METHODOLOGY OF AUDITING: NOT DOINGNESS AND OCCLUSION

A lecture given on
4 August 1961

Okay. We have . . this is what . . this is the 4th of August

Female voice: Yes.

Haven't got my sextant with me. How can I tell the date?

We're going to lengthen this course to eight weeks. I'm not going to do anything particularly to . . on the cost or anything like that. We are lengthening it to eight weeks just basically because you're being pretty slow, man. I mean that's all. That's being pretty crudely slow.

Now that isn't actually in effect for anybody but people who aren't here yet. That is to say that would only be effect . . in effect on people who have not yet enrolled. Your course is still four weeks, and you're still behind. I figured out a way to give you a lose, you see. And I want to invite you to some attention to the checksheets. Make sure that you get those checked out. And I would like to make this statement, particularly to those people who are leaving: It isn't the new technique or the new idea that is wanting. It is sound technical application.

Throughout the world, Scientology has, here and there . . where it has . . fallen on its face solely because of lack of technical accuracy of application. That is utterly fantastic. Its basic methodology of auditing is just not applied. And in the absence of the basic methodology of auditing, you cannot get a result, and that's it! I make that statement categorically.

A bum auditor never got a good result. He got a sporadic one once in a while, and then tried to get it on the next pc, and then he kept looking for new and startling ideas that would get this idea again on the next pc. But of course, it never did. And he figures out there's something very inconstant about the ideas of Scientology or the actual processes of Scientology. These must be inconstant. No, he should look closer to home. His application of processes is inconstant, so therefore, his results are inconstant.

What it takes to comprise a blunder in the technical department is of such a wild order of magnitude that you normally, when you're supervising processing, don't even bother to ask for it because nobody could be that dumb. And yet, that is the exact blunder that is made. For instance, you seldom ask, "Well, did you report for sessions?" you know. you just don't go into that order of magnitude.

You're wondering whether or not the pc might not have had some tiny little ARC break that held up his processing and all that sort of thing. That is not the order of magnitude that causes technical results not to occur. It's the order of magnitude of "Did you report for the auditing session?" Casual statements very often have a very disarming effect and you're liable to get the sudden truth dumped in your lap, you know.

You say, "Well, did you change the process often enough every hour?" Yeah, you've had a wild, non-result profile, see, over twenty-five or fifty hours of auditing. It's this kind of thing that you're looking at. you may have perfectly nice Auditor Reports, but they haven't anything to do with the sessions that were run. It's quite incredible, quite incredible.

Picking up this Form 6 discloses this, too. you start running a Security Check Form 6 about "What have you done to pcs?" you know. And one of the questions on there is, of course . . well, in essence . ."Did you fake auditor reports?" you know. And you'd be surprised how many falls there are on that.

The auditor wants to look good, so he writes down a good auditor's report; it didn't have anything to do with the session. It happens. It's happened over the years all too often. So, this, of course, has had the effect of making me work three times as hard as I might have otherwise, because I couldn't figure out what was happening because I myself was not looking for the gross error.

But the error that was gross is gross, man. I mean it's a really marvelously gross error. And such a question as "Well, did you change the process often enough each hour?" is liable to get, "Oh, yes! You see, this preclear has to have a new process every four or five minutes, you see, because he loses interest." You'll get some of the wildest rationales, you know? And most ARC breaks that occasion auditing are actually an auditor . . simply bum TRs. That's all. The auditor doesn't press on, carry through, bad Model Session, that sort of thing. And you'd be surprised what that does.

You yourself, I am sure, have noticed with enormous relief on your own part while being a preclear that an auditor who just ran on down the line with a good Model Session . . he might not be very brilliant in the way he's handling the data you give him, but he's giving you a good Model Session. And all of a sudden your confidence gradually rises. You noticed that?

Audience: Yes.

And you noticed what happens to you when you run into several flubbed auditing commands and flubbed bridges, and flubbed this and flubbed that, and how your confidence deteriorates? That is a direct monitoring factor.

This, by the way, is a new field, a brand-new field in the whole field of psychotherapy . . the application of the therapy to the person . . that has never had any slightest study; not until Scientology. That sounds astonishing, doesn't it? But it never has.

Oh, I'm sure some old witch doctor has educated some kid that he was bringing up to be a super witch doctor or something of this sort. I'm sure he's educated him to the proper way to handle a rattle, you know, and say, "Boo" and scream at the right places. But I'll also call to your attention that those barbaric and uncivilized practices, when they are actually rendered according to rote and the way they are supposed to be done, they're quite astonishing they get a pretty good percentage. They at least get their twenty-two and a half percent.

Psychiatry doesn't, man. It doesn't get any twenty-two and a half percent. And boy, they handle an electric shock one way one day and another way another day, and then they change it all around and handle it some other way, and they don't know what they're doing But then you and I, of course, ire apt to be bemused and amazed at the psychiatrist because we don't understand what his goals are. And of course, he doesn't have the same goals we do. And you can ask him for his goals and he'll give you some of the most incredible rattletrap bunch of nonsense. Sounds like nonsense to you.

"What is your goal with regard to patients? What are you trying to do with patients?" you see, something like this. And you're liable to get stuff that will curl your hair. I mean, it has nothing to do with your goals. Has nothing to do with helping people. Hasn't a thing to do with helping people. Hasn't anything to do with curing insanity. You can say, "Well how can a fellow be in the field of psychiatry if he has nothing to do with helping people and curing insanity." And you could rattle off yourself the pattern goals which ought to exist in psychiatry. And they don't exist in psychiatry.

And many of those goals are missing in medicine, particularly in the field of surgery. And you ask a surgeon, "What are your goals with regard to a patient?" and you, of course, could tailor-make a whole bunch of goals that a surgeon should have. Well, it's seldom that a surgeon has any of those goals. And so you're very dismayed because you don't understand the man.

And in Freudian analysis, the methodology of application alone prevented Freudian analysis from working. I'm sure that Freudian analysis can work because I can make it work. In 1945 I ruined more cases for the United States Navy. I told you about that, I'm sure. I ruined cases left and right by finding guys out on a park bench and pulling some second-dynamic traumatic experience, you see.

And then they were keeping records on the effect of hormones on ex-prisoners of war and that sort of thing, you know? And of course, I had access to their records. So of course they were running a wonderful test program for me. It must have cost the government hundreds of thousands of dollars. And they would write down in the records how it affected the patient an this day and how it affected him on the

next day. And, oh, these were beautiful statistical records, so all you had to do was alter the psychic attitude of the patient toward sex, then go look at the records a few days later, and of course you had the direct test of what you were doing.

The government was very nice. In view of the fact that they intended to do nothing for the fellow but were merely trying to find out. See, they were just trying to find out. And you . . I asked old Doc Yankeewitz, "Well, what are you trying to find out for? And he said, "For? For? For?" Sounded like he was playing golf Stopped him in his tracks. Evidently, his thought processes had never gone beyond that point. He'd been well trained, but his application of methodologies, application of the theories of psychoanalysis are almost 100 percent the reverse mirror to the Auditor's Code.

If you don't believe it, look them over. It's almost 100 percent reverse picture, and then is inconstant. They didn't even employ it the way they might have done, you see. So maybe these theories would have worked, but who would know? Because the theory was applied in such a ruggedly random fashion from one practitioner to the next, from one day to the next, by the same practitioner, and mostly reversed as to what would do anything for the patient.

But methodology, its application . . and only then can you get a consistent and constant result. And it starts in with TR 0. And frankly, a person can't even read an E-Meter if he's so agitated about looking at the pc. And, you know, he's got to sit in session, but he's got to look at the E-Meter. And by actual observation, I have found out specifically that the person doesn't get the data on the needle or tone arm. If his TR O is bad, then his recording of the E-Meter and what it says is fantastic. Tone arm can be at 5.0, he says it's t 2.0, you know. I mean he just can't record, he can't read the E-Meter.

Now, what do you do? You sweat in going out and teaching other people and so forth. Perspiration is doing a Zambezi Falls from your brow, and your beeves are rolled up, and you're getting ready to call for the rack and whip, you know. You're getting to . . you're getting desperate, see. You've told some auditors that when the needle is tight like that and won't drop on a can squeeze with a high sensitivity knob, that the case probably needs Routine 1.

See, you keep telling them this, you see. And you get this case in, and at sensitivity 0 on the knob and a near Clear needle, and the tone arm with nice action in it, you find out that this person has been run for three days on Routine 1. So you say, "Well, now study your E-Meter," and you get out E-Meter Essentials, and you put E-Meter Essentials under the nose of this person and you say, "Study that E-Meter Essentials. Now, study your meter. Get so you can read a meter; get so you can read a meter."

And he reads it all through, and he passes the examination about it, and three weeks later does the same trick with another pc. Only this time the pc is totally stuck with sensitivity at 16, and can't even find him with the tone arm. And all of a sudden, why, "Well, what are you doing?"

"Well, we're running Routine 3, and that's all we're running, and the pc has such long comm lags, however, that it's impossible really to run Routine 3, because we only get about one goal a session. Well, I think . . we think we Sound his goal. We think we found his goal though already because the whole meter just stops moving whenever he mentions being in session. So we found his goal all right, which is 'to be in session,' obviously."

And you say, "Wait a minute now. Read this E-Meter Essentials here. Read it. Read it, would you please?" And you are just banging your head against the wall, because that isn't what's wrong with the pc. That isn't what's wrong with this auditor. He ought to be a pc. But that isn't what's wrong with him. What's wrong with him is he can't confront. It's one of these horrible, wide, wild fundamentals. It upsets him so, the idea of looking at a pc, that of course he can spare no attention for the meter or if he looks at the meter, he can spare no attention for the pc. And these two things, attention on two places, of course, adds up to the definition of a problem, doesn't it?

And so you've got two counter-postulates, which here you'd have two counter-objects. And you've got two things with which you are unfamiliar that you are looking at at the same time, and of course, it looks like a problem. And a person's indecision rises. If indecision could be measured in inches of mercury, it'd be the height of the Empire State Building. And hasn't anything to do with being able to memorize a

meter by rote. It has everything to do with being able to connect what the meter is doing with what the pc is doing and regard them as a unit. They actually are two things, until he Jets that connection straight . . got it.

So, the advice I will give you is simply, basically just this: look for treater technical gains when you have achieved greater skill in application. Don't necessarily look for greater technical gains because you have given them some new ideas. That's the thing to concentrate on. And when you've got that concentrated on, when you've got that smoothed out and squared away, all of a sudden this new factor . . ideas and the application of ideas and handling the pc's ideas and all of that . . that all ensues afterwards.

But as long as the person is upset and worried and maybe not even realizing he's worried, about the mechanics of how he does this thing, he of course has no judgment. And that's the basic stomp on Judgment, is the person has no judgment as long as he himself is sitting in the middle of a problem of "can't apply." Well, he's sitting in this problem of "can't apply," and you expect him to have judgment about this case. Well, he can't do it.

So ideas come after, even though they apparently come before. Handling the ideas, the theories, processes, what process when, that sort of thing, comes after somebody knows E-Meter and TRs and Model Session and the other things . . has these things pretty good, can do an assessment on the Prehav Scale accurately and well, and can do a good Security Check. When he can do all these things, now he ought to be worrying about what makes people Clear, because of course, this is the fundamental. These are the building blocks on which this idea of Clear is built. And it's like trying to build the top of a skyscraper without even skyhooks, to just get an idea about clearing and then without any methodology, try to bring it about. Won't work. I had a lot of experience with this.

Now, I don't necessarily state that the TRs are the most ultimate drill that will ever be invented or even perhaps the best drills that have ever been invented, but they are very widely effective, and they are very applicable, and they are very useful, and people will sooner or later get over the hump with them.

Nor do I say that the last volume to be written on the E-Meter is contained in E-Meter Essentials. There still may be things to be known in that meter although some of the things I have found out about an E-Meter in the course of just the last year had me astonished. I didn't know there could be that much left in that meter. And there was. And this work is pretty well summated now in E-Meter Essentials. Well, that isn't the final text, but it is certainly a useful and usable text and serves our purposes at this time.

I don't say that the wording of Model Session is the best wording that could be devised for all countries, all places, and all preclears. But it's generally applicable, and it works out a good average. And therefore, is a workable structure and therefore a workable methodology.

Now, the basic laws of auditing, unfortunately, have never been stated on one sheet of paper. I have never been this adventurous, but there are certain definite laws that regulate the choice of the command. How do you run commands? Or how do you figure out a command? How do you add up a command? There are some laws relating to that. There are several laws relating to processes, whether they're good processes or bad processes. You have the one . . a good example of what I'm talking about in Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought. If you were to run somebody on "can't-have" on self and "have" on somebody else . . like this process: "What could you give somebody? Thank you. What wouldn't somebody else give you? Thank you." Well, he'd go right into the ground right away, you see.

So there are several process rules, but these rules are relatively flexible. They are not terribly fixed and most pcs that you try to run a games condition process on are going to tell you sooner or later that it actually should be "can't-have" on the other one, "have" for self You'll probably run into that yourself on the bank. Well, that's . . you're being so hopeful about it, that there it goes.

Well, this violates, unfortunately, another rule. And that is that running "have" for self, under long and arduous testing, has yet to produce any gain. It doesn't upset anybody. It doesn't chew them up particularly, but it doesn't improve them either. And I have looked at an awful prolonged parade of cases on which that particular facet was established, so that you would just he throwing away an auditing command if you said can't-have for the other fellow, then "have" for you . . you know, his havingness,

you. That command would be lost every time. It would be a meaningless command. So you can't run it that way.

It's "can't-have" for self, the other fellow's "can't-have" for you, his "can't-have" for another, another "can't-have" for him, and so on. That is your basic games-condition proposition. Even though it might appear more comfortable to the pc to run it "can't-have" and "have" for himself and so on. That might took much better to him, and it might feel much better. But if it feels much better, there's another little rule that comes up . . is the degree of reality of the pc. And it's so weird that pcs can run glibly processes they have no business being able to run. They can run them with great glibidity. And they can just chatter off answers left and right. They get no better. Nothing happens.

Well, they're working behind a protective screen. "Nothing is real and nothing means anything anyway, so it doesn't matter what I do." And these processes don't hit at that particular button, so of course, they just continue to run and the pc can run forever. And he's running without comm lag. He's running without difficulty. Running CCH 2, he'll walk around the room and touch walls and . . this was the first time this showed up wildly. Why, he'd just run 8-C forever and just nothing happens. Nothing happens at all.

You've seen cases like this. So you have the reality factor. You have the reality factor which enters into commands and processes. And that is to say a person should have a reality on what he's running and at this point, with commands, in enters the E-Meter.

So the E-Meter moves in because that thing which will cause the needle to change its pattern is real to the pc. I know, it doesn't sound real to you sometimes. You say to this pc, "Well, have you ever had any difficulty with oceans or planets?" or something like that, and all of a sudden he falls sixteen dials. You've run into the clam on the beach, you see, something of that sort. It's real to him. It isn't very real to you, but it's real to him. So your own unreality sometimes defeats you in admitting that somebody could have such a good reality on being a clam and such a bad reality on being a human being.

So your own reality factor doesn't have to get dismayed or pushed around. You've got a simple test called an E-Meter. And so in putting together auditing commands . . actually the best way to put together an auditing command is to put it together with needle reaction, and just choose your words of various kinds, and so on.

Well now, this only has one limiting factor: is after the pc has been run for a relatively short space of time on any bracket process, only then do some of the outer brackets become real to him. So he can run it for himself, run it for himself, run it for himself It fell for himself, you see, but you couldn't get it to fall for the other fellow. So you didn't run that other leg. Well, after he's run it for himself, run it for himself, run it for himself for a while, all of a sudden this other one shows up. And we get the broadening effect of commands. We get the broadening perimeter.

Actually, there hasn't been a lecture on this since November of 1950, Los Angeles. It's a picture of the dynamics, and they're concentric. They're a series of concentric circles. I think it's been sketched around someplace, but there was a full lecture on it back then. A series of concentric circles. The first dynamic is the inner circle, and then the next circle is the second dynamic, and they go on out to eight circles.

Well, the pc's ability to reach is reflected directly in the pc's ability to conceive of somebody else having an idea or an action. And so, as you run a command, his ability to reach betters and the command you started with can become too narrow and now operates as a restriction on the pc's gain. There hasn't been much discussion of this last point at all, but I've just run into it using: pc giving somebody's, or denying somebody, the pc's interest and the . . then the other person denying the pc their interest.

After it had been run for quite a while, it started to become restrictive. Why? Well, the pc's ideas now were reaching further, so denying another the pc's interest could be dropped down to just denying another interest, you see. His could be dropped out, or hers could be dropped out, see. Pc identity could be dropped out of the auditing command because it was too restrictive.

The pc now could conceive of other zones and varieties of interest, don't you see. So the auditing command modified to: denying another interest and another denying the pc interest, you see. And more legs could be added to the auditing command too.

And you'll find this is very common in putting together commands: that you get the first leg of the bracket is the most real, and then the second leg of the bracket becomes real after a while, and then the third leg of the bracket shows up and becomes real. you see how this works. And out it goes. And you vet a wider and wider and wider perimeter of application. So that, frankly, there are some processes which are so steep, run on certain pcs, that they cannot conceive of a bracket interchange between themselves and another. They cannot conceive an interchange. Self can conceive of interest; another could conceive of interest, you get the idea. But for self to conceive of interest for another, that's impossible. You get the idea?

So each leg of the bracket stands as an individuated unit without any interchange amongst these brackets. Well, now if you tailored up the auditing command to run as a totally individuated type of auditing command . . you see, each leg of the bracket is totally individuated, and there is no interchange with another leg of the bracket . . it'd be like shooting.

All right. Let's just use shooting here. "Get the idea of shooting self that's fine." "Get the idea of another shooting self." Well, this becomes a little hard to do, you see. And this is about all that you could get to fall on the meter. But after you've run as much as you could get to fall, you're going to get the rest of the legs of the auditing command showing up.

Well, in view of the fact that it really doesn't harm anybody to run an unreality . . it doesn't really harm anybody to run an unreality if they're approaching a reality from some other quarter . . why, you could put all those brackets in right at the beginning. And you could say, well, "Get the idea of shooting yourself. Good. Get the idea of shooting another. Good. Get the idea of another shooting you. Good. Get the idea of another shooting himself. Good." You see? This is kind of a built-up bracket.

Well now, these commands at the beginning would not at all be real to the pc. The pc would say, "Get the idea of shooting self" oh, boy, can he get that, see. It falls off the pin. He thinks about it all the time. That's marvelous, yes. And "Now get the idea of shooting another." Absolutely no slightest reaction . . not a bit. He hasn't got a clue. Shooting another? Nobody ever does that. He's heard of wars. He's been to the motion pictures. He's even seen IV . . to get to the utmost in violence . . and still cannot really conceive of a person shooting another.

And as far as another shooting him is concerned, nobody ever would.

The world is full of kind people and its full of nice people. And wars are fought with chessboards and carved men. Everybody knows this. And there's just no reality. But after you run it for a little while, "Get the idea of shooting another." You've been uttering the auditing command, but "Get the idea of shooting another" . . if you've been watching your meter, you all of a sudden see when you utter this command, you get a needle reaction. Pow! He can conceive this now.

And you could ask him at the same moment, "Well, is that real to you?"

"Oh, man, yes, Sir. Wow! Oh, that's something I don't want to do. Yeah. It's pretty terrible doing something like that. And then having to call the ambulance, you know. That's pretty bad."

And "Get an idea of another shooting himself."

"Oh, yeah, that's what everybody ought to do."

Well, all of a sudden that particular aspect of the auditing command isn't quite so hot. It's not too hot, but "Get an idea of another shooting you." Oh boy, oh boy, it starts to fall and you'll notice that command gets hotter and hotter and hotter according to your needle reaction. Well, it's getting more and more and more real to the pc.

So if in doubt in putting up auditing commands, choose, if you possibly can, a bracket and command wordings that all fall on the meter. See? If you can do that, why, you're really cooking Everything's fine. But remember that if you choose a very limited scope of application that the command itself is going to restrict sooner or later the pc's recovery.

Now, supposing all you could get to fall was: pc shooting self; another shooting himself Well, after you've audited this for twenty or thirty hours, all of the . . you see, in the meantime the other actions of it would have become real to the pc, too. And you get all these other things, and they'll start stacking up as automaticities. And he'll start getting some kind of an automatic feeling like he ought to shoot everybody or something like this, you know, or has he shot people . . he'll start to worry about it. Because you haven't let the pc look at it, don't you see.

So therefore, an auditing command . . part of the rules of auditing commands is, an auditing command can at any time be broadened and made more general and must never be made more particular. You can broaden an auditing command. Don't ever make it more particular. Don't start out with, "Get the idea of shooting another. Get the idea of another shooting you." All of a sudden, find out it isn't working too well, so add in "Get the idea of shooting yourself. Get another idea of another shooting himself" Boy! Have you goofed.

Now, that is making a more restrictive auditing command. And when you've developed an auditing command and you're going to change it in the course of processing, you must never change it in the direction of making it more specific. You must always change it in the direction of making it more general. Follow that? And you follow why?

If in doubt, take the broadest, most particularized you know, just the most possibly involved and . . form of the auditing command with eighteen legs to it, and right . . run it from the outset. If you're in doubt about it, just start and run it from the outset.

Then very often your pc, in getting audited, is getting . . they all of a sudden start turning on a set of familiar somatics or something of this sort. Well, you can suspect, of course, withholds and you'll probably be right. You can suspect present time problems, and you undoubtedly will be right. But you should also add into your list of suspects, even though it isn't terribly important, the fact that the auditing command is too narrow, and is too specific and has probably reached a point where it ought to be generalized. Now when you generalize an auditing command, you don't change it any more than you have to. In other words, you don't change "woulds" to "coulds" and other particularities of the auditing command. You keep it in exactly the same verb form and so on. you just change its targets.

So it's always legitimate to change the targets or directions of an auditing command, but it's never legitimate to change the wording form of the auditing command. You can add more legs, in other words, or you can add more directions for the auditing command to go or you can add a more general way for it to go. But the basic form which you had . . how you were using 'how" . . you better not change it. It better be "how." In other words, don't Change a "where" to a "how" or don't change a "what" to a "who" or something of this sort, you see. Don't monkey with those mechanics. You get what mechanics I'm talking about now, you know. You're running "Think . . " Well, don't suddenly start running "Get the idea of . . " because that's a wild Change.

You can say that you have not changed the auditing command if you have generalized the targets in the command, and if you have not changed the verbalizations of the general command. Now for instance, "Get the idea of shooting self, get the idea of another shooting himself." All right. That was all we were running at first for some reason best known to us. All right. You can't now say, well, "Think of shooting yourself Think of shooting another. think of another shooting himself. Think of another shooting you." You're running an entirely different process.

But you can just add more legs or add a greater generality to it such as 'Get the idea of shooting self. Get the idea of another shooting self. Get the idea of shooting another. Get the idea of another shooting you. Get the idea of another shooting another. And get the idea of others shooting another." See, we're just going out further. "And get the idea of others shooting themselves." See? All this is perfectly legitimate. You're just adding, adding, adding, but you're just adding scope and direction, aren't you?

Now, you can drop portions of an auditing command equally easily by saying, "Get the idea of giving another your interest." Supposing you were running this one. It's wrong, but supposing you were running it. "You get the idea of giving another your interest" could be altered very easily . . "Get the idea of giving another interest." You've dropped the pronoun which was more of a particularization than all of a sudden it was necessary to have. Maybe it was necessary at first, but now it is not necessary to have this thing so you can drop it.

All right. But "Get the idea of . . ," you started out with "giving" . . "Get the idea of denying." Oh, no, man, you've just changed the whole process from one end to the other because you've changed the verb. you see?

Now, this process with all these legs goes eventually into this cycle: The pc gets free enough on the whole process and all parts of the process . . the pc now nets free enough to be able to consider all of the various legs of the process and the pc isn't running motivator, motivator, motivator all the time, and so forth. find you could just say, "Get the idea of shooting" You get the reduotio ad absurdum. This would then cover . . you've accumulated up to this time, let us say, forty-five legs to this auditing command about .45s. And you . . it's got more particularities. You've got the thing involved out there until it's running all over the pasture, you know. And this starts to go pretty null.

Well, if you wanted to polish it off, get all the missing legs that you've missed, and so on, well, just drop the whole lousy lot and go back into a simplicity but use the same auditing commands such as "Get the idea of shooting," period. All of a sudden, why, the pc will add the targets in, and he'll add everything else in. But he's now capable of doing so. Don't you see this?

Usually an aberration is located as a total imprisonment and in a total individuation. Auditing commands, as you run them, resolve the degree of imprisonment and individuation. And as this degree lessens, don't suppose because you have knocked out just the individuation on one leg that you have flattened the whole command. Yes, you've ceased to have tone arm action on just one leg of it, but there were many other legs which you've left untouched, don't you see. So you can always "check out" an auditing command, which is another little rule that you should follow.

It isn't enough to say that the auditing command then . . I'm letting you in now on some postgraduate college auditing command . . mock-up here. It isn't enough to say that an auditing command is flat because the tone arm has ceased to move while it was being run. That is only a workable statement at HPA level. It's going to hang up some pcs here and there. Not seriously enough to really upset the game, but, give them a headache once in a while.

The tone arm ceases to move when the targets of the process have been flattened. Now the targets of the process mean self-another, let us say, or something of this sort. Now, the tone arm has ceased to move because those targets were exhausted. It does not mean that the process is exhausted. And so therefore, this is the rule: Before leaving an auditing command, regardless of the "twenty-minute rule," which is only a signal, you should check out the auditing command . . this would be the very thorough auditor . . for all possible variations which might produce new action. And you very often find that they all flatten off in fifteen minutes. But it was a good thing to do, don't you see?

You check back over the process, and you found out the one person that the command never applied to was "Mother." For some reason or other, this auditing command just isolated and made it impossible to use Mother. You can get auditing commands that'll do this, you see. And because it was "his" or some stupid pronoun or something of the sort. And yet it was "Mother," and "Mother" kept cropping up and toward the end of the auditing process, the pc is left there sitting with a static picture of Mother.

Now you check out the command, and you'll say, "Well, now how do you feel about this?" is a nice, general statement, but you should be much more interested. You should say, "Well, do you have any still pictures now?" "Is there anything . . what do you think about the command in general? Is there anything to which it did not apply?" "Is there anything that it missed?" So forth. Bong! All of a sudden.

Well, you say, "What was that?"

And the pc says, "Well, it's a . . it's a static picture. Could that be a picture of my mother? It's right out in front of me here."

And you say, "Yes, yeah. What about this? Well, what about this?"

He says, "Well, you see, the auditing . . I've been dodging this for the last hour or so because the auditing process doesn't touch that particular aspect of it."

And you can say, "Doesn't touch what aspect of it?"

"Well, you said 'shooting himself,' see. And actually Mother is a herself, and so forth, and she used to talk all the time. That's all she ever said just morning, noon and night. I' m just going to shoot myself if your father keeps on the way he is going. He is always here nagging at me.' " Some Dianetic phrase ending it up, you know. And all is now revealed.

Remember that in dealing with reactivity, you're dealing with a Simple Simon type of intelligence. On any point where the pc has been extravagantly reactive, he has been extravagantly stupid. And he can add up more horses in more beds in less time, and on an auditing command, is just walking in the middle of pieces of pie carefully you see. you see, you didn't say pies. "Have you ever stepped in any pies?" So therefore, when he was in the bakery that time when it caught on fire and walked over pies, he can't find one pie that he stepped on, you see. There's nothing but pies that he stepped on, so he can't answer the auditing command.

You've heard this kind of logic. You yourself have faced up to it occasionally. Well, it isn't that your pc in general is being exorbitantly stupid. It's just because on a reactive point in the bank, you get this Simple Simon, totally identified, idiotic nonsense. And the pc is as unconscious of it as he will be when he says . . . Running engrams in the old days, sometimes the pc would give you one word every ten minutes, you know, talking very low and very slow. And the pc's totally convinced he's chattering like a magpie, you know, giving you one word every ten minutes. No way to boot him out of it. He eventually runs through it. Well, he says, "That auditing session certainly went fast." You've just sat there, you know. Nothing but weights on the clock hands, you know. Certainly went fast.

Well, a reality factor enters the case as the case is being audited, so therefore, reality has to be kept pace with, with an auditing command if you are really doing a slippy job.

Every once in a while you'll get a pc who is a bit hung up. Other processes will solve it. It'll work out in the long run on the crude basis, so therefore, we don't bring this up. We're just talking now about the very fine points of auditing It'll sometimes, though, show up sufficiently seriously to cause the pc physical discomfort or something, you know. Can't answer about Mother shooting herself, you see. Just can't do that because... This quite escapes you how this generality of pronoun couldn't be adapted, but it doesn't escape the pc. It's impossible.

All right. The handling of a pc, the use of the methodology, the slippiness with which you can do a Security Check, all these things add up to advancing cases. And when these things are omitted, the cases don't advance. I don't care how clever the solutions are which are arrived at by a D of P or an auditor or anything else. If those solutions are terribly clever in the absence of methodology, nothing will happen to the case . . that I guarantee.

Once in a blue moon, a fellow like this will have a win. one of the ways to have a win is to stick the pc in a manic. Pc gets in a wild manic. "I feel wonderful. I feel wonderful," you know. And it wears off in twenty-four hours and he goes into the depressive state. All you've done is shove him over the hump of a little bit of an engram. And it looks like you had a win, you know, to some auditor not using methodology.

This used to happen to me all the time. I never got so disgusted with anything in my life. I finally got very used to this phenomenon of the pc telling me, "Rave, rave, rave. I just feel wonderful. I love the whole world and everything is fine and everything is wonderful," and so forth. And I would just say to myself,

"Well, we'll find out in seventy-two hours." We would, too. "Oh, God! Why did I ever get audited " you know is your next immediate sequitur response. You just put him on a little toboggan.

Processes which we're using these days don't turn on these manics the way running engrams and that sort of thing used to. Those used to turn on quite regularly.

But anyway, in trying to convince somebody that it's worthwhile knowing his tools, you run into quite a barrier sometimes because the fellow's never sitting there looking at himself audit. And if you run into this too badly, remember the Auditor's Code and the Instructor's Code are two different codes. They're actually mirror faces. They're quite reversed. Never fail to invalidate the wrongnesses of a student, you know, that sort of thing.

Make the student in question or the auditor in question . . and borrow a tape recorder and a blank piece of tape . . and make him sit there and do all the TRs 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and then do Model Session from scratch to the end. Just do that, you know, under a coaching basis, but don't give him any flunks. Put it all on the table. It makes a very rapid, short, little piece of tape, you see. It's one TR at a crack. You know, three "Do fish swims" and that sort of thing and go right on through to the end. And then turn the tape on and say, 'Now, what in all that would you flunk?"

Well, you do something like this only, of course, at a time when somebody believes he's doing it all letter-perfect and doesn't believe he has to do any of the TRs and believes he's got it all taped. You've got to show him that he has something to learn in it, and that the cruder course is usually the kinder one. Don't go thing about it and say, "Well, with a little more practice, you'll come along all right." No, I'd just say bluntly, "You stink. Get on the ball, and if you don't believe it, why, we'll let you listen to yourself on a piece of tape." And wow! You know?

It's something on the order of the fellow knows that he sounds exactly Like Caruso in the bath. Something on that direct order. And if you were ever to give him a tape recording of all those flat notes . . . Well, you have to bring it home to them.

Methodology is quite important. It's the most important factor we've had, and the only reason I'm stressing it is because there has been our greatest failures. The greatest failures we have had in dissemination of Scientology is failed methodology. The methodology wasn't there, it wasn't exact, and it wasn't . . certainly wasn't being followed. And as a result, processing, and so on.

Now, it's not an accident now, that we're making Clears. It's not an accident we're making Clears because we're pushing methodology, pushing it very hard. you won't make Clears in it's absence, let me tell you.

So them's the . . them's the words of advice I give to these dear departed. You will be remembered, however, particularly on the despatch lines.

Well, now, very probably you would like to ask a parting question or two, 30 if you do wish to, spit now or forever hold your speech. Any questions?

All right, then. We can assume now, that you know your business, you know your business thoroughly and backwards, and any complaints I get, I will not-is because I know they are not true.

Male voice: I2ll take a rain check on it.

Female voice: That will save you a lot of work on your own despatches.

Well, I would like to say just a few words to you about this new development because . . I gave you a lecture on it last night, but you talk about new ideas . . don't downgrade new ideas. They're very important. It's just I'm telling you they don't get anyplace unless they're applied.

Now there is the biggest barrier in organizations, and easily the biggest barrier in disseminations is the not-doingness of people. And next in rank is the misdoingness of people. But the not-doingness of people

ranks above the misdoingness. It isn't so much by their misdeeds ye shall know them, it's by their not-deeds.

And therefore, I'm very, very happy to be able to jump this barrier. I can answer now, bluntly, an old philosophic question of the value and quality of not-doingness. Now, this is a very fundamental, philosophic question that has been with man for Lord knows how long . . "to do or not to do." It isn't the Shakespearian "be or not to be" that worries man. It's the "to do or not to do." And it isn't really on a specific instance of "to do or not to do." It's the generality of "to do and not to do" that worries him. Is it better to lead an active life or to lead a quiet one?

Well, for instance, romping around France over here in the last few centuries, I used to alternate rather consistently between two types of existence, one and the other. One was a political soldier's existence, rough, tough, fast and hard, you see, alternated with almost mathematical precision with a philosophic existence . . almost a sandwich, one life right after the other life. And in the same pages practically . . the Encyclopaedia Britannica talks about this quiet fellow who was well liked, never got around very much, wrote a couple of books and so forth. And you flip a couple of pages, and you find out about this rough, tough character who chewed everything up in sight, see? Same guy.

Well, this was basically an unresolved, philosophic question. Just look at Matisse. Is it better to do or not to do? If you do, of course, you get into trouble. You commit overts, obviously. Spattered brains all over the place. Empires falling and thrones reeling, you know. And if on the other side of the picture you don't do a thing, you get into trouble. And this is what makes it a philosophic question because each is surrounded by a considerable confusion. Those are two islands surrounded totally by confusions. And it amounts to just this.

I had this demonstrated very clearly. I used to be very, very nasty to . . (I put this in the first person so you won't feel pushed around on it.) I was a young writer up around New York City. I was just about the meanest young writer that ever lived. If an editor rejected a story, he was in for it, man. I'd meet him at a party . . I'd meet him at a party, and as one of my friends said, "My God! The horrible things you do to people!"

"Why, I never treat people badly."

And he says, "Ron, I have seen you take the skin off of a person square inch by square inch, and make him like it."

And before the war, it actually was almost traditional in New York City that you'd better not reject one of Ron's stories. And no other writer ever dared criticize my stories or tell editors they were no good. They never dared chop up anything, this was for sure. They were scared. Just plain scared. I don't say that I was putting up a vicious mock-up, particularly, but I could get very nicely sarcastic, particularly at parties when there were lots of people around, you know. I never had any trouble at all.

And after the war, I was very nice to everybody. I was very pleasant. And writers started criticizing me like mad. And editors every once in a while would write me nasty letters. My rates were superior. They were up. My numbers of readers were up. All these things were up. Well, what had happened here?

You solve it. It was an unresolvable problem. To do, in other words; to just go out overtly and claw everybody's eyes out in order to protect and effect a sphere of interest, you see, and a sphere of economic interest; or to be nice, pleasant, well liked and get along well in a sphere of interest and economic interest. Look it over. Both answers were wrong.

Obviously, it did me no good at all to go around with that many overts. It's a wonder I didn't become an editor. Editors, you know, are best defined . . are always defined by writers as failed writers. What is an editor? He is a failed writer. I never became one, but there it was.

And on the other side of the picture . . let's look at the other side of the coin . . to get along well with your fellows, that didn't work. That was an unworkable doingness, and so forth, because obviously the

clique that wanted my markets, naturally, would chop me to ribbons because they knew there was no danger involved.

So what did you do? Were you nasty in the field of the arts or were you pleasant in the field of the arts? And there were all sorts of contradictory lessons in this zone . . very contradictory lessons.

Such as in Hollywood one time, a fellow criticized some scenes I wrote. And they could make life hell for you, you know. I blew up in his face. He was a producer. He says to me, he said, "Ron," he says, "I . . I think you must have had a ghostwriter write these scenes because I don't think you can write that badly."

Well, that is the signal that you are now going to have an office in the basement, don't you see. And that is about the end of that, so . . the way Hollywood goes. So I just said Raow! You know, walked back into my office, got a blank copy of a contract, brought it back in the producer's office, tore it in about forty different pieces, all small pieces, threw it up in the air, and it came down like a snowstorm, and I said, "You can go ahead and sue to get me to finish my contract, but it won't do you a bit of good. I'm through."

I went back in my office, moved my receptionist and secretary aside and I started clearing things out of my desk, you know, left and right. I wasn't even mad. This was all just a total phony. I wasn't even upset. I knew what I was doing. His favorite yes man didn't take five minutes to be standing outside of my door. And I can remember those words. He looked at me pathetically, and he says, "Lou likes you, Ron."

Well, of course, they just wouldn't have it in any other way that I had to have a better office, and I had to have this and that, and they pushed me on upstairs as fast as possible. And they were very careful not to invalidate any of my scenes. And in view of the fact there wasn't tension in the air, the scenes were pretty good. And everything was running along beautifully. So that was a reward for a total phony doingness. Totally rewarded.

Well, time marches on. one time in the navy I quit one hundred percent. [started telling people, "It's been a long war." That was my pat phrase. And [would tell admirals or anybody else. "It's been a long war." And their immediate, direct response was, "Ah, well, you mustn't quit like that, you know." they had been, the moment before, just raving, you know. And "You mustn't quit" and so on. And of course, I had them backed up against a wall. They'd look at me and here I had campaign ribbons all over me, and they just, you know, said, "Well, what do I do about this," and it put them in a total know. [t was a not-doingness.

And nobody could get me to do a thing. They'd post orders for me on bulletin boards and things like that, and I'd never report and read them. And they'd tell me to go here and do that and do something else. I'd just never bother to do it. They'd come around and beg me to after a while, and so on.

And I'd in an offhanded sort of a way go up and slouch through it one way or the other. Do it all right, but . . now that was . . they just couldn't do enough for me. So that was a total reward for not-doingness, huh? Doingness gets a total reward. Not-doingness gets a total reward.

Back on the other side of the coin . . being rambunctious, being mean and Cruel . . well, that kept everything going all right. The being nice and so forth and pleasant and quiet, that didn't work at all. But it didn't work at all being mean and cruel because look at the overts you stacked up. you began to hate the whole world, you know. No answers there, see.

I'm just going over this stuff because you yourself can think of times when you have faced this particular problem. I'm sure you can think of times. 'Should I do this thing or be this way? Or should I be quiet and nice and orderly, you see, or should I be a chromium-plated bitch?" You know. This is the question. Not the Shakespearian soliloquy, but to do or not to do, that is the question.

Well, the reason you have no answer to it is the basic datum is missing they're both overts. Only the longest, continuous overt is not-doingness. And very far from escaping . . well, my dear, dear friend,

Paul van Niekerk down in South Africa, wrote me all about the Seychelles Islands. He is proposing notdoingness like mad. He says these islands are paradise. The greatest danger is the lush fruit falling off the trees and hitting you. And he said all you have to do is walk uphill until you find a climate that you like and then just sit Sown and relax. What's he proposing? He's proposing a total not-do, isn't he? Well, that's great. Nothing wrong with it. We can yearn in that particular direction, and that's fine.

Let's look it over here, in my particular boots. Supposing I did go to the Seychelles Island and walked uphill and found a climate and sat down. Just supposing I did, right at this particular instant. Well, just look at it in terms of overt. Look at it in the term of overt, not term of responsibility or other thing yip-yap, or rights to do this or that because man's got himself all taped through this, so that he guides himself with false beacons the whole way, see. Just look at it for what it is. It's one God-awful overt.

For instance, I'm pulling an overt right this minute on East Grinstead. they gave us a bunch of yak-yak about death lessons and the newspapers up here were not particularly friendly or kindly. They're going to have a lousy parade tomorrow. They're going to have a lousy parade. They have a bank holiday parade. It's quite a feat. They were down here on their hands and knees trying to get us to cooperate. They wanted me to be Parade Marshal and they wanted Mary Sue to be hostess to their guests and lords and ladies and everything, and I just said "Not" And because Waddingham can make a couple of quick quid out of driving the car for them, why, I said, yes, well he could borrow the car . . as long as they paid Waddingham very well.

That's an overt because I'll tell you, if I hadn't been on deck last year, they wouldn't have had any damn parade. It wound around all the wrong streets and the wrong corners and tried to get itself wrapped around every available telegraph pole. And even then wound itself up on the side streets five blocks away from where it should have been, and probably would have been there till midnight. I kept it from being a total debacle, but it's an overt because, of course, Saint Hill is actually quite a peg in this community.

But I'm not kidding myself I don't feel bad about this one way or the other. But basically through the root of this, we're just to some slight degree getting even. Give it another month or so, why, I'll start telling them, "Well, if you people had been a little nicer about your death lessons and so forth, we wouldn't now be trading at Crawley."

And they'll say, "What death lessons?"

"Don't you remember how mean you were to Saint Hill?"

"Well, grudge, grudge, grudge." And we'll bring it all around the circle again.

But of course, all this is totally knowing on my part. There's nothing reactive about it; it's a plot. I won't take the blame for the rain.

Now, there's your "do" and your "not-do" . . your "do" and your "not-do." And the greatest overt that produces the greatest amount of confusion is, of course, omission.

Have you ever noticed the randomity that can be produced by a missing datum in any given problem? You notice that? Right now, I have some randomity with regard to this ship, you see. I don't have all the data and books on the performance of this particular type of hull. And lacking them is making a considerable confusion. And they apparently exist, but nobody is willing to answer up to them, and I have to wander through a lot of things, but it's causing a lot of confusion.

A false datum can cause some confusion, but nothing compared to a missing datum. Look at man with missing technology about the field of the mind. If you want to know what missing data can do, he's been staggering around for the last fifty thousand years, running into blank walls. He's involved himself in autos-de-fe and every other kind of weird, oddball activity. And civilization after civilization has perished one right after the other. And civilization today is almost synonymous with weakness. Various other factors exist, all because he didn't know any . . didn't have any instruction books of any kind. He didn't know how the mechanism worked. He didn't know what made it go together or anything else. Well, that randomity is just produced by a missing datum.

Well, how about a missing beingness? Now the ultimate, of course . . the near ultimate in not-doingness is a missing beingness. You can be there, you see, and just not do anything, but at least you're there.

How about not being there? You realize that'll produce more confusion? All right. Now, there's one more. . . That's why this is only a near ultimate. There's a "not being there." The near ultimate is that one, but the ultimate, of course, is "forgetting."

You not only are not there . . doing nothing, but you're not there, you see, is the next step down. Doing nothing; next step down, not there to do anything; and the next step down from that is to forget all about it. And these, one, two, three, produce in that order increasing magnitude of confusion. And this is the production of confusion.

Do you realize there is probably some place in this universe, a power station, right this minute where you are supposed to throw switches in and out. And you're not there, and you've even forgotten that it exists. Isn't that interesting, huh? I imagine there's some activity someplace . . some activity someplace . . that is just . . well, did you ever look out across a bunch of mounds which were once stone walls? You know, just utter ruin.

Rome is a wonderful place to look around. But there are other countries have them, too. Did you ever look out across that? And did you ever have a feeling, a rather pleasant feeling about it? Old ruins. Did you ever have a rather pleasant feeling about it? Did you ever kind of like old ruins? You know? Think, isn't that nice. Look at that cloister, you know.

I ran into one in Spain one day. I came running down a hill on a motorcycle, and here was the most enormous arch in front of me. And boy, was it . . had it been a grand arch, and, man, was it a ruin. And oddly enough, it didn't even have an identity anymore. Nobody could even tell you what it was. [remembered it very well. It probably has a great deal to do with my having difficulty sometimes speaking Spanish. But there is that action.

Axiom 10, insistence upon. A thetan never, never, never, never, never . . this is the rule . . ceases to try to have an effect on anything. He never ceases to try. No matter how he looks, no matter what he is doing, he never ceases to try to get Axiom 10 in effect. He just never ceases to try. No matter how many trillennia have gone by, he has not stopped trying. And you are trying to process people who are in the middle of about a hundred thousand continuous averts which they are doing right this minute.

How are they doing them? Well, they may be in life here, but they're not doing anything in some direction. That would be the least of them. you see, doing something is apparently the least overt. It's quite interesting, isn't it.

And look at the success which you have in handling this in processing Overt. You know, running overts. But how about withhold. Withhold evidently produces a considerable difference. Ah, withhold apparently is a little more so, isn't it. A withhold seems to be the more therapeutic side of the O/W situation. Produces the greater gains on the pc when you get the withholds off. Well, what is that? You can marry that up to this other thing of not being there.

It's his not-doingness in some version or form or another that is weighing heaviest on his case. His not-doingness is weighing heaviest on his case. And there is no picture of "Should I do or should I not do?" These are not data of comparable magnitude. "Do" and "not-do" are not data of comparable magnitude. "Not-do" is enormously greater, and the fellow sitting down on the Seychelles Island having abandoned all the world, you would say, well, he can't possibly . . we've all agreed that he couldn't possibly be committing any overt of any kind whatsoever. Then why does he go to pieces? That's the question.

How has this businessman who has been in there gouging his competitors, ruining his employees, just raising hell in all directions, pulling national security to pieces just . . you know, anything he could do . . ."Well, let's make a deal with the Russians, you know. They've got some material and so forth, and we can black market it through Switzerland," you know. He seemed to be fairly . . fairly bad shape, but he was still functioning. And then one day he listens to a medico, and the medico says, "You ought to

retire." Ha, ha, ha. And we see this bird in a few years, or a year, and sometimes in a month or two, and the guy is just a collapsed mound of flesh. He's a gone dog. He's carrion bait. That's all.

Well, how does this retirement produce such a fantastic effect? Why do men die on an average earlier than women in the workaday world? Well, women are still doing more or less what they did before. They didn't retire. But the man did. And he introduces a "not-do." And even though he is advised to do this and he thinks it's the thing to do, and everybody's agreed the thing to do, basically underlying all that, this unknown factor existed: It was one God-awful overt.

Now we gloss over the overt very nicely. In Amarillo, Texas one time, I saw a sign on the wall, and it says, "If you think you're so valuable and needed, go down to the graveyard and look. Those fellows thought so too." A nice western type of. . . Unfortunately, it happens to be totally incorrect. It's not right. It's not right.

A thetan, down underneath it all and over all of the motivators and excuses and so forth, knows he was important to that zone and action and knows he is important to life. And knows he has a function in life. And when he doesn't perform it, he knows he is performing the greatest overt he can perform. There's only one greater overt . . is to forget it. And that is the final effort to have an effect.

You can have a effect on an area by not doing anything in the area if you can have no effect from doing something.

All right. Now, let's take the gradient scale of effect then. All right. It runs like this. you do something and have an effect on things. Axiom 10.

Now let's float on down and see the undergrades of this. you can have an effect on things by not doing. That's still an effect on things.

All right. Now we could have a downgraded, lower effect, a lower order of effect . . but still an effect and actually a worse overt in not being there. We not only not do, but we are not there either.

Now, below that gets the lower grade, which is to forget it. And that still has an effect on things. Believe it or not, it still has an effect on things. A very rambunctious effect, too. you can see that in everyday life. you forget to bring home the milk and you produce some randomity, you see. All you've got to do is to forget to do something and you can produce a considerable amount of randomity.

Well, how about forgetting a whole lifetime? Not just a quart of milk. But don't you think that might produce a greater randomity? Well, it does, oddly enough. And it's an overt, and the fellow realizes it's an overt. He recognizes totally the overt character of forgetting And there is whole track occlusion, and I've been on the track of it here for a long, long while to nail it right on the button to where you could actually resolve this thing called occlusion because it's been a considerable target over a considerable period of time.

And that is occlusion. It is the overt of forgetting. And the law behind it is: that a thetan never ceases to try to have an effect on targets he has selected. He never ceases to try. And the only thing which could ever pry him loose from those fixated effects and so forth would be something like Scientology. He is imprisoned to the degree that he is still trying to have a hopeless effect on something. And there is his imprisonment. And that is his most basic imprisonment. He's his own jailer. He's trying still to have an effect.

I dare say there's . . there are armies whose bones have been wheat germ for a long time, battlefields totally forgotten, on which you are still trying to have an effect. And your last order of effect, of course, is to forget it because of course, that doesn't ever permit it to as-is, does it? Ah, that's the overt. It can never as-is if you forget it.

When a fellow goes totally bad and gets even meaner than I was when I was a young writer, he forgets. "That'll show them. That'll get even with them. When you get it on down, all the way down to the bottom, of course, it's just that: occlusion. You make an occlusion on it, and of course it will never as-is,

and that makes the finest variety of overt ever heard of, and you're trying to process people who have thousands and thousands of these things.

Now, if O/W can stall a case, and if it's a mere matter of withholds . . if the mere matter of withhold can stall a case . . . You see what I'm looking for here is speed-up of auditing, not anything else. But if the mere matter of having withholds can stall a case, how fast or how much do you think a case could be stalled by not being there. That's a withhold of self, isn't it.

All right. Now there's a deeper grade. How much do you think the case can be stalled by the withhold from self and there, and from doingness and from the subject, and from any knowledge of the subject, and from any acquaintance, and from any communication with any beingness of the subject? You get the idea? Kowww! And that's why the more occluded a case is, the harder the case is to audit. And there's the mechanics of it.

So you get somebody and you run them on "What wouldn't you mind forgetting?" they're apt to make some very interesting case gains. Because you're really running withholds. But you're running withholds of a specific variety.

But the auditing command which would add up to something like this would be more likely in this zone and area. It would be . . this is some generality of pattern of command . . it would be "What confusion would forgettingness create?" That's just . . not necessarily a deliverable command; it's just the model command out of which you could get many commands. "What confusion could be created by forgettingness? What confusion have you created by forgettingness?" would be your rock-bottom, all-the-way-downhill form.

Those are not the auditing commands. Those are just the theory statements. You ask yourself that question, you're liable to get some astonishing answer. I suddenly realized that I'm still getting even with the Middle East of about the five hundred years on each side of the year zero. I'm still getting even with it. I'll show them.

Forget all about it. And what would be the consequences of forgetting all about it? Hm! Nobody would know the succession of kings if I forgot all about it. Nobody would know the various dynasties. Nobody would know the national boundaries. Nobody would know the customs. Ha-ha-ha-ha. Nobody would know anything about the weapons. All those fellows and all those glorious deeds which were supposed to have seen posterity would all disappear. See? I must have done a good job on it because of all unknown archaeological areas in the world, the Middle East is certainly one of them. That's the overt.

But we've looked on forgettingness as a sort of a passive thing. And we've looked on . . you know, "The fellow's just unfortunate. He forgets, you know." And we've looked on . . we've looked on not-doingness as the natural state of beingness and all of a sudden find these are the most horrendous overts that a person could possibly run, of course, opens up a brand-new, wide horizon for faster processing.

Okay. I wish you all a very good weekend and I wish the three who are becoming dear departeds all the luck in the world and all the success in the world. And I'll be hearing from you.

Let's have a contest. You make more Clears than we do and we'll make more Clears than you do. Okay? All right.

Good night now.

Female voice: Thank you.