UPGRADING AUDITING

A lecture given on
20 December 1961

I think that was a very good way to start this thing. Hurry up and get your Class IIs. In fact, some of you could even get your Class Is. I won't say that. I shouldn't say that. That's cruel. Actually, I don't feel that way at all.

Now, I've practiced enough for the Washington Congress, so I'll sit down. 20 Dec., AD 11. Shortly be AD 12. Time marches on.

Now, I told you everything there is to know, and there's nothing new that you don't know, and you've got it all taped now and straight, and you're right up there.

Now, the dynamic principle of existence—I'll tell you some data you're not familiar with—the dynamic principle of existence is survive. The cycle of action is create-survive-destroy. Axiom 1 is . . .

Now, a lot of things come up in running of 3D and the handling of 3D, and the first and foremost thing that shows up on the handling of 3D is the lack of basic skill. That is the first thing that will startle you. And therefore, I'm going to talk to you today about the handling of groups and the training of auditors in an area, the handling of auditors in Central Organizations, and so forth. In other words, upgrading auditing And that would be, I suppose, an appropriate title of this lecture—is "Upgrading Auditing."

Now, the first thing we have to realize is that most people have a considerable diffidence about tampering with the human mind. This is the overall majority of Homo sap today, is oppressed by a feeling that he must not inquire into the other fellow's wits. This effectively keeps him imprisoned and in the bird cage.

No better mechanism could possibly be devised to keep a race enslaved than: "One must not tamper with anybody else's thinkingness."

In other words, take no responsibility for anybody's thinkingness but your own and take no responsibility for that, and then you will nicely stay in every implant you have ever been handed. And all of your now-I'm-supposed-to's can be counted on to function and particularly, and may I give you a little slice of galactic council thinking, then and only then can you be absolutely sure that no revolt or menace will ever come out of a planet. If you can make these things stick, then no planet will ever give you any trouble. They will be in constant trouble themselves and they will be in a horrible mess, but no threat will ever come from one.

This is the principle of the boxer. It's thinking of this type: If your opponent is knocked out and sprawled on the floor—you don't want to be guilty of murder, you see, so he should be breathing faintly—but he's perfectly safe, isn't he? He's perfectly safe. I mean, that's a condition to have an opponent in. Except for this: there's no fight, there'll be no gate, and there'll be nothing if that is all that ever happened. No game is extant.

Galactic council reasoning—and by that term I don't mean some great hierarchy which ruleth this parteth of the universeth; I simply mean the supergovernments which do exist and which come into existence and which fade away and which do carry, on the whole track, the most powerful monitoring effect upon civilizations, because their civilizations are done by slide rule.

It’s a slide rule civilization. They just figure it all out, and “This is how nobody will ever give you any trouble,” is one of their main things.

When thetans have battered themselves up to this particular status, that is to say they have banged their way up the line, they finally made it stick on the basis of space fleets and planets and confederations and crisscrosses and that sort of thing, they are, of course, at the mockery of a no-games condition. They’re not in a no-games condition at the top end of the scale, they’re in a no-games condition at the bottom end of the scale. And they don’t want any game.

So their idea of the perfect game is they sit there and know all about it, and nothing ever happens, and they can be absolutely content that everything is going to be just fine throughout the entirety of the empire. Which is to say, things will be barely breathing, and nobody will ever get out of the hoosegow.

Now, when you’ve got populations which are in essence concentration camped, you have, of course, an ideal situation from one viewpoint—the viewpoint of somebody who doesn’t want any game.

Now, Hitler didn’t have any trouble with a large section of his population. He just put them all in concentration camps and that was it. And it’s that kind of a game if you want to look at it. It’s not the game of government and who will we elect and democracy über alles, or something—it’s not all that kind of a government. It’s just the kind of a government, “Well, there they are nicely out of the running Everybody is out of the running; isn’t that nice. And things are just barely ticking over, and we’re not going to be troubled by those fellows from the 18th Panzer Division that put up such a hell of a fight on Exnoo. We’re not going to be troubled with them anymore because we got them implanted very nicely, and they’ve all been sent down to Earth, and the mores of the society there will take care of everything And they will never be in circulation again as space jockeys.” It’s that kind of thinking, you see?

“We got everybody in jail, so now we’re all set.” I might as well level with you on this kind of an action, because it’s something that I happen to be an expert on.

Now, what would you do if you wanted to create that kind of a condition? The first thing that you would do would, of course, be to never let anybody monkey with anybody’s mind. You have psychiatrists. Ah, ha-ha, they’re the boys! Ha-ha-ha, yeah. All they’ll do is implant people further. All they’ll do is immobilize, immobilize, immobilize, don’t you see?

But if you put this in as a kind of a stable datum along the line, that it was all secret and private and one’s thinking should never be invaded and so forth, then you can be absolutely sure nobody will ever as-is anything and throw a monkey wrench in the works.

You won’t ever have the captain of the 28th Panzer Division suddenly appearing again saying, “What the hell do you mean doing this to my men,” you know? He won’t cause any trouble. I mean it’s just, you know, quiet now.

And this sort of a graveyard peace is a highly desirable thing, and if you want to know what thinking is on a galactic government basis, that is the pattern thinking. A graveyard quiet.

So little gimmicks of this character are considered rather valuable. And one of those gimmicks is to never let anybody ever interfere with anybody else’s rights. Rights. That’s the keynote. That is the way you get the thetan to accept it.

You get the guy to get the idea that he has rights and that these rights are the rights of privacy. And then having worked it out so the rights of privacy are paramount to all other rights, you have, of course, created a concentration camp.

So now the auditor is going up against this particular gimmick. And very often when you're training auditors, some have it worse than others.

Now, how does it get worse in some people than others? Well, they're withholding their terminals. They have a terminal and they have an opposition terminal and they're withholding both, because they've been thoroughly punished for ever having been it. So they know that the safe thing to do in order to contribute to the graveyard peace, is to withhold their terminal.

See, first there's the mechanism that one has rights of privacy and rights of never being interfered with and that one must never invade anybody's rights in privacy. And we've got it all set, then nothing will ever be done on any planet concerning a resolution of the problems of life. Because nobody ever dares look in anybody else's mind to find out why—what makes it tick? Don't you see?

It's no accident that 50,000 years on this particular planet have gone by without anybody even coming close to sniffing at the edge of Scientology. That's not an accident. Of course, it's remarkable to do this, and I'm perfectly willing to share any credit given in this particular line, but I must reduce the credit by this degree, by this degree; is that I happen to be peculiarly skilled along in certain lines of control and so forth, and mechanisms.

In other words, a lot of time has been invested in me, here and there in this universe, and I've had my share of all this, so somebody tells me, you see, something like this, like well, "You mustn't, you know, invade privacy, and it's all for the best, and a graveyard peace is the very best possible thing and if you just keep everybody in a concentration camp for the next billion years, then everybody's going to be happy, you see, and nobody will be troubled at headquarters."

Somebody tells me all these things and I say, "Ha. Now, let's turn to page 2 of the rule book."

So that doesn't make much of an impression on me. My credit in this particular line happens to be reduced by just that degree because I have no respect for these rule books. I think that—I think a prisoner always has a right to revolt. Always. I'll stake my bottom kropotnick on the thing, see.

I mean, if I myself were running a military prison someplace or another and it had a hundred thousand inmates and so forth, and somebody'd snarl around about those damn prisoners, "Do you know they're liable to kick up a revolt at any moment?" I would be surprised at him for thinking that anything else could happen. A prisoner has a perfect right to revolt.

A slave has a perfect right to strike off his chains, because by essence these are living beings. And some people are close enough to the edge of that thinking that they say, "Well, that's correct. That's correct. People have a right to be free. That is a right they do have and I agree with that right."

I don't agree with the right that the privacy of the deepest-dyed criminal should be protected by all the forces of the state from invasion. I don't believe in that. I believe that if a fellow means to shove a dirk into his fellow man at any given instant and he wishes to remain very private so that he can cut throats at will and unexpectedly, I believe that this fellow's privacy is the privacy we should invade.

But all galactic thinking along this particular line runs in the basis of, “Well, the way to do this is you put him in the electric machine. And you put the handle down to full blast. And you give him a nice mass to worry about, and because this fellow has done things like that to other people, why, the motivator-overt sequence takes place at once, and the way you handle a criminal is to make a piece of MEST out of him, and then don’t invade his privacy.”

Well, this thinking is perfectly all right too. Nobody’s being too critical of this, except that is the most unsuccessful thinking that has ever been thought in this universe. You never are able to guarantee utterly that the archcriminal is going to remain a piece of MEST. Furthermore, this other hole exists in galactic thinking, is you can never guarantee that a planet will not revolt. You can never guarantee that wisdom will not get abroad. This cannot be guaranteed.

And the only thing that you can guarantee and find any future success in, and so on, is this: Man or thetans are basically good and they get all mixed up, and when you unmix them, they revert to being good. That is a piece of thinking which is probably not even well known in galactic council lines. Because they don’t like to believe in it because it makes everything so active.

Everybody gets so active, you know? People start thinking for themselves. They stop being utterly dependent upon a proclamation put on the side of the post office to know which bread they’re supposed to cook on Tuesday. And so therefore, although these truths probably are not unknown to them, although I don’t know that these truths are known to them—the basic intent of man and so forth—I don’t know that these things are known at all. I think they possibly are quite original as a discovery. But that type of thinking that would make slaves only guarantees one thing: a miserable mess. That type of thinking which brands every man a criminal and says all intentions are bad has an end product of a mess. These are types of thinking which do not make people happy.

Now, you could stand by to be able to confront a great deal of action. You start clearing somebody, one of the things you’ll be struck by—as I’ve told you in earlier lectures—one of the things you’ll be struck by is the person goes into motion. Not hectic, agitated, undirected motion. No, but very effective motion, and he doesn’t happen to realize that he is moving faster and that’s one of the peculiarities of case advances.

It’s only now and then that you suddenly will realize that you are moving faster than you were. You’re doing things more quickly. You walk a block more quickly. You don’t consider it’s quite as far from here to the post office and back as you did. These are the types of advances which means greater motion and greater movement.

But in view of the fact that that is regularized movement, in view of the fact that it is controlled movement, it is infinitely preferable to uncontrolled movement because movement in the vicinity where everybody is crazy is movement which is never controlled. It is better to have more motion, in my thinkingness, which is controlled by the individual creating it, than to have random motion controlled by nobody.

Now, you can say that’s just a matter of personal preference. I can hear it now. I can hear it now across some council table someplace or another. “Well, now, I don’t know, ah, I don’t know about that. That’s just, that’s just your idealism. It’s never worked. Never worked. Well, just look at it right now. Take system and system and system and system so on and so on, and here’s 809,642 million systems and they’re all working very, very well on the subject of slavery, and you come along and you want to introduce a wild idea like this. These people, I mean they’re getting along all right, and they’re just going to pieces routinely, and well, I mean they’re—they have hospitals to care for them if they’re sick. So if they’re sick a lot, why, that’s tough. They’ve still got hospitals to care for them. We’re taking care of all these things. Now here you are, here you are espousing this type of idealism which would upset things. It would upset things.”

Of course, I can hear the argument that would ensue. Nobody'd win that argument by the way. Neither side would win because where all power is vested on a now-I'm-supposed-to, you're not about to shake those now-I'm-supposed-to's. Don't try to sell the rulers of the universe on the basis of "all they have to do is change it all," because the first thing they would lose would be their own power. They would lose their total dictatorialness, you see.

Yet their power is artificially upheld. Artificially to such a degree that it isn't power at all, and they don't even dare exert it anymore. This is interesting, you see, but these are viewpoints. You're in the field of viewpoint and speculation when you're on the field of the basic ingredient of man.

But you yourselves can observe this. And you could observe that those people who are not quite spun in and who are not quite enslaved are fairly willing, once you set their heads to it, to invade the privacy of another human being because they're not totally mired into the other philosophy. And the other philosophy is, of course, "Now if we just sit very quietly and never ask any questions, why, nobody's going to wipe us out with a spaceship." You see? It's all prevented action. All that type of thinkingness.

"Well, everything is going along just fine." You see war raging, you know. Millions of men being killed, you know, and everything being blown up, and planet becoming a desert, where everybody—death—death, and nobody's going to be left, and the planet's going to be a billiard ball, all that sort of thing. But they say, "Now, if I just sit here quietly, everything will be all right." You always can go into a belly laugh over that kind of thinkingness, you know? Because he's the first guy that gets shot because it's rigged that way. See, he's the fellow that would have naturally enough overts to receive all the motivators.

Well, your auditors fall into three generalized classifications. One is the fairly free individual who hasn't taken his terminal too heavily, and so forth. And he hasn't totally subscribed to the idea that his natural lot is that of a slave and a dust mote floating unimportantly through the universe. He hasn't quite subscribed to all this philosophy, you see. And you can count on this fellow charging into a case and doing something

Then you get your next grade. Your next grade is the person who intellectually can recognize that it would be all right for him to invade the privacy of others, and that the only way he could ever set them free is that this sort of thing did occur, but who has a terminal which is peculiarly worded and composed so as to make him withhold it violently. And if he's withholding this terminal very hard, you'll have a hard time getting this person up to Class II.

He's a person who is intellectually in agreement with the fact that man could be freer, and it'd be better to make men freer, and so on. He can intellectually agree to that, but his own terminal gets in his road. His terminal is peculiarly composed so that he has to withhold it hard. It appears to him to be a dangerous terminal. The reason he's withholding his terminal, by the way, it practically proves this theory that man is basically good. It's the best proof of it as an examination of how a person handles his own terminal.

He'll hold it out of action which is, by the way, what makes it go into action. But he's trying to withhold it, see? He's trying to withhold this terminal.

Sometimes when you're trying to run an assessment list on somebody who has one of these difficult packages that's given him a lot of trouble—a difficult 3D package, you see—and you're running down the line and all of a sudden the thing goes null. He's got it ARC broke up in some peculiar way so he'll withhold the terminal because he's actually afraid of releasing the terminal. That is why he does it.

Now, if you had an idea of what his terminal was—just to give you a broad view of this, not this modifier trick which is a perfectly valid trick— but if you had an idea of what his terminal was, just ask him why he should withhold a woman killer—let's say this is his terminal, see—why he should withhold a woman killer from this session. And he'll all of a sudden wake up to the fact that he's doing it, and your needle would read again.

So you can actually turn a read back on if you happen to know the fellow's own terminal. Because what is he doing He's withholding a woman killer. You're a woman, and you're auditing him. You give him an ARC break, although hell dramatize his modifier, if that terminal is something like a woman killer, he's actually scared stiff that hell kill you. There's not the slightest possibility of his ever doing so, but just the hint that he might get mad at you causes him to withhold the terminal so hard that everything goes null.

Withhold of the terminal is the key to a 3D package. That is why the package disappears out of sight. Withhold of the terminal. A violent withhold of the terminal. It is quite remarkable how thoroughly the terminal can be withheld. That you can get to it at all and that an E-Meter can find it is fantastic. Don't be taken in by somebody saying, "Oh, well. That's very easy. All you have to do is so and so." Because it isn't. It isn't at all. Because this is the one thing the fellow was withholding most.

And you have trouble getting withholds off pc A when pc B, you see, is running quite easily. You can get his withholds off very easily. But pc A, oh, man, do you have to get down and sweat. You know, the sweat is dropping off of your brow and splashing on the E-Meter glass. And you're trying to pull a withhold on this guy, and the fellow squirms, and he goes through misery about the whole thing, you know, and ooooh, you know, "Whew, I don't know if I better tell you or not."

And then finally why he braves up to it, and you find out that he used two cubes of sugar instead of one in his tea this morning, which is a departure, you see, and the landlady has already told him that he had better use less sugar, and it's a big overt.

You look for another overt. No, there isn't any other overt. It's just that what he does withhold, he withholds so solidly, you see, he just withholds this, he clutches it to his bosom. Why?

Well, of course the degree of withhold is the key to the degree of withhold of the terminal from action. They are a direct coordination.

So your second class of auditor is intellectually as himself, independent of the 3D package, and there is some of that showing always—except in the booby hatch. There's where a 3D package is in total—you've got a condition of a person whose withholds are so hard and thorough that he believes that nobody should invade that because he's got to withhold it. So therefore, he is very chary of ever invading anybody else on the subject of withholds.

And you'll get some fellow who will sit there, and he'll say, "Oh, you thought an unkind thought. Oh, somebody else thought an unkind thought. Oh, isn't that nice? Somebody else, ooooh, that was a close one. Well, we'll buy that one. Somebody else thought an unkind thought. Well, that's good. Well, I certainly got a lot of withholds off that case in this session. He thought unkind thoughts about other people thinking unkind thoughts. And we got the unkind thoughts of his Aunt Bessie and his Uncle Bill, and we got the unkind thoughts of his instructor about him, and we sure got a lot of ground covered in this session."

You just look down the list—he didn't get off a single withhold. He just wouldn't do it. Now you've got your galactic thinking keyed in here, you see, whereby we shouldn't invade anybody

else's privacy, you know, it's very hard. Except he really thinks intellectually that he should, you see? And he'll say to you, "I—I—I but I meant to get in there, you see, but I—I—I—I—I—I meant to ask, you see, and I know . . . I know it's right, and I know what you're supposed to do, and so forth. And next session I'll do much better."

And next session he sits there, and he says, "Well, all right. Now, did your Uncle Bill think any unkind thoughts, you know."

And he says, "No, that isn't right, no it isn't," and he'll just grit his teeth, and grit his teeth, and he'll finally say, "What have you done?"

And he notices the E-Meter doesn't blow up, and he notices that the pc does tell him something and he gradually comes through this even though he's got a hell of a terminal package he's withholding, you see? You can educate him past the line. That's the second class.

And your third class of person—this is not classes of auditors. Your third class of person. Man, he is just so mired down in that withholds package, the terminal is so lost below withholds, he's so keyed-in on the basis of must never invade anybody's privacy, and so forth, that he could only be audited. He could only be audited. You just never would crack through the barrier.

Now, this is a pretty wild kind of gent. This would be somebody that you—probably never walk into your co-audits, you see.

He does form a large percentage of the human race, however. Just because he never walks into your co-audit does not mean, you see, that he doesn't exist. You'll find him, and you're liable to find him in civil positions. Isn't that strange? I think that's very weird. Of course, he's bought galactic council-type thinking, you see, and it tends to make him part of the boys. It's quite interesting

You listen to some of the political bigwigs of the world raving around and it always gives to me to laugh.

Anyway, there's three classes, three generalized classes of people.

One, the first fellow, you'll teach him, or if it's a girl, you'll teach her very easily. She gets in there, and she gets off withholds, brrrrrrr-boom, thud, bang, crash.

"What have you done? All right. Okay. Good enough. Shot your mother. Very good. All right. That's fine. Now, what have you done? Yeah." So on. "What was that? What was that?"

"Oh, well, I didn't mean to tell you about that."

"Well, you better tell me about that right now. What is it?"

You know, it's just going off bang, bang, bang, bang, you know.

And then your second grade, your second class of "I don't know. I'd better come over. The Instructor has said I better ask, and Ron has said I'd better ask, and the Director of Training had said I'd better ask. They have all said I'd better ask and so, so, so, here goes. Here goes: 'Have you heard anybody else thinking any critical thoughts?"'

They just don't dare charge the withhold at all.

But out of those two classes, you can make auditors. In spite of that, you can make auditors. That the person will try at all, shows that they're analytically in agreement with it, but their terminal has some peculiarities that forbid it.

Now, it becomes very interesting to us how the terminal package monitors conduct in session. Conduct in session is monitored first and foremost by the unwillingness to give a withhold. That is a pc unwillingness to give a withhold, just can't quite seem to get one out. And the other factor involved in it is the feeling of doubt that keeps coming across it all. Because, of course, they've got the withhold pressed in so tightly that, of course, it's sort of a pretended know or a not-know has sort of keyed in, and they're very hesitant, and they're very unpositive, and they're very diffident, and they don't give it up well. This all goes with this 3D package.

You'll see this one. I imagine somebody will have a terminal like a secret hider or an archives burier, you know, a nice terminal, you see, something like that. And you'll kick the terminal into action.

Of course, the modifier modifies their actual visual conduct whenever they get the rudiments out. You throw the rudiments out there, they'll dramatize their modifier in the session.

Now, oddly enough, as an auditor—auditors don't have cases. The modifier doesn't much influence their auditing, doesn't really much influence their auditing. It does to some slight degree, but they can override it.

What influences their auditing more—see, pc'ing is more influenced visually. You can see the modifier go into action in a pc—but what influences the auditor is the amount of withhold on the terminal, you understand? And the degree of withholding—it's fabulous.

Now, if you—you'll start fooling around with this sometime in a session, just on the basis of all of a sudden it all went null on somebody or other, and you do happen to know their terminal, see. Well, let's say during level runs, you all of a sudden notice the terminal is not acting. It's not reacting.

Let's say their terminal is a waterbuck, and you say, "Well, what would you be withholding a waterbuck from around here?"

And they say, "Oh, well, now, that you—come to think about it, for the last fifteen minutes I've been keeping him from going and getting a drink."

You don't have to go let him get a drink. Just the realization of this fact alone will get your needle reacting. That's how important the withhold is. That, by the way, is, you might say, the clinical research test of how I've come to this conclusion concerning withholds and that sort of thing It's experiments of that particular type and nature; degree that the terminal is withheld and review of cases and their behavior in session and all of that.

Now, we've got another factor involved in the plan of auditing. When I tell you that—well, we give this rough figure of 75 hours of Sec Checking and straightening up and that sort of thing before we do a 3D assessment. This becomes very easily understood by you when you recognize that every withhold he has, every single withhold he has is stacked up 100 percent on top of the withholdingness of the terminal. See? He's withholding this terminal, waterbuck. Every time some water occurs, why, you'd think a waterbuck, he'd become immediately a waterbuck, but he doesn't. He withholds the terminal, waterbuck.

All right. So this starts getting—glued on top of this then is every other withhold he has ever withheld since the first acceptance of the terminal, waterbuck. That's a lot of withholds, isn't it?

And because present time has a much greater, greater value than past time, present life withholds then have waterbuck glued down to a point where it's practically unassessable when you first grab ahold of the person, see. So he becomes relatively unassessable because he's got this thing withheld.

And then on top of this, of course, he's got all of his withholds. And the withholds are right in with the waterbuck.

So in order to loosen up the 3D package, you have to get the withholds off, hence the emphasis on Security Checking. And you get enough withholds off, and all of a sudden the terminal starts to float to the top. If you could get withholds off on the whole track, you could security check the 3D package into the full view, if you could, if he could remember, if you had enough time, if you could dream up that many Security Checks, if, if, if, if, if, see.

But theoretically, if you got off all of the withholds ever since he became imbued with this terminal waterbuck—well, the last 150 trillion years worth of withholds—if you got all of those off, a waterbuck would blow, you see, with all those ifs, ifs, ifs. But for sure, you have to get off the more important withholds.

For instance, the social standing—his social standing of the life he has just got through living is not as important as his present life by about one-thousandth. See, the withholds of this life and then one-thousandth as important as the life just behind this life, and then about a thousandth as important as that life are some earlier lives, you see, and then about a millionth as important as that is some life he lived a hundred trillion years ago, you see—the withholds in that. Relative importance goes down with great rapidity from present life back is all I'm trying to say. So you have to get off this life's withholds and by doing that you make the package that . . . It isn't that these withholds are what is holding down the package. It's just that these withholds have to be gotten off before you can get the package. It does enough to unburden it so that the package becomes visible.

But everybody's going around withholding their 3D package, and the basic thing, of course, which they withhold in the 3D package is the terminal. You could almost say that the last terminal to come up—this is not true because of the methods of assessment which you're using—but if you could measure the relative difficulty you had in getting items, you would get items that were closer to the terminal. See, the terminal is the bottom of a package.

Of course, you're so rigged in assessing that it crosscuts, so this rule doesn't hold. But if we were dealing with some other system—if you were dealing uniformly with some other system which unstacked it to the degree that they were withheld, you would find that the last thing to come up would be the person's terminal.

The first thing to come up would be the goal. And the last thing to come up would be the terminal, and other things would be mishmashed one way or the other in between.

This is very, very important to you in the handling and training of auditors. Extremely important to you because it gives us a very rapid estimate of how long a person has to be worked over before they can be assessed.

You will get to this point where you could look at somebody being security checked, and get some kind of a vague estimate of how long it would be before somebody who couldn't assess very well could do an assessment on them. You could make an accurate estimate. Here's this person sitting there saying, "Oh, ohhhhh. Withhold. Withholding anything Withhold. Murder. Murdered anybody. Let's see, have I murdered anybody in this lifetime? I don't know if I've murdered anybody in this lifetime. Yuh, and so on. Let's see now. You say . . . What was the

question again? Oh, have I ever murdered anybody? Have I ever murdered anybody in this lifetime? Have I murdered anybody? Don't know if I ever murdered anybody in this lifetime, you know."

And you'd say, "Boy, there's somebody that's going to take awhile. There's somebody's going to take awhile, man. And when we find it, it's going to be one of these plunger-type terminals, like it's going to be a—a hider, and the modifier's going to be something like, "and never be found out," you know, the terminal more important than the modifier to this degree, you see? But it'll be some kind of an odd terminal like this. It'll be something that would be a secret-type of terminal.

And you see somebody else. He's just taking a medium time, you know, and you say, "Well, have you ever murdered anybody?"

"Mmmmm murdered anybody? Let's see. Mmmmmmmm-mmmmmmm. No. No, I haven't murdered anybody."

What the hell! You mean this guy has to think over whether or not he's murdered somebody in this lifetime? Nuts!

Then the other case—I'll give you another view on the thing—and another case, say, "Well," you say to this person, "have you ever murdered anybody in the present—."

"No."

He knows, you see. And there's a reversal of this which can fool you, which is the lower scale mockery. You always have lower scale mockeries of practically everything. And this person says, "Yes." Right away he says, "Yes, I've murdered about seven people."

You don't get a single reaction on the meter, the meter doesn't respond in any degree whatsoever, person doesn't care if he's done these things, doesn't make any difference to him. That's your lower scale mockery of this.

Well, this person is not necessarily that much easier to assess. That person is that much harder to assess. Now, you'll dig and dig and dig, and you just never can get him to say murderer, you know? I mean he'll make lists. He'll make a long list, and you say, "Well, is there anything else on the list?" And you'll get a tick, and you'll say, "Well, what else is on that list?" And he'll say, "Well, there could be a roller skater."

"All right. Is there anything else on this? Is there an ARC break. Is the ARC break what's making this fall?" No reaction, see.

You say, "All right. Well, is there any other on this list?" And the needle will go tick. And you say, "All right. What is the next item?"

And he'll say, "Well, candy maker. Candy maker would do that."

Candy maker is the terminal for the goal, and murder everybody in sight, see.

And after you've done this long, arduous list and gotten clear to the bottom of the thing, practically sheets, you see, he'll come in, usually in the morning after he's had a good night's sleep, and all is well with the world, and he has no upsets, and his rudiments are all just in kind of naturally, don't you know, and he will say to you, "I've just had a terrific idea. Just an

absolutely terrific idea. I woke up this morning, and I was thinking it over, and do you know we haven't got some item on that list."

And you'll say, "No, what?"

And he'll say, "A murderer. What do you think of that?"

Do you see the person just doesn't have any recognition of his terminal value of any kind whatsoever. It's just totally withheld.

Now, it isn't naturally true that the more violent kinds of terminals are more withheld or the more secret kinds of terminals are more withheld. You're liable to run into somebody with a terminal "little girl," who is just withholding it like mad. Of course, we don't know what a little girl means to this person. See? That's what it takes. What does a little girl mean to this person? Oh, well, that's another story.

So whatever the terminal package is, it—the way to understand it is by the person's reaction to Security Checking and their ability to security check. Both of these things could be used in a monitoring factor. We could say, "Well, this person can't security check worth beans. This person takes forever to answer questions." Well, we'd just better security check the living daylights out of this person, and get everything as clean as we can possibly get it in all directions before we begin to attempt an assessment.

And as far as training is concerned, we're not going to hope for much from this person before we get an assessment completed, because they're going to goof. As an auditor, you see, we're just not going to hope for much. Oh, we'll let them audit. We're not going to push them. We're not going to spend much time sweating over them.

We'll spend more time sweating over some other auditor making him good enough to assess the one who was dragging up the rear when we finally get up to that. It's that kind of thinking which pays off easier than taking all the dunderheads who can't pull a withhold, who won't give a withhold, stacking them all up together and saying, "Now, you're the only people that's going to audit anybody. And you easy sec checking people over here, well, we're not going to run any 3D package on you. We're not going to find anything or anything And we're not going to work very hard to train you. We're going to work on this tough group." You know, the way they teach modern schools. They downgrade the whole class to the only idiot they've got.

Now, there is nothing disgraceful about having long comm lags on withholds and having an insufferable terminal in Scientology. There might have been out in life, and on the whole track and that sort of thing, but we consider there's nothing disgraceful about this. But we are permitted to curse about it occasionally. I think we'd be permitted to do that once in a while.

We finally get it totally unburied and we've practically sweat our skin off our brow, you see, trying to get this thing and get this thing security checked and so forth, and we finally get down to the lower end of the thing and find out that the person's terminal that was causing us all this trouble, you see, was a "never knower."

Now, we're permitted at that time, "Well, I'll be damned," you know. We're permitted one of those. Even tell the person that. The person never appreciates it though. I've said this to a person or two, "Well, now I know why we've been having so much trouble." And you know, they never appreciated it at all.

Now, this is an interesting thing that you happen to be dealing with live, living beings with a very live, real and factual science. Our science is not a theoretical, interpretable science.

Scientology has about the same delicacy as a pickax right now. I mean yeah, you could be pretty adroit, and you can handle people pretty adroitly and that sort of thing, but it's very direct.

What we know that is important about life can be instantly and immediately applied—instantly and immediately. And applied in certain direct ways, it'll arrive at certain direct places. It's like taking a dry box of matches. You take a match out of the box and you strike it on the striker of the box and the match lights. Well, I'm teaching you to please have the frame of reference of only be surprised when the box of matches doesn't light. And look twice to find out if it was a match you took out of the box and not a nail or something. Because it runs off just about like that now. I mean we've got it running off with just that degree of accuracy.

As you finally wrap your wits around this to a full embracing of it, you'll get to this point where somebody does something in a session. They get mad at you for instance. You don't say, "Gee, I certainly wish I could audit better, and if I just possibly could audit a little better, maybe the person would never get ARC broke, and what is wrong with my auditing, and the person has a perfect right to cuss me out."

We don't go through this player piano piece, see, because there's no facts in it. We have learned to this degree that if a person got mad at us in session that it's one of these things: We missed a withhold. That's the most probable. Other rudiments are out and the modifier has kicked in—has the high probability of it. And we've missed a withhold and the modifier has kicked in. Or we have missed a withhold or the modifier has kicked in by the other rudiments being out, you see?

And then you have another choice. You've missed a withhold and the modifier's kicked in. That's it, you see. You don't spend a long time going quietly off to your room where you can be quiet and breaking out your violin and tuning it up to a low pitch and saying, "Oh, God, what have I done? I have probably ruined him," you know.

In other words, you're looking at what is and finding it out, it is what it is. You see, your certainty is totally based on whether you can do something about it or not. And if you have certainty you can do something about something, you don't worry about it very much.

You know the least hysterical people around a fire—let's say a warehouse is burning down—oddly enough, the least hysterical people there will be the oldest veteran fireman there. Isn't that odd? And the newspaper reporters who are the old newspaper reporters and that sort of thing.

The other people who will be hysterical—you say well a manager of the plant could be hysterical, and quite understandably because his plant is going up in smoke. I don't know that that's understandable. It's all covered by insurance, and he wanted a new plant anyway. He's just not used to fires. That's all. He doesn't know what makes fires tick, and he doesn't know what puts them out, and he doesn't know the inevitability of fires, and he doesn't know this, and he doesn't know that.

And all those not-knows add up to an hysteria. Worry, concern, hysteria. Those are the things which are going about it. And the local dwellers in the immediate area, they've never seen a fire before. They've gotten up every morning and found out the world was there by looking over and seeing that that plant was there, you see? And what's disappearing on them is a stable datum and they go into fantastic hysteria on the subject because they don't know anything about fires either. But if you left it in the hands of the manager who, of course, himself, is accustomed to running that plant and is a very expert man in running of the plant. He's no expert in handling fires. He never handled one before in his life.

So if you turned it over to him and the local dwellers in the area, they wouldn't even save a shed. Man, I mean to tell you the whole plant would go and probably half the surrounding

countryside too. Because they'd be, "Ahhh, oh, and what do we do now," and they'd pick up a fire hose and then throw it down, you see, and then turn on the water and decide that was too much water, and go and turn it off again. They didn't have enough water, and then they'd go start up a truck and move it some other place, and change the fire lines, and then watch a wall come down, and well, that's just because they don't understand fires, you know. So they can't do anything about it.

Now, you sit there and watch a pc burning down, you'll stop him burning down to the degree that you have a good certainty on what makes pcs burn down. You'll see those first smoking embers go up long before anybody else would detect them. What makes me cross occasionally with an auditor is that I can actually detect an ARC break or a blow about an hour and a half before the average auditor can. And I don't know what's wrong with them, you know?

I say, "Agggg-agggg-agggg-agggg-agggg What is wrong here?" I try to teach them this, you know. I say—I've done this in HGC, you know—"Now look, now listen. The reason why Smith keeps blowing up is because you get something out at the beginning of the session, and then this multiplies, don't you see, and it gets worse, and then he blows. Now, actually, the blow is detectable to you, certainly a half an hour before it happens. Now, please detect the incipient blow and the ARC break long before it happens."

They say okay, and they go back and this time they catch Smith just as he's leaving the chair. And then I have enough reality to appreciate the fact that they did catch him just before he left the chair.

See, I'll argue for the moon and settle for a round of green cheese, but this is the way the thing is, you see? And I'm actually happy that they get that far. I'm not saying how bad auditors are or how good I am. I'm just giving you the level of expectancy.

All right. But it's rather unreasonable of me with terrific familiarity with pcs over an awful long period of time to expect every time that an auditor will recognize that small wisp of smoke long before the building starts burning down and simply walk over, and put his foot on it, and go on with the session, see? That's unreasonable of me to expect that an auditor will do this every time. So, I'm unreasonable. You should be able to do that.

Right away you say, "Well, what have we now, here? This person's being cross? This person's being critical? Not able to get this in too good? Day before yesterday I had some kind of a question. Maybe I didn't get it flat. What was the withhold I missed day before yesterday, if I did? Oh, yeah. That's the one."

Bang! He gives you the withhold, and that's the end of that ARC break, the end of the out-rudiments, and your session goes on. It took you all of thirty seconds. You recognized it, you caught it, you pulled it and you're on to the next action, see? So I'm unreasonable. So do it.

Now, in training up auditors, you have no other choice than to follow through a pattern of training which has emerged over a long period of time. People are so diffident. Anybody is rather so diffident about reaching into anybody's mind that you have to start them out on some kind of a gradient. And don't go and abandon every process that has ever worked on Class I, because a lot of those processes have served their purpose in that they conditioned auditors to being able to sit in an auditing session.

They've made pcs more confident of being able to ask questions, and they have even advanced cases to a remarkable degree, more than anybody else has in the past. So don't be afraid to use these old processes.

Let's get somebody auditing before we get them reaching right into the core of the fellow's mind and picking out a handful of brains, raw and bleeding. I think that's a rather unusual thing for you to demand. You start training an auditor, you sit down and you say, "All right. That's an E-Meter. And when the person gets an idea, why, the needle moves. That's all you need to know about that. All right. Now, ask him if he has ever done anything that his mother would be disappointed in him for. That's right. You ask him that right now. And clear the question good, and I'll come back in a half an hour."

You come back in a half an hour. There's the auditor lying there in a secondhand heap in the middle of the chair with the E-Meter busted over his head, don't you see. And the pc has just caught a plane for Canada. Probably the results as dramatic as that actually almost could exist.

And you just haven't realized how far you've come on the line, that's all. You haven't caught the gradient at a small enough gradient. And you'll find that, some of you, teaching in an Academy or teaching a group of people to audit, and so forth, will encounter that exact phenomena.

Sooner or later you're going to take your finger off your number, and you're going to say, "Well, that's an E-Meter, the needle wiggles. Now, you know all about that. You saw that film, we made the other day, and got that. All right, now just find out what this person's withholding, and get them straightened out, and get them straightened out for an assessment, and that's all you need to know."

The auditor will sit there and—"Huh-huh, no, huh-huh. No, I don't think this is for me."

You've just said, "Well, there's the Empire State Building. Now, take a—it's just an easy jump. Just crouch down now, and spring, and land on the top of the building Now, there you are."

And what have you asked him to do? You've asked him to invade somebody's privacy. And he knows that Galactic Council order number one says, "Thou shalt not invade privacy and the rights of thy fellow being, you slave."

You've just asked him to violate it without any conditioning of any kind whatsoever. He knows better than to violate it. That's kept him a slave for years, so it must be stronger than he is. Years? Kept him a slave for trillennia, so it must be stronger than he is. See how it works? So, you just violated that wildly. Well, there's dozens of things you can do. The smartest thing, if you were going to train somebody up, is to take an E-Meter, a perfectly valid E-Meter, not a dummy one, tell him to be very careful of it, not to drop it, hit people with it. Of course, if you've got any Mark IVs and do that with it you'll regret it because students rather chew up stuff

I tell you, if you got any old squirrel meters or anything like that, you use them. Oh, no, that's bad. That's bad. That's bad, too. No, no, do it with a regular E-Meter, and then call it to one student's attention, "The reason you can't use your E-Meter is because you have been eating sandwiches—keeping your sandwiches in it for the last two or three . . ."

Start up a repair service. Anyway—taking old sandwiches out of it.

But you run a Comm Course? Then you're really going to teach somebody to audit. I'm not talking about a public brought in to run a Comm Course co-audit, see. I'm talking about you're really going to make an auditor. Set him down in a chair, give him an E-Meter whenever he is the student in a student-coach situation. He sits there and holds the E-Meter with the thing plugged in, and nobody holding on to the electrodes. See? He just sits there. You don't care whether the thing is plugged in or not, or he puts them on the other fellow's lap. We don't care

what he does with that. But he sits there and holds the thing And you teach him his Comm Course that way.

Get him up to a point of familiarity because even this slight familiarity gained through a Comm Course is valuable. Every time he's sitting there auditing, well, he knows he's supposed to have an E-Meter in his hands, and he will get familiar with the thing. He'll get familiar with its mass, and it won't start bothering him.

All right. Push him through a Comm Course in that particular fashion. Never let a coach have an E-Meter. Fellow's coaching, no. Fellow is being the auditor, he's got the E-Meter.

And your next stage up the line—now, he's going to run this very difficult process of "think something" Give him an E-Meter. It's an exercise process, see. Give him an E-Meter. And make the person he's (quote) auditing (unquote) hold the E-Meter and he'll see that the thing is wiggling. And that will be very strange to him. He will be able to read all sorts of wild significances into the fact that it's wiggling.

He'll ask you all about it. He'll say, "You know, all the time that that was wiggling there, all the time the person was running it, do you know, the needle was moving, but after awhile it went over to the side of the dial and didn't move anymore. I just thought I'd let you know because I like to keep you advised about these things."

So all of such basic processes, "something you wouldn't mind forgetting," all that sort of thing, he isn't doing anything with the E-Meter at all. Just don't give him any, but just scold the living daylights out of him if he ever dares sit down and audit anybody without holding an E-Meter on his lap. He's not doing a thing with it, don't you see? But he'll eventually find out, "What do you know." I mean, as the fellow goes, you know, "To make the thing center, you have to come over here and move it there. How interesting. You have to move it there in order to make the thing read center. I wonder what that means. It's gone up to 6 now. I'll have to ask the Instructor. Does that mean he's Clear at that point?"

"Oh, here we've got a fellow. He must be almost Clear. He's reading 1." Let him go through all that. Let him be totally baffled. Who cares? As long as they're doing their practice, their practice oddities, just little, little runs. Anything except a CCH type process. Anything except that. That alone is exempt. They don't do the TRs of Upper Indoc, of course, with an E-Meter, and they don't do the CCH Processes, they wouldn't do Op Pro by Dup with an E-Meter. But anything else they sure do it with an E-Meter.

All right. They get up the line on this, give them some talks on the E-Meter. They name the parts of the E-Meter. Show them exactly how it's set up and how it's turned off and how it's turned on. Anything, training materials you have on the subject, and demand that they study E-Meter Essentials and take an examination on it with a grade of 70 percent. You're just going to ask for a grade of 70 percent. And before they are permitted to run an HCO Information Letter type Security Check on anybody, they have to have gotten a grade of 70 percent on E-Meter Essentials, have had some lectures on it, and so forth.

See how downgraded that is. Really downgraded. And you don't let them, at that stage, run anything but the most innocuous type of Security Check, such as, "Have you ever put on shoes?" HCO Information Letters have some on it that are quite beefy, but there are also several innocuous ones that came out which are good student training checks. There's even some with kind of a motivator side of the thing, "Have you ever resented an Instructor speaking to you?" you know? It's this kind of thing—nothing And they can detect those things, and make them security check that, but only after they have attained this grade.

It's actually, you call it Class I grade if you want to, but they've attained this grade. They aren't a Class I at all. So it's just—just a—they're just a student grade. They're permitted to security check. They passed E-Meter Essentials by 70 percent and they've had some training on it and already they've been holding it in their lap for a week or two, see?

And they've had some demonstrations, and they know what it's all about, and then you let them struggle, and these are very innocuous, extremely, extremely, extremely innocuous Security Checks. It doesn't have any meat in them at all. And it'd be a wise thing for an Instructor to go down over the type of Security Check they're using and take out anything that'd ever had a real punch to it to any student. Just thread it out. Just scratch it out. Alter those checks all you want to, but make them innocuous.

Well, "Have you ever returned late for lunch here at the Academy?" You know? That would be just about the upper limit of severity that you would permit on one of these checks, you see?

"Have you ever disliked the color of a dress?" You get what I mean? I mean, these are almost average, everyday situations. And you'll find out they'll get a read. They'll get reads on these things, and they'll be able to "clear" them (quote) (unquote).

But what is the final gain here? I mean, the fact that you've got somebody who can handle the thing, he finds out it operates, he finds out he can security check.

All right. That would be your next stage. That would be your total stage there of training on the thing, he's using them. And he continues to use them for any other auditing, but he also actually runs these innocuous-type Security Checks.

Now, we make this fellow actually pass the examinations of a Class II auditor: Hundred percent grade on E-Meter Essentials, demonstrations, tapes, anything else, any materials on the E-Meter, has to pass them a hundred percent, and then we let him use the Joburg, an HCO Policy Letter form type check. And we won't let them touch one of those forms until. Otherwise, you're going to have mangled masses of auditor lying all over the floor and people acting as pcs blowing for the North Pole as a routine action.

Why? Because it's just going to cause the most fantastic amount of randomity in an Academy. Missed withholds by the ton. Well, you can pick up this missed withhold, which is a training withhold, "Have you ever been late for lunch while you've been at the Academy?" See? So somebody missed that withhold. Oh, well, so somebody missed the withhold. He realizes he's being checked by a student and it's all kind of funny anyhow and fuzzy, and it isn't very important, and you're not going to give him randomity.

But you ask, "Have you ever raped anyone?"

The meter falls off the pin. Got a person who spent seven years in prison on three different occasions for rape, and feels worse about it every minute, and then the student says, "Well, isn't that the lunch bell?"

Well, the guy goes out, puts on his hat, catches the plane for Canada. He might as an afterthought come back and shoot the student who did it. But this would simply be the mechanisms, the mechanisms which you would restimulate by not following such a policy.

So these are the stages of training. Now, the mere reason of having passed a Class II classification in an Academy or in a field auditor's training unit or in a special course out in the field someplace, that doesn't make anybody a Class II Auditor. It just permits them to use HCO

Policy form Security Checks. And they shouldn't be permitted near one until they can pass those qualifications as stiff as a Class II Auditor. Don't you think that's wise?

Audience: Yes.

All right. Now, Academy training and training of people will begin early to give you a good insight into what kind of an auditor this fellow's going to be and which way this fellow's going to go, and what this fellow's going to do, and what this fellow's not going to do. You should be able to catch all that up rather, rather quickly. You should take a pretty good estimate of the situation.

But the length of time in training can often be slowed up. But remember that it isn't going to do you too much good to suddenly say, "This student is not learning well and so we'd better send him over to the HGC, or we better send him over to an auditor; I'd better audit him, find his 3D package, and then he will learn better."

You haven't speeded anything up. Instead of getting trained then, he is just going to get audited forever. You're not going to find his 3D package. What's wrong with him?

Well, he needs all of his preparatory work. You could send him over to an auditor or send him into an HGC or something like this to get his 75 hours preparatory done. Oh, yeah, well, that would be quite wise. Nothing wrong with that. But you would not be able to go this other route and say, "Well, we just—all you have to do is find the fellow's 3D package, and that's it. That'll change everything around, and instantly he'll feel better, and he'd be Clear," and so on.

Going on the basis of training Clears would be quite interesting, only you would very rapidly run out of auditors to clear auditors. I don't care if we were five years up the track, with a Scientology population of Earth of fifty million people. No, you'd be running out of auditors all the time. That is a course which runs out of auditors.

In other words, if nobody can be trained until they have been cleared, that you will find will never work. You see, because you always got that many more people being cleared. It's almost fatal, you know, to clear people. You disseminate Scientology. So it defeats itself at once. How would you like to be the only auditor in Egypt with training up against this one basis, that we musn't train anybody until they're Clear. Well, that would be great, wouldn't it? That would leave you auditing everybody in Egypt. Well, maybe this would be all right, but I don't think it's a very optimum solution. Certainly never train any auditors because you'd never get around to clearing anybody either. You'd have maybe fifteen people on the auditing lineup and about three years later, you would have fifteen Clears. But you still wouldn't have any auditors, would you?

So, now you would go out on the basis, don't you see, of clearing up some more people and it would take you another three—. You know, you get the wild nonsense that would go on on such a program. You'd just better make up your mind to it that there is no other solution than to train uncleared, unprocessed people. That's all. This other one is an ideal piece of nonsense. It arithmetically breaks down at once. Actuarially it becomes utterly unfeasible. There isn't anyway it could be done. So, you'd just have to go ahead and train uncleared auditors, that's all.

Therefore the subject of training uncleared people becomes quite a technology in itself, because it's nowhere near the same technology as training people who have been cleared. That's an entirely different training technology. You give them something to memorize, and they memorize it and you tell them how to apply it and they apply it and they think that's fine, they go on and do it and they do a perfectly good job. So what? Then the pc gets in desperate trouble and they've never been trained or audited by a bad auditor and they can't understand why. Then

they begin to think people are unreasonable. And that would be the end product of that—would be a total breakdown all the way along the line. That's right.

I was auditing somebody not too long ago, and I—suddenly dawned on me that this person audited rather poorly because they had absolutely no experience of bad auditing, and they didn't think—person perfectly reasonable—but they didn't think any one of these parts of anything were important. Never happened to them. So therefore it couldn't possibly be important.

There's nothing that makes a citizen out of you like being run on a level—I'm not saying that everybody should have this happen, but it certainly would make an awful citizen out of you. Wow, would you really, after that, become absolutely savage on the subject—let somebody assess you on the Prehav Scale and then run it, leave it unflat, assess a new level on the Prehav Scale, run it, leave it unflat, assess a new level on the Prehav Scale, run it and leave it very unflat, and then try to function. That's an absolute sure way of feeling crazy.

I know of no better way to make yourself feel crazy than to have that happen to you. You know, you feel uuhuhh. You're not sure whether the world is still square or not. It gets these must-reach-can't-reach ridges, you see, all in restim. Well, if you—that would be a severe thing and nobody is going to do that particularly just for the fun of—it feels so nice when you stop hitting yourself on the head with a hammer, you know, I mean.

But somebody sits there and their TRs are horrible and their metering is fumbly and that sort of thing—well, it sort of gives you the idea that all of that could be improved. And it gives you a certain perfectionist attitude toward training. And that perfectionist attitude will disappear if everyone was perfect before you started making auditors out of them. You'd no longer have perfect auditing at all; you'd have rather sloppy auditing. In a very short space of time the whole technology would get lost in the slop of it all. It's an interesting viewpoint.

There is a value in having been aberrated, and don't you ever forget it. It has given you a wealth of experience which you can attain in no other way. That that experience is at this time, more or less unavailable to you and has not been used by you, has nothing to do with it. As you go on up with case progress and so forth, you'll find a tremendous amount of experience there. And remember it was, every single bit of it, the experience of a knucklehead. The way you had all of this experience was by being a damn fool. You were a professional. That's about what it amounts to—a knucklehead.

Now, that doesn't mean that all of your experience should be that rough.

But you will find out that eventually you will remember something or other. I think a trillion and a half years ought to be, or two hundred trillion at the outside, I should think would be long enough for a person to get enough experience on the subject of knuckleheadedness. I have faith in you. I don't think you learn slower than that. And I don't think at this particular time you need any further experience in your terminals. I think you've accumulated most of the available experience. It's very doubtful that anything that could happen to your terminal has not happened to you.

Well, looking at it reversely, I think you should get some experience in other lines for a change. Broaden your view, you know. But you'll find out that it's peculiarly a parallel with auditing, that life, when it does follow to some degree (this doesn't have to be exaggerated) a pattern from a highly aberrated to a rather sane state—when you're going in that particular direction. The best way to accumulate experience in that direction is by taking a person when they're aberrated and teach them something and improve them at the same time. It doesn't matter how gradually you improve them as long as you keep on improving them and they're learning as they go.

Man, when they get through with that channel they'll be able to tell you things about it you never realized. They've been over the jumps. They know it wrong side out now. They know all there is to know about it. You never look upon misadventure as being much of a teacher. Well, in the final analysis if you've got to learn by experience at all, it is only misadventure that will teach you. The greatest successes in the world can go unremarked if you have nothing with which to compare them.

Now, you realize that getting somebody sane and walking straight and their psychosomatic done and the person back in action and all of this kind of thing happening, you realize, you have a pretty good idea that, one, it takes a bit of doing, and two, it is very well worth doing You've got that as an action cycle—you have a good view of that sort of thing We could easily lose that.

If all you had to do was say, "Take this pill," and the person takes the pill and the person cleared instantly and they were now Clear and totally sane and they went on about their business, do you realize that clearing would have absolutely no value of any kind whatsoever. Wouldn't have any value.

In the old days most of the people who were real worried and plowed-in and so forth, used to worry about being—all they had to do was unbuckle their pants buckle and drop one side and have you shoot them in the gluteus maximus and they'd be Clear. They were always dreaming of something like this happening I never dreamed about it happening I' let a few of them be demonstrated to me. But, I never dreamed about it happening One, it wouldn't be clearing, it would be total enslavement. Because, what is this? This is just a new overwhelm, isn't it?

Nobody ever appreciates his freedom unless he has to work for it. And if he does, he values it and he then finds out that he is free. And we'll go further than that: If a person doesn't work for his freedom, he never finds out he's free. So, there'd be no such thing as a Clear who hadn't worked for it. You're going to clear people sometimes, that are going to look at you and say, "Of course, yes, naturally, uh-huh. Fine."

And you look at them and you wonder why you bothered. They have no realization of anything having happened or anything really having been improved, or that they're going anyplace and they have no purpose to which they may put this new breath of skill and it's far more than they need in anything they're doing on this cotton-picking planet. And the net result is a sort of a odd feeling of lose for you. It isn't quite that grim. They invite you to dinner. They introduce you to everybody. They're very enthused about you and so forth and they keep going on to the PTA and sitting there and taking notes and... So why doesn't this person do something in life? Well, they haven't found out they can.

It's something like a fellow, you've taken these chains off of him, you know, and it's left—and the chains were a little bit rusty and it's left some rust marks on him one way or the other, and he keeps looking at the rust marks and he still thinks they're chains. He doesn't know they're gone. I imagine he could probably go on like that for a century or two and then someday he'd read something in a book or something like that and it'd say this fellow was Clear and could do so and so, and he all of a sudden says, "Well, I think I could do that," and reaches up and says, "What do you know, I'm not wearing any chains. What happened?"

And then go into a total overwhelm and build a stone image with your features. Set you up as a household deity and pray to you every night—as the fate of people who do sudden things that other people never earn or appreciate. Of course, it gives you a lot of heads to go into but they are usually stone.

All right. Well, I just thought I'd better give you a few words on the training and upgrading of auditors and what you should look forward to in that particular line, because I think you'll be needing the information. And I hope the data is of some help.

Thank you.