

BASICS OF AUDITING: MATTER-OF-FACTNESS

A lecture given on
11 August 1961

Thank you. Thank you. Of course, that was Mary Sue's applause. Ah-ha. Whose applause was it?

Audience: Mary Sue's. Yours . . .

All right. That's it. All right. 11 Aug. 11.

The subject of today's lecture . . well, one could say this in a sad voice, he could say this in a happy voice, almost any kind of a voice . . is auditing.

I think a lot of auditors are doing something besides audit. I think they're trying to press through in addition to auditing. I think they are trying to introduce some additional factor that will make auditing work. I think they are . . aren't pressing hard. They're putting something else in sessions.

The exact tools with which you're working, if you will just sit back half asleep and administer them, will clear people. You actually don't even have to be very alert.

Now, I myself am responsible to some degree by saying the auditor is making the auditing work and that sort of thing. But probably this advice has occasionally gotten a different reception than was intended. Yes, the auditor ought to be on the ball, he ought to be alert, he ought to be there, but the auditor shouldn't have to be doing something else beside auditing. A certain impatience for result or a certain apathy about result causing a sort of a grind atmosphere, you know. These two things alike would speed up or slow down, apparently, auditing. That is to say if you were pressing in there all the time, you see, and you say, "Well, that process isn't working. I think I'll change it." you know, "It isn't . . hasn't . . I've . . I've run it for ten minutes," you know, "and it hasn't worked, so I'll change it," merely is expressing your desire to help, you see. It's an anxiety, you know. It's an anxiety. Or, contrariwise, "Well, this probably won't work, but I'm supposed to run it," you know, that sort of thing. "And so I'll just sit here and grind away on it," you know. "Well, what girl haven't you ever known? Yeah."

Well, the pressure or the withdrawal of the auditor from the session, the impatience of the auditor, the feeling that the auditor has that it ought to all be different or ought to all be faster, alike get in the road of a smooth rendition of Model Session and a smooth application of processes.

I've been a long time at this business. I gave a session last night (oh, to Wary Sue, she had a bit of a headache) and it was, by standards, of course, would have been . . seemed to you . . a rather sloppy session. But I'm sure you would have thought of this, "sloppy session." It started without rudiments and it ended without rudiments, but it was an assist. And it started with "Is it all right if I give you an assist?"

"Yes," she says.

So I explore around and find out what I'm trying to assist. And then I move around and try to find out why she feels bad and then I take the basic technology of Scientology and put a process together that answers this. And then this ran scam-bang into an engram. And I knew confounded well that the process I was running might run into an engram, but it darned well wouldn't move through an engram, don't you see. So I thought we'd better clean up this engram with practically the same auditing command, but let's put "not know" in it, you know. Let's find out what she's not-knowing in this engram and get the thing blown out of the way so we can smooth out the track and get her into PT. Otherwise, I had a vision of her being parked down the track some place at the end of session, don't you see. Blew her through that, returned to the original process, smoothed . . see, flattened the interim process, returned to the original process, moved her up to present time. Headache was gone; everything was fine. Checked through some . . just the important things: "Do you have an ARC break? Was there anything I did wrong in the session?" You know, that sort of thing. "Are you upset about anything? That's it. End of session." See,

“Is it all right with you if I end the session? Now, is there anything you care to say?” You know. Boom! “End of session”.

Oh, I don’t know, it took twenty minutes, something on this order. In that twenty minutes, took a chronic headache (which had apparently been cutting in and out for a long time) and a heavy engram (which had apparently been there for quite a while) and got rid of both of them. At the same time got rid of a present time difficulty. Twenty minutes, auditing.

All right. But there was no . . . no doubt in my mind about what I was doing or what my intentions were or what I was doing. Which is to say, I was there to give the pc an assist, wrap it up as fast as possible, effectively; not with superpressure or doubt or withdrawal. I was just there to help the pc, so I went right ahead factually and helped the pc and that was it.

And as I was doing this, I had a bit of a cognition about some other auditors’ auditing. I . . . I suddenly sort of exteriorized from what I was doing and took a look at it and made a comparison and was suddenly struck by the fact that my auditing was very matter of fact, basically because there is no doubt in my mind but what I could help the pc. There’s no doubt in my mind about the effectiveness of the process I’m going to run and there’s no doubt in mind about the fact that the process is working and there it is. The thing that summed it up is matter-of-factness. You know, there’s just an inevitability, matter-of-fact relaxedness about the thing that I haven’t seen in other people’s auditing and I just thought I’d better make up my mind on it, because we’ve still got this . . . well, it’s a factor that measures five to one. I get auditing results with considerable speed and I suddenly realized I don’t get in the road of my own results. You see, you get what I mean?

Well, it’s just a matter-of-fact application. I . . . I know that this person has a . . . has a headache and a difficulty, is having a present time problem and it all lumps together in some peculiar fashion, so I just go to find out what this is; and then I know the mechanics of the mind and what the mechanics of the mind add up to in terms of a psychosomatic illness. So we just start getting rid of this whole thing and sure enough, run right into the engram. So we . . . hit a secondary, so we’re going to run into the engram and that blew a little grief charge. Secondary. Must be an engram there. Got the idea? Old Book One. So boom! Well, let’s plow out the engram. Well, what was the biggest difficulty we’ve had with engrams . . . well, people not-know . . . don’t want engrams known. There’s something they’re trying to hide about the thing or something, or it wouldn’t be that . . . held in that close. Well, run the thing out, get rid of that thing, bring her back up. Let’s make sure the original process is flat. That’s it, man. Just checking with the pc all the time. How is it? You know? And where are we going and so forth. But it was all very matter-of-fact. I think you’ll agree with that, that was . . .

Female voice: Good session, got rid of my headache.

Well, it was a good . . . good session, see, that was just nothing to it.

But I thought I’d better remark on this. Not holding myself up as a vast paragon of virtue, but I do get auditing results and I don’t have any difficulty with auditing.

You could say well, it’s my subject. No, not necessarily my subject. I’ve known witch doctors and . . . and I’ve known birds that were pretty clever in my day. Pretty clever at getting some kind of result, very clever at handling people and so forth. My hat’s off to them. I know . . . I know only one at this particular business, but I just suddenly realized, well, there’s . . . there’s no doubt about what I’m doing in me, you see. It’s all matter-of-fact because it’s just matter-of-fact. This is . . . this is sort of inevitable, and it’s all going to come out all right. I . . . just auditing by the rules of the game. I wasn’t departing in any particular direction on the thing.

And also some more data turned up that the reason an auditor wasn’t flattening processes was because the auditor was anxious to get the job done. So he didn’t flatten a process because it wasn’t getting the job done, don’t you see. But then the process never had a chance to get the job done. you got the idea? Terrific impatience has entered into the thing. Therefore, sort of an anxiety is communicated. Therefore, the pc gets pulled out of session all the time, so therefore there’s ARC breaks, so there’s all kinds of upsets, you know.

And I've often wondered how I could get away with the things I get away with in auditing, because I have to caution you all the time not to do some of the things I do in auditing I don't evaluate for a pc. But I sure tell him what I think, you know. If they're struggling around and floundering around and . . . and they're avoiding auditing commands or something like this, why I'll just level with them, you know; I say something like, "Come on, come on, come on, come on, come on, come on, come on, you want to get rid of this or don't you?" You know.

And the pc says, "Oh, yes, I want to get rid of it."

"Well, let's get down to business. Come on now."

It's sort of an odd approach, but it's . . . it is quite real in that I don't artificialize the way I feel about the pc particularly. When I . . . when I'm giving a session that I consider a successful session or it's a very happy circumstance of one kind or another, I'm perfectly happy to give a session and so forth. As long as I keep it real. As long as I'm not on a big artificiality, and auditing sounds kind of artificial to me here and there when I hear it, you know. It sounds like the auditor's being very artificial about it. He's not really being very matter-of-fact about what he's doing. He . . . he's sort of being stilted madly, so his intention, of course, is not too well defined. But even so, if he just sat there and did Model Session right according to the rote without pressing it, you know, without being impatient about it and without pulling off and just being exhausted about it . . . it he just was sort of matter-of-fact and did Model Session and did the process he was supposed to do and the assessments he was supposed to do, I'll tell you, the pcs would come out the other end feeling wonderful.

And I've looked in vain for any other bug factor in auditing now and I don't find any bug factors in auditing. I just don't find any additional bugs that we might have overlooked and so forth. I've been looking for this for a long time. I've been looking for maybe, oh, I don't know, two or three years and I haven't found anything we've missed.

Since I put the Model Session together . . . I put the Model Session together last year, actually, and put it together because I was perfectly convinced that it was time for an auditor to memorize a session form, because we had a session form, you see. It had been on there and it had been working for a long time. Well, let's standardize it and there'd be a lot of use in standardizing it.

Basically, in my matter-of-fact session, I did not particularly depart from a Model Session form. I was running an assist, not a Model Session, but I was running the assist in Model Session form. There was nothing strange there. You would have found all the words . . . all the words and music would have been very familiar to you, but I think you would have found the atmosphere different. That's what I think you would have found. The matter-of-factness of which this thing was rolling off was . . . I had to stand back and look at it myself. I said, "There . . . there is a difference."

I actually was taught this many years ago by Ken and Steve and I found these guys were listening to me audit to find out what I was doing that other people weren't doing and they kept isolating factors and kept speeding up auditing; and the first of these was acknowledgment. It had never been announced, you see. It had never been announced that you ever acknowledged anybody and they discovered this as a fantastic discovery, that when a pc said something, I answered them and that was a big, new thing. That was a fabulous discovery to them.

So the only reason I bring this up and make this level of comparison is because they . . . they were making such fabulous discoveries, and I suddenly awoke to the fact there was a lot about auditing that hadn't been communicated and it's all been communicated so far as I'm concerned now.

Now, an auditor who will sit there and turn in a good Model Session and run something that's real on a process, handle the exact pc that is in front of him, handle the exact rundown, makes sure he flattens what he's running and so forth, within the realms of reality . . . oh, man, he can't miss. I don't think he could miss. I think he'd just have to work day and night, belong to the union, in order to miss. I can't understand how he'd miss. It's something to think about.

But there is a difference which I have detected which might be of interest to you and you might care to take that as a frame of mind.

Sit down, draw a long breath, relax, make up your mind you're trying to help the pc and then just go ahead and do so. Just go ahead and do so with no further nonsense about it, you see. Just run off your Model Session patter, but that's all just to assist you to help the pc, you see. And just go ahead and matter-of-factly help the pc and take care of what the pc's doing.

The pc's writhing around. You say, "What's got into you, Mac?"

And the pc says . . . you say this because you want to know, you see, not because it's all written down someplace. And, "Oh, well, I've got this horrible pain in my umbekillus."

And, "When did that turn on?"

"Well . . ."

"Did it turn on in the process we were running before this one? Oh, it did. Well, why didn't you tell me? All right. Here we go. I'm going to give you one more . . . two more commands of the process that we are now running and then we're going right back to the earlier one. Next time, sing out, man." you know? Find out I've missed. He doesn't take it as an ARC break, he interprets this as being thorough. In other words, go back to an earlier process and flatten it if I find it wasn't flat. Or find out what was wrong with it, you know. Do something. You know, just be effective at all times compared to what the case is. Don't be so hidebound that you won't do something.

You know, it's something on the order of walking a tightrope anyhow. The guy who walks tightropes best, of course, walks them and yawns at the middle of the tightrope and he's very familiar with tightropes and stands on his hands for a few minutes and finishes off and goes to the other end of the tightrope and he doesn't think anything about it.

Somebody else comes up and takes a look at the tightrope, and he says, "Uuuuuuuuuuhhh!" He'd fall 117 feet, point 5. He's worried about falling off the tightrope all the time. He's not worried about walking the tightrope. You got the idea?

And this is expressed I think, with this term matter-of-factness. It's just a matter-of-fact proposition. If you can turn in a sort of a matter-of-fact . . . nothing heroic about this sort of a . . . of an auditing session, I think your pc would do an upsurge.

It isn't that you're doing badly or the cases are holding up or anything like that, but that addition by itself might speed it up for you. I'm only interested and have been interested all summer only in one thing: is just a faster result in the same unit of time with greater ease of auditing. That's all I've been interested in all this summer. I've had it taped since February. I've tried to clarify mistakes and bring people back on them again and I have taken the liberty of trying to set cases up a little bit better for assessment for you and so on; and find out if there's any great advantage to that, and so on. Feeling my way through here about what you can do with it. That's what I've been concentrated on.

Same time, we've made some interesting discoveries and rediscoveries. The practical application of "forget" and "not-know" are utterly fabulous. Turn back the clock to 1950. Any engram, any secondary you ran would have run on just "not-know." Any one of them would have run from beginning to end on "not-know" and "forget" and, man, they would have run like startled deer.

You get this guy into this horrendous, cataclysmic, space opera God-'elp-us, you know and he's writhing around and so on and burning down cities and executing maidens and revolting against the captain; and all kinds of things going on in this particular engram. Well, we used to just agonize through it, and grind, grind, grind . . . grind, grind, grind, grind, grind, grind, grind and then grind, grind, grind. And then all of a sudden his perceptics, you know, would turn off and they would turn on, and we'd sweat to get these things on and we'd run him through it again, and so forth.

Well, I'm telling you it's very weird, but you could set a person down and you could run "not know" on an engram or "forget" on an engram in a command form which includes as many dynamics as necessary to resolve it. A command form must include dynamics. In other words, "not known," you could specialize it in, "Well, what would you rather not-know about this?" you see. Now, there's the first dynamic. What would you rather your fam . . any family would rather not know about this? Or any children would rather not know about this?" you see. Or "What should be not known about this to children?" "What should children not know about this?" "What should be." any kind of a way you want to use this thing, you see. "What should remain unknown about this incident to the public at large?" you see. "What should the government not know about it?" "What should your superiors not have known about your activities on planet Xerxes?" Bzzzzzz! See, it's just all . . occlusion just starts flying off in all directions.

Our enemy in 1950 was occlusion. We can say that the occlusion is selfmotivated in order to withhold; and that the hang-ups in any engram are from a desire to get these things unknown or on the third postulate, forgotten, or make somebody forget or use "forget" as an overt act. It'll be some combination of occlusion and you can play it directly. Play it instantly and directly.

You can ask somebody, "Now, if you forgot about that, who would really be messed up? Now, if you knew nothing about that whatsoever, would this . . would this mean something else would happen someplace else?" You'd always get the answer, "Oh, yes." Forgetting is a sort of an overt act, you see.

And the forget and the withhold come together, and you've got the sum and substance of the reactive bank and the reactive bank is composed of engrams and secondaries, so if you use various versions of what we know now about not-knowing and what we know about forgetting, why of course, these component parts of the reactive bank known as engrams, secondaries, machines, anything else you want to say, will just start flying apart in all directions. Shades of 1950.

Wouldn't have mattered whether the fellow had sonic, visio or anything else. Man, he would have had sonic and visio on. The redcoats' and the rebels' rifles alike would be knocking his eardrums in, don't you see, as he ran through the incident. Up to that time, it's all black and invisible, you know. "Well, I don't see anything here. you say there's some kind of an incident here, but I dza-za . . don't see any incidents . . dzaa-za . . eh incident. Yeah, I just had that one little flick. That one little flick there. You know, that picture of the corner of the Tower. Just, ha-ha, that one picture of the corner of the Tower, and so forth. Yeah, and kind of the idea . . kind of the idea that maybe I was beheaded at the Tower. Yeah, maybe, maybe; could have been, see. But of course now you're trying to force this incident off on me."

All of that's just occlusion . . this unreality, this feeling of pretense, the feeling of. . . The pretension of knowing about it also blows on a not-know. This is, of course, the pretension of knowing about an incident . . dub-in, in other words, simply blows up because that's another method of disguise. Boy, can you run incidents if you try that one. you ought to try that just for the hell of it to give yourself a good win somewhere along the line if you ever ran engrams. Just try it.

Just sit somebody down and say, "All right now. Go to the incident necessary to resolve your case," you know and they wind up plank in a prenatal or conception, sperm sequence or a beheading or planetary space opera or something of this sort. And now just run it on the basis that he is overtly not-knowing and forgetting various parts of it and just use any version of that command, or those commands, necessary to plow through it. And you'll find this thing going boom, boom, thud, thud, boom, boom. All of this, of course, has as a prerequisite that the rudiments are in and that the individual is . . is to some degree in-session, and therefore under the auditor's control so they will do what the auditor says. With those reservations, why, you really find the engrams flying.

Kind of fun running engrams and I don't know how much we've speeded up the run of an engram with this because I haven't made an actual measure, but I would say something on the order of about one-thousandth of the time. I mean it's a jump of that breadth. Take you about one-thousandth of the time to run an engram now.

Running engrams, by the way, should not be discounted in the benefit to the case because you're liable to do this. You're liable to clear somebody and you've got them more or less stabilized. This will be in the stabilization period which usually follows for three or four months. But they'll be Clear all right and the needle will be drifting around. Everything's fine and you'll have worked on them to stabilize them, and then they will defy you by all of a sudden being in an engram. See, here's an engram staring them in the face and so on, giving them symptoms of some kind or another.

Well, because they're Clear and able to take these things in their stride, it's not going to take very long to run this thing anyhow. It's going to take a very brief span of time to run it because they're Clear, don't you see . . . even if you ran through with old Dianetic techniques of 1950 and it'll blow up. But you want to clear up that particular thing. This guy has got . . . still got a piece of bank. All right. Clear up the bank. Bang!

We had a Clear down in South Africa had an appendectomy. They were going to rush her to the hospital. She was Clear. But the doctor said, "Oh, terrible. You have all the symptoms," so forth. She went around and saw the auditor. The auditor had a hell of a time because he couldn't read the E-Meter on it and gradually was able to read the E-Meter on it, cleaned up the incident, zuuup-booop-zzzt,bong,thud,crash. That was the end of the appendectomy.

But . . . so this tool is not . . . not to be despised at this time. It isn't just nostalgic value. You'll have something like this. During a stabilization period, while a person is coming out of it and unsnarling track and that sort of thing after they're as-ising . . . still as-ising things and so on, they'll still run into things, you see. Now, you've got to give them a hand as they come along and then all of a sudden it'll all blow Clear.

If you can run an incident with even greater speed than a Clear can run them, it's practically at a glance. You know, just . . . it's almost at a glance. A Clear running an engram runs them almost at a glance, you see.

"Well, it's so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so; and it's so-and-so and so-and-so-and-so and then I so-and-so; and then they said so-and-so. And oh, there's the overt. Oh, well, that's it." Bang, it's gone.

Well, that's . . . that's fast enough. Now, supposing you said, "Well, what are you trying to not-know about that?" or "What not-knowingness about that would do somebody in?" or any kind of a phraseology you'd care to apply using the not-know as an overt, using it as just a straight occlusion, so forth, why, the missing piece of it that is holding it there would blow . . . just like that. It wouldn't be da-da-da-da-da-da,da-da-da-da-ada-da-da,da-da-da-da. It'd just be da-da . . . da! See, a difference of speed is . . . would even be apparent there. So this is a trick you'd better latch onto. Latch onto.

You're going to use this trick and I hope you are using this trick with some success right now in handling your Goals Assessments and Terminals Assessments, and handling what you run into in terms of getting the pc set up so they will give you some goals. Now, there's probably the most valuable application. Pc goes on to 2,975 goals and so forth and you haven't got a goal out of the pc yet. Well, what is this? What is this? You know something's wrong with the pc's giving of goals. It's . . . something wrong there? Are these the pc's goals or is the pc trying to please you or something of the sort? There is something disconnected here and before it went out that long, you had certainly better introduce into a Goals Assessment another type of questioning

When you start up a Goals Assessment, it just could be that you should set up a pc to having a Goals Assessment and that you keep the pc set up for Goals Assessments with some kind of an additive question of more or less this character: "What sort of a person would get in the road of somebody having goals?" "Has anybody ever got in the road of your goals?" See? And "What are you not-knowing about goals in general?" And "What goals don't you want known?"

Of course, now when we say, "What goals shouldn't be known?" we're over into assessment, because that's a legitimate assessment question. But "Who's gotten in the road of your goals?" "What sort of a person would get in the road of your goals?" "If I were sitting here trying to make nothing out of your

goals, what would my name be?" This kind of an approach, you see. "If I were here trying to pound you and hammer you and order you to get something done in life, who would I be?" It's, in other words, clearing the auditor to get the auditor disassociated from the personnel who has stamped on the person's goals. You get the idea?

So it's another . . . another string to the bow on the clarification of the identity of the auditor. It's a more modern version of "Who would I have to be to audit you?" You know? "Who would I have to be to make . . . to raise hell with your goals?" "Who would I have to be to actually make hash out of you on the subject of goals?" "To what person could you best tell your most secret ambitions?" This type of questioning, you see. "Who would you leave totally in the dark with regard to your . . . with regard to your goals?" "Who would you leave in the dark with regard to your goals?" "Who had you better not tell them to, man?"

And you'll get some kind of an interrogation line like this going and all of a sudden the pc will sort of loosen up and disassociate you from the barricades of progress toward their own ambitions. Got the idea? Because let me tell you, one of the most prevalent neuroses afloat . . .

If goals can stand in the road of Clear . . . obviously they do because if you straighten out a person on goals, they get Clear . . . been demonstrated time and time again. Well, then you'd look around the society and you wouldn't find very many Clears. Then you must assume . . . You see, you look around the society, pre-Scientology society, and you find out there weren't many Clears present . . . none . . . so, that you must then assume that it must be a fairly prevalent neurosis, psychosis or "bato-sis" to knock in the head other people's goals and ambitions. You must assume that there must have been some people around who were anxious to do this, see, by assumption.

And therefore, if you were having trouble with a pc in getting his goals, you then . . . by no great mathematical computation . . . should assume that he has been up against such a person and so therefore, a bit deranged and unwilling to communicate on the subject of goals. Do you follow out the reasoning there? Very elementary reasoning.

So I think that should be taken care of thoroughly at the beginning before you start a Goals Assessment on a pc. Just beat this to death. This one I know you can beat to death because it'll have the pc's interest, see. And just . . . just take a flail to it, and a morning star and a broad sword and a mace and then beat it for a while, you see, with a sjambok, and in other words, just knock this around something fierce and hammer and pound it; and all of a sudden you're liable to get your pc with a big cognition on the idea, just using these basic mechanics I've been talking about.

"Oh, oh, yes, well, as a matter of fact, you do look a little bit like my father. He's an ugly son of a . . ."

And then he'd have a big cognition. Big cognition. "You are not my father," you know. "You know, my father used . . . used to sit there, day in, day out and he'd say, 'When are you going to amount to something?'" And I remember I was working at the bakery and I was making sixty-five quid a month and I was doing all right and I was buying new clothes. And my father would sit there and he'd put the paper down in the evening and he would look at me and he would sigh deeply. And then he'd pick up the paper again. Yeah, I remember in the army, the officers always used to keep telling me that if I just had a little ambition I could make something out of myself and so forth. I remember this. I remember, just like my grandfather used to do," you know.

And then, of course, there's . . . be all mechanisms with regard to goals. There'd be coercing a person to have a goal and trapping him because he did. There would be the mechanism of making sure that any goal a person came up with was promptly stamped on and wiped out of existence. There would be the mechanism of demanding that a person had other goals than the person has. The person comes up and says, "I would certainly like to take a nice photograph of that landscape out there." And then the mechanism "Well, it would look much nicer if it were painted. Instead of photography, actually your interest ought to be in the subject of oil painting. Oil painting, yes. you should go in for oil painting. Not . . . not photography. No, not . . . well, much better, much better, oil painting."

Now, what the person, who was standing there who had been talking about the landscape and photographing it, does not latch onto at that moment, is the other person's simply dramatizing a squash of

goals. It has nothing to do with anything but a squash and if the person examining it had said, "Oh, I would certainly love to make an oil painting of this particular landscape," the other person would, of course, said immediately, "You don't want to take up oil painting. You should take up photography." See? But this is being helpful. This is normally branded as being helpful. Constructive criticism. Man even has various labels for it one way or the other.

But then parentally, children almost never are recognized as individuals by the parents. They are recognized, if at all, as an extension of the ambitions of the parent. And they're just all over the place, parents are busily trying to do a life continuum on their ambitions, you know and they take this poor, little, skinny runt, you know . . . this little runt of a kid . . . and Papa, who was a fairly broad bruiser in his day, you see. He wanted to be a star of the football team or something like this and nothing will do but what this poor little runt, you see, he's gotta get out there on the football field and get half killed, you see, every Saturday. The old man just never seems to notice that there's some stone difference between the two, you see. Never seems to take this out, you know.

The kid has the mathematical genius of being able to add up always two and two and get three, six, nine . . . any number, just think of a number. Oh, yes, he's got to be a mathematician because the old man wanted to be a mathematician, you see. Life continuums of various kinds and it's odd how many people are walking around right now who actually fell for it, went ahead and executed it and are being moderately unsuccessful, successful, and so forth, in some walk of life.

Well, I tell you the armed services in any war can be utterly counted on to just dramatize this just flat out with shown teeth. Fellow walks up, he says, "What have you been doing?"

He says, "I'm a garage mechanic."

He says . . . and the navy will say to him inevitably and invariably, "Deck force." You know? Or, "What you really want to be is a signalman. How about cook's school?"

And he walks up and he says, "Well," he says, "I've been a merchant sailor and a deck sailor for the last fifteen years and here are all of my tickets and that sort of thing."

"Very good. The very, very man we want. You're a yeoman." Instant and immediate response. I mean it's almost berserk. And then they give tests that can be thrown any way you want to throw a test, called aptitude tests.

And I had a lot of fun one time. I took a bunch of these tests. It was very nice of the government to give me these tests. I spent all one day in some little town in Pennsylvania, where my records happened to be at the moment, taking aptitude tests to find out how I should be rehabilitated as a disabled veteran. It was utterly fascinating. They finally woke up at the other end that I ought to be playing an organ. I never found out whether it was the hand-crank variety or the pipe variety. As a matter of fact, it . . . was . . . what was baffling to them is anytime they gave me a test I showed aptitude, you see. So they just took the one I didn't really want, and that was . . . that settled it. But I malign them. Because they were very pleasant after the war and training up veterans and that sort of thing.

But anyway, even these tests are about the cloudiest things for vocation you ever want to have anything to do with. you look them over sometime. You notice we don't use them. We have them. We've got tons of them. I've investigated most of them.

Only one test out of the commercial tests I was terribly interested in. I was fascinated with this particular test because it was an anonymous test that employees could make out with regard to the management and their own bosses and so forth and you gave this test out to a roomful of employees and then they marked down all their nasty, unkind thoughts, you see; about the management, and then they turned it in; and management then knew what their employees thought of them.

I thought it was an awfully interesting test in that it was rather pointless. Management that is unimaginative enough to know what employees are thinking about it anyhow, shouldn't be managing. Obvious what this score is. Well, anyway, that test was very good. As a matter of fact, I figured out a

way for . . for them to booby-trap it and I've been very carefully not telling any psychologist how to booby-trap this test.

Well, you make it out, you see and you have a form number, tiny printed Figures . . form number, you see. you just number the chairs of the room and you have this form number of the test which goes undetected as different, but it's the number of each chair, you see and the fellow turns it in, and then you know who to fire. you fire the fellow who says the kind things, naturally, from the psychologist's point of view. That's why I haven't released it.

They are now running all kinds of lie detector tests on employees. We actually have really started one in the US. We are being copied like mad in the US . . just copied like mad. It's marvelous. Start worrying when nobody copies you. Don't worry about all the things they're grabbing that are ours, see. Start worrying when they don't do it and we're sure leading the van because apparently every detective agency, every employment agency and every psychologist has suddenly set himself up with battery E-Meters. They are lousy E-Meters and they mean nothing. But he's set himself up with them and they're giving lie detector tests to everybody. And it's getting to be quite a . . quite a scandal, so that even in Australia they are publishing articles about how to ruin your home. Just bring in one of these things, you see.

So these are the earmarks of success. There's no greater . . the greatest praise with which the public at large is capable, of course, is damning you thoroughly and if you want even greater praise, have them lie about you. But that's about as high as they come up the line, because they . . they move off of this point, you see . . they move off of this point . . onto copying, imitating, and the duplication gets a little closer and a little closer and a little closer; and all of a sudden, why, there it is. It's nothing of . . nothing to be worried about when you see that sort of thing. Of course, your hair kind of stands on end when you first see this. But anyway, everybody is now doing this and they are only hiring . . as I mentioned, they are only hiring those people, you see, who get no reaction on the machine of any kind whatsoever; and if this trend, of course, is followed, every able person in the country will be out of work. Interesting, isn't it?

Ah, well, they'll discover the error of their ways sooner or later and come around to the old stand and . . .

They covertly get on our bulletin lines, which is quite interesting. We have all sorts of Joe Doakeses and Bill Smykes . . Sykeses and things like that in our mailing lists and so on in order to get bulletins and memberships, and so on. And these turn out to be the most interesting people when you run them down. They turn out to be the head of MIT or something like this, you know and the . . . We've suddenly started selling books in the United States to the most unlikely areas. The Army Infantry School has just now officially put in orders for many Scientology and Dianetic books. One invoice was sent to me . . maybe there was just one at the moment, but there'll be more. Loyola University, by the way, uses Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health as a textbook . . the Catholic University that teaches priests. Interesting, huh? Well, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association spent rivers of money to get Loyola to study psychiatry and psychology. And after they succeeded in doing this and Loyola set up an actual department to do this, then the first book they ordered was Dianetics: Modern Science of Mental Health, which I thought was pretty good. They're doing a land-office business in book sales these days to unlikely areas. There's quite a few of them have come in lately.

Female voice: American Tel. & Tel.

Mmm?

Female voice: American Tel. & Tel. have bought all of our books.

Yeah. Yeah. They got them all.

So don't . . don't worry about it. Dissemination goes out on a covert line when you're being successful broadly. It goes out on a covert, unlabeled, copyist line and then keep moving up and eventually they establish it. Because, of course, they'll . . monkeying with this sort of thing, they'll get into so much trouble that they'll need help sooner or later.

It's like two guys were found someplace or another who were auditing each other and they hadn't a clue. They had just heard it on a rumor line . . . this is back in 1950 . . . and they heard it on a rumor line, so they were auditing each other. And what they were doing . . . and somebody from 42 Aberdeen Road got ahold of them and spent all one night with them straightening them up, teaching them how to audit and went away and left them and never had another report on it.

But they were in plenty of trouble. They'd parked themselves all over the track and just messed themselves up gloriously. But they could be straightened out.

All right. Back on this other thing, the slam-bang attack that one's goals are up against, are not confined, of course, to an antagonistic personality. One himself has overts on the subject of other people's goals and you can straighten that out too, you see. One has run all kinds of ambitions with regard to other people's ambitions. For instance, right now there's a tremendous ambition on the subject of Russia to covertly take over small nations, one after the other, or dominate their political scene, you see. Well, saying Russia shouldn't do this is actually invalidating Russia's goal to do this, don't you see. It's simple.

I've also watched with some amazement the United States getting itself whipped up to go into an atomic war. I think the deterrent factor has now been accepted by the public as the very best way to bruise off a war. The public attitude should now serve as a deterrent. Evidently, they've collectively sort of gotten the idea somehow or another that . . . that if the public is unwilling to go to war, therefore, they are not a deterrent. So all you have to say is you're willing to go to war and this is very deterrent, because Mr. Khrushchev counts totally on the decadent democracy . . . each war it's the decadent democracy, you know . . . the decadent democracy is not willing to engage in war, so therefore, of course, he can do what he pleases and apparently . . . this is all I read out of this. I don't read any war dangers to amount to anything or I'd be helping out the Washington organization to evacuate and so on, which I am not. Nothing's going to happen. It's just a deterrent. You're going to watch Khrushchev back down on this. He's going to back down fast and if that wins, you're going to have a nation of warmongers. They're going to say, 'Look, we won.' Of course, I will admit that it's mostly Texans that they've been interviewing.

Anyway, on the subject of goals, the . . . there's an interplay of goals. And in individual who has countless, just countless overts on other people's goals . . . well, let's say a music critic. Let's take him as a profession. He comes and sits down in the auditing chair as . . . in the pc's chair and . . . and he's in an auditing session and his profession is a music critic and you start to do a Goals Assessment. Well, use your head, auditor. How many ambitions in the Field of music do you suppose this boy has wrecked? Hm? So you could start in as well as finding out who has stopped the pc's goal lines . . . let's not go totally motivator about it . . . let's also find out a few of the goals that the pc has stopped, you know.

"What goals should be unknown?" Some broad question of this character.

"Other people's goals," he will say.

"Yes, yes. Well, which one should just be forgotten completely, you know, and just not known?"

Oh man, on some people, you'd get a roaring automaticity as a result of that question or that type of question. "Whose goals should never be valid?" "Whose goals should never take place or form up or become reality?" "What goals should be unknown, of course, tends to plow it out of the pc. His unknowingness-occlusion button is then set to work and he starts showing stuff to the light of day.

So there's numbers of things you can do. I'm just trying to show you, there's numbers of things you can do by being very matter-of-fact and very flat about the whole thing in looking at this pc. This pc is having trouble giving you goals. All right. Then you had better get down to a basic trouble with regard to goals. You just better ask for it right now.

All right. Now, let's take a Terminals Assessment. You see there's something wrong with a pc's goals. They give them to you slowly, or . . . or very, very slowly or poky or don't seem to have many. They give you unlimited numbers . . . any one of these various things. Or they give you goals that they haven't

themselves anything to do with. you could handle this by handling the factor of who has suppressed goals and whose goals that they have suppressed. You got the idea?

All right. Now, let's take terminals. That's slightly different and we get back to a lecture . . . a lecture back here in Camden of 1954, wasn't it, Suzie? Yeah, it was about 53. It was way late in the autumn of 53: Granting of Beingness. Most of you've heard this lecture. Well, you know how scarce it is, granting of beingness. The willingness to grant a beingness to somebody, that's pretty scarce. Oh, that tenet and that observation and so forth is still valid. Well, apply that tenet to . . . to assessment for terminals.

Let's look it over. If this person's very unwilling to grant beingness, ah-hah, then this person would be rather unwilling to remember beingness, you see. They squashed beingnesses, so that beingnesses must be on a scarcity. There's a misemotion here with regard to the subj . . . whole subject of beingness and therefore you're going to get terminals being out. Terminal lists then are hard to acquire or they're too numerous and so forth. You don't have as much trouble with terminals, however, as you do with goals. But, nevertheless, remember that you could remedy difficulties with getting a . . . getting a terminals list. you could remedy them rather rapidly.

You could ask the individual . . . ask the pc, "What type of beingness should remain unknown forever?" That's a good, broad statement. "What class . . . what general class of beingness should just be forgotten, not known, never heard of again, and so forth. What . . . what would be that?" Well, they start plowing up terminals for you, the like of which you haven't heard before. Don't you see? All of a sudden here're a lot of terminals.

Of course, you don't ask that in conjunction with the assessment itself. You just ask that in general, you know. Just two-way comm sort of a basis, you know. Let's get this out of the road. Let's see if we can start any roaring automaticities going here and of course, if an automaticity starts going, why, we continue to run what started it as a process until we get it slowed down; and all of a sudden, you'll have a pc who's assessing on terminals entirely differently. They'll assess entirely differently. Because "not granting of beingness" is an effort to suppress beingness, isn't it? And if this is fairly prevalent and your pc's having difficulty giving you terminals, then he must be having this trouble with beingness and he must be suppressing beingnesses, so when he tries to think of a terminal, his automatic suppressors on the subject of beingness will squash the terminal out of existence and he won't be able to give you a list. That's as simple as that. So you can take care of that.

Any . . . any type of question that says what beingnesses should be forgotten, unknown, skipped, never looked at . . . particularly what kind of beingness should just be ignored . . . various types of questions this way add us up to some of the most innocuous sounding questions you ever heard of, which add up mildly to the same thing, which is, "What sort of person shouldn't you associate with?"

That sounds like a perfectly reasonable, almost Freudian, sort of . . . you know, mild, psychotherapeutic, you know, sort of question. "Have your parents ever protested against certain types of association?" Or something like that. Well, you're asking them what beingness should be unknown, not known, forgotten, gotten rid of, gotten away with, you know. "What type of personality is particularly detestable?" Now you're much further afield, but you'd still produce some kind of a result. You're getting away from the core of the matter, but it's still a . . . still a question that could be asked and you'd say, 'Well now, if you were in the business of manufacturing people, what types would you keep off your list?' "Who would you never under any circumstances, list as 'to be manufactured'?"

Any . . . any such type of oddball questioning, of course, is just "not-know beingness" and you can take the formula "not-know beingness" and extrapolate from it day and night for a long time and still get material off the pc; and you can set a pc up for a fast Terminal Assessment. Of course, you could do the oddity of setting them up for Clear. You . . . the whole thing blows if you treat it in this particular line.

You know, don't you, that it isn't necessary to run the terminal to make Clears. You . . . you know that, don't you? I mean that you can assess a person through to Clear and it will happen. For some reason or other, you just never seem to find the goal and maybe you find the goal and you find a goal that sticks. And you say this is marvelous and then you assess the terminal and then you can't find any terminal and so forth; and go back and check the goal, and you can't find that goal anymore. And you say, "Well,

where the devil have I wound up here?" You know? And now you go back all over it again and you've got to do another Goals Assessment. You see what I mean? then you find a goal that hangs up for a whole session and then you start in looking for a terminal for the goal and it all goes into mush and it's nowhere. And you go back and check the goal, and it's gone now and you could keep doing this and run a person through to Clear. I mean it can happen. A remarkable number of cases will do this and this should change your attitude toward "you must find a goal that sticks."

Because this will occur that you will, every now and then, find a pc that's . . . not even rare, in fact quite ordinary . . . you'll find a pc who doesn't have any goals stick at all. They just goals assess to Clear. Pretty soon, why all of a sudden, the needle is splop, you know. Needle's coasting. You're not getting any registry and so forth. What do you do now? Well, you goals assess to stable Clear. That's what you do now. Got the idea?

And then another type, as I just said, you goals assess the case and find the goal. Hurrah! Hurrah! Hurrah! And we're all set now and all we've got to do now is find the terminal. You set the person up for terminals for that goal and you never find a terminal and you go back and you check the goal, and it's gone. Got the idea? Get off of your anxiety that you must, must, must find the pc's goal, see. What you're trying to do is clear the person by assessment. It's a different action.

Now, if their goals go too numerous and the needle is not getting loose and the tone arm is not getting better and so forth, now this is the case we were talking about where you have to do some work on the case to get this malfunction out of the road. The person hasn't given you any goals. The person's having great difficulty giving you goals. You get the idea? Well, that's a person who has such a heavy bug on goals that's sitting right there, that you just can't really get an assessment going.

If a person is assessing easily and you're doing a good job of assessment and your rudiments all stay in and so forth, you can assess a person straight through to Clear . . . just on goals alone; never even get to a terminal. And you can assess a person through to a goal and the goal hangs and you never get through with a terminal to run. you just never find a terminal that fits the goal. you find a lot of terminals, but then you go back and check the goal and you . . . you can't get anyplace with that line. That's it. You've run that one completely out. Now, you've got to go back and find more goals.

And this is, on a gradient scale, the next step up from that is you find the goal and then you find the terminal and then you assess the terminal on the Prehav Scale and that's it. You've had it. you can't find any level for the terminal on the Prehav Scale. Well, then you go back and check the terminal and you find out it no longer registers. Now, you go back and check the goal. You find the goal registers a little bit so you'll find another terminal for that goal, you see.

All right. Now, you've got that terminal and you get a terminal and you've got the terminal all pegged and it's right there and you open your mouth to get it onto the Prehav Scale and you don't make it; and then you run it back and you check for that goal and the goal is now gone. Then you have nothing to do but to return to another Goals Assessment. You got the idea?

You see, if you're trying to find something, if that is the basic goal of all of your assessments, if you're . . . you've got to find the goal and if you have mocked it up so that you have failed, if you've failed to find the pc's goal, you see, you're just going in the wrong direction entirely. That isn't . . . that isn't correct, you see.

What you're trying to do is clear a person. Well, clearing a person consists of getting the stuck goals and stuck terminals off the case. you got the idea? So you're really taking the goals and terminals off the case and if you have to take them off with . . . by finding a terminal and then assessing the terminal on the Prehav Scale and then running the terminal on the Prehav Scale, on and on and on, don't you see . . . that's the way you've got to go about it . . . and then run it for a . . . lots of hours and so forth, to loosen it up; well, all right, that's how you had to go about it. Don't worry about that.

But you see, that's why the fast, short assessment to find the goal and terminal so that you can run it and run the person through to Clear is not a valid approach. It's not a valid piece of thinkingness. That is that you've got to find the goal and then find the terminal and then find it on the Prehav Scale and run it and

that is the only way to make a Clear, you see. That's not a valid approach. That would be the rougher Clear level, you see. You're going to make it that way, but that's going to take longer. The approach is, you're trying to knock out the stuck goals and the stuck terminals that have got this pc fixed in various game conditions which prevent him from escaping into existence again. That's what you're trying to do, so if you'll just change your level of orientation there and what you're trying to do, all of a sudden, why you can draw a long breath, and you'll find your assessments are much smoother, much happier, don't you see.

And if this pc doesn't seem to be getting any meter changes by reason of assessment . . you know, you're assessing the pc but you're getting no meter changes . . then you can assume that you have leaped off with a case that isn't going to give you any goals or there's something wrong with goals at large or goals in general and you certainly better straighten this case up. So just to be on the safe side, straighten all cases up on the subject of goals before you start to do a Goals Assessment . . and every so often, during Goals Assessments . . or reorient the person on the subject of goals. "What class of person is particularly hard on goals?" You know? "Give me a list of people that you wouldn't want to have have goals." "Give me a list of people whose goals are not very acceptable," and he comes back with gangsters, politicians, psychiatrists, you know and he comes down and he's thought each one of these over and he's decided their goals are not acceptable.

Well, you could take this list and run a different approach on the thing and that is you could ask him . . one, two, three, ask him just this: "What goals of a psychiatrist have you combated?" You know, this is just a light run sort of a thing. This is not anything you would do as a profession for the next five hundred hours.

But this guy will come up with the fact, "Well, they just shouldn't hurt people and they shouldn't do this and they shouldn't do that and they shouldn't do something or other and they shouldn't accept people's money without giving them any benefit in return," and so on.

Well, you say, "Well, form these up into goals. I mean what are the goals?"

"Well, they don't have any goals."

"Well, they must have some kind of goal. All right. Well, what goals do you think they would have?" Do you see?

"Oh, well, they have this kind of a goal and that kind of a goal, and they have the goal to hurt people and they have the goal to do this and they have the goal to do that."

"All right. Now, have you been in combat with that type of goal?"

"Oh, yes. Yes, I have been."

"All right. Now, what are you . . can you run back now and find exact times when you have actively combated those goals?"

"Oh, well, yeah. Well, that's pretty hard to do," you know.

And then he spots one and he spots another and he spots another and he spots another and he spots another and he spots another; and you say, "Well, that's it." You're not getting much needle action now, so you say, "Well, that's it. We're not going to go any further along that line."

"All right. Now, let's take up this gangster. All right. What gangster goals . . ." Well, this time he knows what you're talking about, so he's grooved in. "What gangster goals have you objected to?"

"Well, I haven't really objected to any gangster goals. As a matter of fact, I was a gangster in my last lifetime." Something like that blows off. That sort of is out of the road now.

And now we take a politician. "What political goals?"

“Well, the goal of hiring young men at slave wages to go out and shoot other young men because they’re wearing a different uniform. I . . . I think that’s a bad goal.”

“Well, now exactly what is that goal?”

And the guy will think for a long time. Then he’ll decide, “Nationalism. Yes, nationalism is a bad goal. Yeah, they have the goal of nationalism. Yeah, their goal . . .”

“Well, now have you ever actively combated such a goal?”

“Oh, yes, yes, yes. Oh, yes, yes. Used to make speeches and that sort of thing. Nationalism. Combated these goals.”

“What other goals in that area were you combating?”

“Well, there’s so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so.”

“All right. Okay. Okay. Well, now how about your immediate family? Any of them very hard on goals or any of them have goals?”

“Oh, well, my brother. My God, my brother. He always wanted to play the pianer.”

“Was there something wrong with that?”

“Oh, yeah, he was just obsessed. All the time he wanted to play the pianer. Of course, he . . . he’s with Sammy Kaye now at . . . and so forth, but gee, he always wanted to play the pianer all the time.”

You’ll notice this guy’s kind of sighing. He’s looking at a failed overt on goals. See, he didn’t want his brother to play a pianer, but his brother went and played the pianer. And now his brother’s being very successful, and he has Hollywood beauties standing ten deep around the . . . the baby grand, you know. Big failed overt.

You can start sorting these things out and it isn’t the aggregate of small things. What you are really looking for is some crashers. See, we’re looking for the unknown people here. We’re looking for the squelchers and so forth. We’re looking for the incidents where one’s goals really started to blow up in smoke, you know and just went blooey! Or when one really got to somebody else and blew all of his goals up . . . blooey, see.

For instance, I know several people at the present moment that you undoubtedly couldn’t goals assess. You just couldn’t goals assess because every single ambition Dianetics and Scientology ever announcedly had, these people were violently against and they’re just violently against them. So you’re assessing them with the understood goal of freeing them. How are they going to make it? How are they going to make it? Well, the only way you could make them make it is they’d have to pick up all their overts and attitudes against Dianetics and Scientology and then they possibly could make it. But they’ve stood in the line of any goal that we had for man or anything else.

Now, handling a pc has a lot to do with it. Because you handle the pc you are auditing and when you get glib enough and smooth enough with your tools and you feel very sure of these tools, you can sound very matter-of-fact in the use of these tools. But let’s put it another way. When you have had some wins, you will start getting very matter-of-fact. You see that? And you’ll all of a sudden find that your tools are much easier to use. See, so it works both ways. And what you need are some wins, basically. And what you need is . . . to get those wins is a very relaxed attitude and . . . and just an application of exactly what you’re doing in order to get that forward.

Now, I’ve shaken out of the hamper . . . for my money . . . anything that was wrong with goals assessing I think I’ve got taped now and it’s all right with me if anybody anyplace in the world wants to run Goals Assessments. This is okay with me. They’re not going to do anybody any damage.

But for heaven's sake, keep on assessing. I mean let's keep going here and let's not get some wild idea. . . This is what they were doing. Somebody would get some wild idea that this fellow's goal really is . . . You know. They just make it up out of the blue, and foist this goal off on him and say, "That's it, isn't it?" Yeah, well, don't bother to look at the E-Meter, and then get a terminal, you see, that fits the goal very nicely. That's all set. They're . . . very easy to do that; all they're reading is ARC break, you see. And then they go tearing off on the Prehav Scale and they run this thing madly and they say well, we're going to make a Clear. Well, that's not so. Had to be much more skilled in assessment than that, believe me.

But keep assessing. Just go on assessing. If you just went on assessing and checking through, you'd sooner or later reach the stop point where it became obvious to one and all that you either weren't going to clear this case by just running out all goals and all terminals by assessments, you see, but that you had come to a total stuck. Yeah, a goal had stuck and there wasn't a single thing you could do to free that goal. That was it. That was there. And then, you pick up all the cause-effect . . . both ends of the goal, you know, the line of the goal; the person that wants to do it and the person it's to be done to or something like that. you pick up both ends of the goal and list those things and just keep listing them and listing them and listing them and listing them and going on and on and on until one sticks and if one doesn't stick, just keep on going and eventually you can get nothing to react in the way of terminals and so forth, go back and examine the goal and you'll find the goal has probably blown up at this point. You've run out all the beingnesses that had to do with that particular goal. Now, you've got to do a Goals Assessment all over the top . . .

But the game is assessing. Assessing is clearing. If you want a Clear, do good assessment. This is what is emerging as people have gone ahead and done a lot of auditing and as a lot of results have emerged here and there. They have all emerged on assessment. The runs of the terminal, flattening that and then reassessing and all Clears have emerged on that pattern; and Clears have not emerged in any other pattern. The only other technique of clearing I know of is familiarizing the pc with the bank so expertly, that he no longer has any slightest qualms of facing even the most unknown portions of his bank and he will eventually blow Clear and it's done by gradient scales; and I've never been able to teach anybody to do it. This other one is a surefire. And auditors far away from supervision are making it with it and so forth. So you just have to say, well, that's the way to clear people.

Now, as far as preparatory steps are concerned, preparatory steps as contained in Routine 1 and Routine 2 and Routine 1A, that sort of thing . . . these preparatory steps are very valid and very valuable preparatory steps. But I wouldn't use them any longer than was necessary to put the pc in a shape to be assessed. How long do you use Routines 1, 2 or 1A? You use them long enough to put the pc in shape where he can be assessed well and then you go to town on assessment. And there is a faster method of handling this and a better definition of how you go about it and I think your own experience so far tends to bear that out and you get a little bit more experience along this line of assessment and you are really going to see this thing borne out like mad.

So get to be demons on the subject of assessment. In the last two lectures, I've stressed nothing else but assessment. This requires, of course, pretty smooth, matter-of-fact auditing, no invalidation of the pc, just carrying on, putting them all down, doing a workmanlike job, knowing where you're going and knowing what you're doing. The pc communicates to him, he goes ahead and he gets in there and he saws on down the line, and his anxieties start coming off and he starts straightening up, and he gets more and more in-session. The more in-session he is, why of course, the faster he clears.

As running it is concerned, you don't need much experience or practice in running the thing because we've had lots of auditing on this. We need experience right now in assessing. How to set a case up for assessing. How to assess a case and what to expect from an assessment and then at the end of all of this, how to check and reassess; and all of those things are very skilled activities.

You can invalidate a pc out of existence, you know. I mean, you can . . . you can take a Goals Assessment, Terminal Assessment, you can just invalidate the pc down to a nothing. But you have to be pretty crude. You have to be actually kind of overtly snide about the whole thing or there has to be something in the attitude which is all wrong. Or you have to be doing it in some fashion which is totally,

totally, totally contrary to in-sessionness or the Auditor's Code or something like that. The error has to be very gross to do a poor assessment.

And if your pc isn't progressing, I am charitable enough to assume it's because the pc has such a wide bug on just the subject of goals that you cannot penetrate that particular barrier without letting some sunshine in on the subject first and on terminals, well, he has such a large bug on beingness that you cannot get anyplace with the beingness. So as a result, why you've got to do something desperate about beingnesses.

Well, right along with this emerges this brand-new tool which is the . . . an old tool in theory, but was never really applied successfully in practice because the whole ramification of it . . . You see, the O/W was missing on the early "not-know." We didn't have O/W when we were first using "not-know" and "forget." So therefore, it didn't have the horsepower to climb the hill and the O/W gives it the horsepower. "Who should be forgotten?" "If you forgot something, who or what would have been gotten even with?" "What forgettingness would get even with them?" Interesting question. "Who or what would be confused by your forgetting?" is enough question that on trying to answer at once, all the somatics a pc's got, could and have blown . . . in just trying to answer it once. Every somatic the pc had blew up. Of course, it was a half hour attempt to answer, but no answer was ever really given.

So you see, as soon as this is combined with O/W and as soon as it's combined with goals and as soon as it's combined with terminals . . . you make that various type of combination there . . . why, you should be able to straighten out any pc rapidly that is having a lot of difficulty trying to give you some goals, you see or is very afraid you will invalidate his goals or thinks the erasure of the goal or the testing of the goal is an invalidation of the goal, don't you see. you have to be very careful of that. Well, if a pc is getting all ARC broke on this subject, he must have a whole lot of bugs on the subject of goals. So let's take these up with him, you see. As a sort of a . . . of a necessary rudiment to Goals Assessment, hmmm?

And I want you to try that out in giving your sessions now and just try and find out how this pc of yours is oriented on the subject of goals. Are goals something one must never have? Are goals something one must make up? Are goals something one must stamp all over? What? What? What's the orientation?

You can get that orientation as I gave you earlier in the lecture by using "not-know," "forget," "people" . . . "What kind of person . . .?" you know, that kind of thing . . . and smoke it out. You're liable to blow some secondaries. You're liable to get some action. You're liable to throw some engrams into view.

Of course, you understand that every execution is simply an invalidation of the goal of living. That's why the state does it. The most effective invalidation of life known, is to kill somebody and that's very successful. That's also the most equal thing there is: dead men.

Now, I wasn't chipping away at the philosophy of equality in a democracy, because Thomas Jefferson was absolutely right: all men are born with equal rights under law. I notice though, he didn't at the same time say all men are equal and I notice that the democracies today have gotten this as . . . on the third string of their violin as the most monotonous chant that you ever heard: "All men are equal." Well, the inequalities of men start showing up in all directions. When you clear one, and one remains unclear, you've got m inequality like mad. It's . . . its an observable fact. It's contrary to life.

So we must assume then . . . I have just a little while ago figured out the most equal man I could think of, and of course, that's a dead man. All dead men are equal to all dead men, so now we know which way they're going. Snide remarks.

All right. Well, have a good auditing session tonight. And have a good weekend and I'll see you next week.