traumas if you please—Freudian style, all of a sudden, zingo, it bites and monitors structure. Now, you could change the man's diet; you could change his exercise. You could do anything you pleased with him. You could change his operating environment; and you did not change the environmental factor enough to make the endocrine dosages work.

In other words, with the changed-mind conditions, why, hormones would work; but with changed physical conditions, the aspect of the hormones did not change. That was a very, very fundamental thing, because it laid in my lap something very interesting.

Well, it was Freudian analysis did that, because I didn't use anything on these boys. Sitting under a tree out in the hospital grounds: "Oh, I think your name is Jones, isn't it? Hiya, hiya, Jones. Understand you're part of that project up there. Hmm? That so? What are they doing up there? Mm-hm.

Have much to do with what you used to think about life and so forth? You ever been worried about yourself? You ever thought about this sort of thing?

Oh, is that so? Well, that's very interesting. What sort of a childhood did you have? Did you ever have any unfortunate sexual experiences in your childhood? Oh, is that so?" You know, light Straightwire.

All of a sudden he'd say, "You know, I'd never remembered that, you know?" You'd get this bug-eyed-blowdown type of look. Mark it down in your little book. "Jones. November, 1945, 5th." Next time you're in seeing the doctor, and so forth, a week or so later, and so forth, let's look at Jones's weight and physical record. "Same, same, same, same, same. November 5th—haaa!"

And I'd say, "Thank you very much."

This doctor, by the way—he was a young fellow, and he didn't take mental treatment seriously. He didn't think it worked. He'd never been educated in it in any way. But he was a nice young bloke, and he didn't blow his stack very much. He was very pleased after a while to find out what had been going on. It didn't draw any conclusion from him, and he didn't owe anybody the record but the medical department in the navy, so the devil with it.

But he had wondered why these sudden shifts and changes, don't you see? Well, those sudden shifts and changes on that dozen or so patients and so forth was strictly and entirely doing what we would call, today, Straightwire, but it was run on entirely Freudian basis. So you see, there was some workability to that technology.

Well, then why didn't they advance any further? Because we were doing technology just a little bit superior—on a Straightwire basis—to that in 1950. We knew more, yeah. But why? Why didn't it move? Why didn't it change? Why was there no change at all in any of the Freudian line? Why was Freudian analysis the same in 1910 as it was in 1894? Why was it the same in 1922 as it was in 1894? Why did this subject never grow? It wasn't that it was successful; it's just that the individual practitioner never could organize, never could get anyplace, never could do anything. They never developed an organization which would have carried forward the research.

After all, it's the same mind. Do you follow? It isn't anything different. So that's why I tell you today that our greatest danger—our greatest danger as we move forward—is that the technology which we have becomes shattered by unworkability, misapplication and so forth. That isn't what you want to do with it. What you want to do with it is put it together in an organizational line. And you want to put it together so that you know all of the accidents you can have with it. And you want to take care of every eventuality with it. And the second you do something like that, it starts moving out with a high roar.

Now, at that particular point, it comes into collision with the society. It comes into collision with vested interests. It comes into collision with suppressive persons. It knocks things appetite over tin cup for the medicos, the psychiatrists. Who the hell would go to see a psychiatrist? We got a shock treatment graph the other day. Somebody had been processed, and had afterwards been forced into an electric-shock treatment by some suppressive.

First time I'd ever seen one, seen a graph. And the person's graph was quite normal and quite good before that electric-shock treatment. The graph taken after the electric-shock treatment was right lying down along the lower band of the OCA graph.

Well, what's the appropriation these boys take in the society? Let's just look into that field of healing. What's their appropriation? What's their annual appropriation? I know that it's over the billion dollar mark in the United States for medicine. I don't know what the figure is for psychiatry in the United States. I couldn't even guess. But it must be something pretty high, because they're operating hospitals all over the United States—lots of staffs, lots of this, lots of that. You better start taking a look at this because you're going to inherit the lot of it—and not before very long. What are you going to do with spinners?

You say, "Well, all I'm interested in is going free." You're going to go into a condition of Power. All right, you go into a condition of Power, the most serious thing you can do is disconnect—bang. It's the quickest way to bring about a collapse. No, you have to do this on a gradient scale! You can't disconnect just like that—bang. You've been woven in with the race and the universe too long to all of a sudden pack it up. You pack it up, and it'll pack you up.

Oh, there's quite a game going forward here. I'm just pointing out to you a few angles. And what I'm trying to do at this particular time is to work out smooth lines and smooth flows. Now, when we look at this list over here of certificates, we see here that we provided a route.

Now, that route is a double route. It's a route by study; it's a route by processing. And we haven't begun to explore or exploit what can be done by study alone.

I taught an ACC one time and didn't permit any processing during that ACC at all. And they got better graphs than they'd ever gotten on an ACC. Well, I think that's a fascinating thing to have happen. So I just set it aside casually and said we'll take that up later on when we need the datum.

The fact of it is, you could probably study somebody right up these levels and straight up through to the top. But he would only come a cropper on study when he hit V. He'd finish right there. Because there's a tiger lying between Release and Clear, Clear and OT. But lying between Release and Clear there's a tiger known as the R6 bank. You're not going to go through that R6 bank by changing your mind. That's all right for somebody to get the idea that they're just going to shift a couple of postulates. No, no. That's a tiger.

I know. I've been bucking this tiger. I'm very, very well acquainted with this tiger. And it unfortunately isn't something which just keys out like that and you're rid of it. No, you can key the pc out of it, and he's in pretty jolly good shape. But when you move him up from Release, up over the jump, it will be by the vanquishment of the entirety of the reactive mind. Have to be a clean sweep and there won't be any dust left in the corners, and the floor will be beautifully polished and there won't be any floor. And then you've got it. And there's nothing of value in that bank at all.

Every now and then, once in a blue moon, as a person starts into it, they say, "But what would I do if I'd . . . ?" Ha! Ssuh! It gets sillier and sillier as a concept as you go on, you see, to think that it has any value or any use.

So with that limitation you could study your way up to Release—with that limitation. But the actual fact of Release might or might not occur. But you probably could study your way up to it. Isn't that interesting? That is a route. That is a route. And it is a route that you must not neglect.

It's the ideas you get, the looking at the rules and the laws, and adding them up to your life and cogniting on them, becoming wiser, smarter along these particular lines. You suddenly look at that and blow that, and you understand something else and boom, that goes, and so forth. This is not something that you should neglect as a case advance.

Yes, it's always an advance in wisdom, but have you ever really looked at it as a straight case advance? Well, we already have this datum. There were quite a few on that ACC and actually their graphs showed conclusively that at the end of an ACC where they had simply received lectures—and they'd receive about one or two lectures a day—with this alone and whatever other texts and so forth had been assigned to them, their cases went way up.

Some of those cases were quite resistive cases, too. We never looked for them to have any gain at all. But, of course, they never had any time to tell the auditor they weren't making a case gain; they probably hadn't even noticed it.

So therefore, this is a hidden line of advance—this line of advance of the levels. Now, we have something poor on this chart in that we call this 0, I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII—we're calling those levels—and now we have a second set of levels. And you'll find out that this is sooner or later confusing. So these are actually classes. Class for auditors, see. When it's all written up to be in concrete, when we say "level" we probably will be meaning these - 34 on up to + 15, or something like that. And when we say "class," why, we will mean this. You're already speaking of yourselves in classes of grades. [See the Classification, Gradation and Awareness Chart of Levels and Certificates in the appendix of this volume.]

Now, this chart is a fascinating chart from numerous lines, because it goes as many as seventy levels below - 34. But to get down as far as - 34 is quite remarkable, because you're down into



screaming insanity long before you get there Now, what are the aspects of these people? Well, there's things down here like False Cause.

Now, the way you interpret this—I call to your attention that the interpretation of these minus levels and so forth is very tricky, because this is the first time you've ever had this scale. You think you know all about it and it's the Tone Scale and so forth, and “Yes, the person . . . Yes, this person's always numb, so therefore he's at -10.” No, no, please! This person may be at -54.

Do you see what's wrong? Is this person aware of the fact that he's always numb? Well, if he was aware of the fact he was always numb, he'd be at -10, see? Do you follow this? It's what he is aware of Now, you take this thing like False Cause. That is to say, down below the bottom here. Now, you say, “Well, I'm aware of false causes, so am I at False Cause?” No, please! The individual could only be aware of a false cause without knowing it was false Do you follow that? See? So you tell him, “Babies are found in cabbage patches,” and he would become aware of that as a datum and say, “Isn't that interesting!” And he'd accept that as a datum, because it's a false cause. But that would be what he could be aware of He could only be aware of causes that were false.

But he wouldn't be aware of the falsity of causes. Do you follow? So this is very, very tricky—very tricky to use. And you could make some blunders with this. But you can also make some very, very bright adjudications with it.

You all of a sudden one fine day become aware of the fact that . . . Well, you say—not you particularly—but somebody says, “You know, I'm always thinking I need changes, you know? Hey, what do you know! You know? I'm always thinking I need changes!” Cognition, see? There he is, -4. He has become aware of it. So you might say that's his cognition level.

Now, how about the fellow who never cognites? Well, he's just not being audited or trained at the level he could cognite. That's all. That's very simple, very elementary. He's over his head in terms of levels. It's just as elementary as that. What can he be aware of? Well, what he could be aware of, he could cognite on. Actually, this lays the pattern, then, of gradient cognitions as it comes right up the line. That person would cognite in that gradient of cognitions.

So what I've been talking to you about admits of the fact that we can now take somebody... Although we have processes which go up along all these classes—the processes go there—there's also this other phenomenon which has occurred of the Power Process, which just bodily takes anybody who can respond and yanks them up with a thud, up to IV! Crash!

Now, although I'd have to give you a complete lecture on this, some of the manifestations which occur there are quite interesting And some of the data is very fascinating that turns out of this. Because it tells you that what you have recovered is a terrific ability to know, an ability to be aware—at this level of Release—without necessarily attaining any more than you knew before. You got that?

But you have this terrific ability to get there in an awful hurry. You see? You can look at this washing machine—and before you couldn't even read directions to one, see; maybe something like that. “Oh,” you say, “what do you know! Isn't that interesting! Hm! Hm! Your washing machine is busted. The whatcha-call-it and so-and-so fits into the sum-sum, and that needs adjustment, you know?”

“Well, how did you know that?”

And you'd be very surprised because “How wouldn't they be able to see that? Are they stupid or something?” You get the idea? You become a very quick study, very capable of becoming or knowing or coordinating or acting or figuring something out or putting something together, don't you see? That's what's increased at that level of Release.

Now, I could say by extrapolation this probably is what will occur at Clear and OT. That is just redoubled. You've got so much more, plus the fact that you can also do creative actions and move things creatively and make things and bring things about which you never could have done before, such as not depending on a body and things like this.

But the actual truth of the matter is that the individual will not know more about how to do that by having been, but his present level of beingness will be such that his ability to grasp the potential and act upon the potential, assimilate and accomplish at that particular line is just lightning fast. Do you follow?

Therefore, with this data falling out . . . And this data is based—it's empirical data. I mean, this data surprised me. I didn't have a total grip on exactly what this was all about, don't you see? I couldn't instantly say, "Well, an individual knows more than he ever would have known before," don't you see? No, he only knows what he knew before. It doesn't matter how Clear you clear him, see, he only now knows what he knew before. Of course, he has this slight advantage: He knows what he knew before as good as when he knew it before.

But if somebody's been on a long snore for eight trillion years, don't expect him to know everything that happened in that eight trillion years. He now knows as much as he knew about the eight trillion years when he was passing through the moments of the eight trillion years, you understand, and it wasn't very much. See, that didn't increase his knowledge of that. What it did was increase his potential, his ability, and so forth. So he isn't bothered by his past. His awareness of his present is what is coming there.

So therefore, we have to deal with this fact. This is a new fact and it's been a little bit hard to isolate this. And I've been studying it now a bit for several weeks, and not quite sure what I was looking at. And finally I realized what I was looking at: The person is never going to make it without being trained.

Sure, he could go through a university in two or three months, you get the idea, to a six-year course, you see? Sure, he could do all these things.

Yeah, yeah, that's fine. But remember he'd have to go through the university. What you're going to see out of this is quite interesting, because the first thing he's going to be aware of as he moves out of a comatose, wog state into a higher level of action—first thing he's aware of is Scientology. I think that's very interesting. It's the first thing there to be aware of, and it's the first thing there to study. And it's the next thing which leads to a higher ability level.

Well, you're going to take this fellow up there, and you're just going to drop him, huh? The cruelest thing you could possibly do would be to audit somebody through to Clear. That would just be about the cruelest thing you could do to anybody: not train him, not have him know anything about being an auditor, not know anything about the bank, not know anything about life, not know anything about himself, not know anything about anything, and you're going to audit him all the way through to Clear. Now he has this terrific potential to know, and you haven't made it possible for him to assimilate the technology which has brought him to this state. Although it wouldn't kill him, it would put him in a most dreadful confusion. It'd be a cruel thing to do.

He'd say, "What's this all about? I never realized a state like this could exist."

He has no gradient, don't you see? Well, he could grasp it with great readiness. Unfortunately, the faster way to do it is to bring him up to Release on an express elevator, and then let him study his way up to where he's got to. You know? "These were the floors."

"Oh, I wondered what that blur was!"

And then put the tools into his hands where he can move himself through the remaining step to Clear. And then give him, organizationally, something into which he can extend this benefit and use his potentials, instead of just going out and picking safes idly at night.

In other words, you have to take a very total responsibility here. You can't handle something like this lightly. You go appetite over tin cup if you do. So we're trying to take as much possible responsibility as can possibly be taken along this line. Along with that you have to have (1) the route which brings somebody up in a hurry, or the route by which they could be processed up slowly. We haven't totally discounted grade processing, you see?

But certainly, provide these various routes by which it can be done. Provide this fast one which, before, the individual who was way down here couldn't have made it at all. Well, he can make it on an express elevator today. What are we going to do with this guy? He's right away going to say, "Oh, there is a state of Clear, and I'm very aware of that, and it'd be very, very nice, and why don't somebody process me through to Clear?"

"Why doesn't somebody blow my head off?"—he's asking the same question. You say, "Well, I'll tell you what you do. I think you have a Beginning Scientologist Certificate, correct? All right. Well, why don't you just start moving up the line, catch up your data, figure it all out, get it all straightened up and bring yourself up the line, and so forth, and you'll eventually be able to get your Class VI training and then you can go on through to the top." By this time he knows what it's all about; he knows how other people function.

You've given him a familiarity with the existence in which he lives. Now, at the same time you've done this, when you've moved him up along this line, you have therefore moved him up as well in his span of knowledge of what is in Scientology, his organizational scope, he has come up to an understanding of the usefulness of the various tools of Scientology, and he has also found out that these new states aren't just being left willy-nilly to fall where they may but are moving up into a type of civilization which can also exist.

Now, having discovered these various things, when he moves out through the top, you're not going to have a lot of catastrophe—you're going to have a lot of order, you're going to have a lot of happy people.

This is what's taking the totality of responsibility along some certain line. And although taking that much responsibility doesn't seem to be indicated, it's only not indicated to a wog. Look what's happened to the atom bomb!

Now, the nut that dreamed that up never took any responsibility for its potentials. He didn't have his ethics in at all. And not having it so, why, one of these days, it's liable to blow the world apart unless we get there first. So we have to get his ethice in for him as well as for ourselves. And we'll be able to do that, too. But when you don't take responsibility for powerful knowledge, it'll all go crash. And you've got to take responsibility for it to the degree that it is powerful.

And we, for the first time in the history of this universe, have a total grip on life and what it's composed of, and can bring people up with an express elevator, clear up all the way to the top, over and out. That's a lot of power. We'd better measure up to it always.

Thank you.