

CLEARING

A lecture given on
9 August 1962

Thank you. Thank you very much.

What's the date?

Audience: 9th of August.

Ninth of August? What planet? Nine August, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

Subject of lecture: Clearing. Series of two lectures here, one of which is clearing in general and the second lecture will be on the specific technology of listing in which you will be very, very interested.

All right. What are you trying to do? Well, you're trying to clear people. Now, that may not be what you're trying to do according to your goal but unreactively, you are, of course, quite happy to do just that. Therefore, you should recognize that all processes are subordinate to this final end. There are no processes that compare with those that clear. That is very much the case.

Now, you have to consider that an individual, in order to be clearable, has to be auditable. So that therefore becomes part of clearing to the degree that it is—assists clearing. And if at any time an individual cannot be audited, he of course cannot be cleared. That's awfully plain, isn't it? That's one of these idiotic things: The way to get up the—across the river is to get across the river. You know? But you're going to face this. You're going to face this many times. You're going to have somebody who is unauditable and you're trying to clear them.

Well, what do I mean by unauditable? There's nothing very esoteric about the definition. If the fellow can't talk and can't listen and can't respond, he, of course, is unauditable.

So when we're speaking of unauditable for the subject matter of clearing, we have nothing to do with the old, I think it's Kraepelin, I think the fellow's name was, over in Germany. I think—it really was! I mean—he made up this scale of insanities and I don't know—very Germanic subdivisions of subdivisions into the subdivisions and all of this sort of thing and this terrific chart. I mean, it's marvelous. They took it over to the United States and they sort of amputated it down and cut out a lot of the steps and then changed the definitions of those, but aside from that alter—is, they're using the same chart.

Now, that's states of sanity. And you frankly don't have anything to do with a state of sanity. Just make up your mind on that, right there. You got nothing to do with it. I know it is an intriguing subject, but consider it one of the lesser para - Scientology subjects that somebody should study sometime for a master's thesis in a University of Scientology somewhere up the track when you can't teach him anything else. You got the idea? See? It's a subordinate subject to Scientology. Yet the whole world tries to force any activity in the field of the mind either into the field of insanity or the field of advertising.

Now, our difficulties are multiplied by the fact that the public at large believes that we have a lot to do with sanity whereas—now I'm giving you a technical truth; what we had to say about insanity had to do with difficulties in auditing and other things in the past, you see.

Well, just kind of lay all that aside and just skip it. Assign it to propaganda, necessary statements, efforts to keep organizations and auditors from getting themselves in trouble and, you know.

So we've used this word "insanity" from time to time. We've used this word "sanity" from time to time. But actually we have no business having anything to do with either because there isn't a human being on Earth today who is sane. They're all batty or they wouldn't be here.

It's just—it's one of these definitions that proves itself, you know. You say, "Is this fellow insane?" Well, you can't say he's insane because we don't know what the definition of that is. But is he sane? And we find him in a small factory working someplace at a drill press, you see, and he comes down to the drill press in the morning, at 8:00 in the morning and he goes this way—see? And he does this until 5:30, see. And he does this five days a week. That guy must be crazy! His total horizon is being retired someday by a socialist government which, of course, having drained the population of taxes in the interim, probably won't exist at the time of his retirement. His complications are many, but you couldn't say that he is taking the optimum solution out along the line.

And I'm afraid you could only define sanity. You cannot define insanity. And somebody who is sane could be defined as: a person who resolves problems for the greatest good of the greatest number of dynamics. That's a sane action. We can define that; I think you would agree with that. I'm not shoving it down your throats as the definition of sanity. We don't even have to have it as a technical fact, but I think you'd rather agree with that as sane.

Well, when you look at the actions of human beings and their various tangles and so forth, very few of their problems are solved with that equation. So, which of course, rather debars them from the subject.

So we haven't anything to do with sanity or insanity—nothing. The guy's in a spinbin; that doesn't prove he's sane or insane or anything else. See, it proves nothing. The only thing you're interested in is the auditability of a person. See? The second you've got clearing as an absolute fact—there it is—you're only then interested in the auditability of a person.

So people fall into a gradient scale of auditability which passes out down into a scale of inauditability. And that's what you should really study if you're going to study states of man and that sort of thing: is are they auditable. Now, that is a very narrow look. That is a very narrow look because it's a technical look.

A person who is not Clear will not resolve things for the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics. Even a first—goal Clear won't, ordinarily—and I think you will find it borne out that you get a second goal, third goal and all of a sudden they're starting to really look around and observe things in that their equating and resolving problems and so forth will step up to that degree—will begin to match up to that particular definition, of a proper definition of a solution to a problem for the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics.

But look, I'm talking to you now—not on a basis of propaganda or what I'd like the world to believe or anything else—I'm just talking to you straight from the shoulder what I know. And what I know is this: There is no processing short of clearing that is worth long and arduous hours. See, there is none. Now, that we've got 3GA, we can take a look back along the line and we can see easily how hard we have worked for what tiny gains. Now, that's—those gains were well worth making. My God, let's not downgrade this fact. They were well worth making, but the gain we can make in comparison to these things by clearing is something like a matchstick up against the Empire State Building. You see? The comparative values of these things are fantastic in compa—they're hardly—they're not of the same order of magnitude hardly, you see?

You got somebody over his headaches, and he got along better with his family. Fine. Good. Wonderful. Nobody could do it before on this planet. And, therefore our existence has been justified. But look, we all of a sudden have got our hands on a fact here. And this fact is 3GA

and I've watched it now. I've kept my eye on this and I just give it to you straight from the shoulder. I mean what we're doing has absolutely—hardly any comparative value with what we've done at all. And the value of actual clearing is so great. And it does so much for the person that to strike for a lesser goal when that other goal of clearing is in your power, of course is an awful waste of time. So we become interested in auditability.

Now, every now and then, there's one or another amongst you I start worrying about, see? That isn't anything that you disturb my dreams or something, but I see how you are doing and how you are not doing, and so forth, and I start worrying. I see your case going awry or something like that. Your Instructors can tell you—all I do is start "push, push" along this line, you know. Well, how can we get him up into 3GA group, you see? And how can we somehow or other cut the corners on this, and how can we press this one forward, and how can we get this person to audit well enough so that he can receive some auditing and, you see, and it's all—it's this kind of action that is taking place, see.

And the difficulty that we face is actually not a technical difficulty that an auditor faces to a pc, see. Here is a little bit of a different difficulty. You are technicians. You are Scientologists. You are scientists. You are people who can do things with the human mind. You practically—this small confine here—practically all the people on Earth who are experts on the subject are confined at this moment in this very small area. See?

All right. The trick is from my viewpoint, to get somebody who can clear somebody else while being cleared, see, that's the stunt. Otherwise nothing else works—not on this planet, you see.

All right. So we're faced with this additional problem, and your judgment on this course is liable to be warped a little bit as to the auditability of somebody because he's not up in the 3GA group, see. There isn't anybody on this course who couldn't be that fast in the 3GA group, you see. You walk right straight in the front door and just go straight onto a 3GA group providing there was no requisite they pay for any of the auditing they get by auditing. You see? Yet there was no requisite. We maybe could have a staff of a half a dozen people and these people are all groomed up, and a student comes in and we audit that student to Clear and then he walks on out the front door and gets lost in the vast multitude, or something like this. You see?

Now, that is not an optimum condition. You may have disagreement with this and you're perfectly welcome to disagree with this because I point it out clearly as simply a point of view. My struggle has not been to clear people. My struggle has been to get people to clear people. You see?

Now, if we can do that, we've got this—we got it licked. We've got this planet licked. We've got the biggest breakthrough that has happened on this planet—ever! There has never been a comparable breakthrough—all right—such as we have in our hands right this minute, because we are doing that very thing and therefore it's a tremendous breakthrough. So don't adjudicate your judgment as to who is clearable on the basis of somebody is in rudiments and havingness section, see? See? Don't go off to that degree. He's in rudiments and havingnesses because he can't audit anybody well enough to receive auditing yet. Got the idea? Or he's working up till he can. We don't have any unauditable cases here from a standpoint of clearing. Now, does that open your minds up a little bit on this?

Audience: Mm—hm.

There isn't one in the place. Not one.

There's some dirty needles. There are some people that have a little difficulty to stay in—session. And all those things are curable by the very things which you're being taught. That is to say you can give them some rudiments and Havingness sessions and you can give them some Prepchecking sessions and you can pull their overts and there goes their dirty needle;

and you can straighten them out and then you can take them right on through and find their goal. Now, that's—that's the truth of the case. Don't you see?

You actually are not being subjected to inauditable cases, and you aren't. Now, getting your point of view, then, straightened out, just on this: How bad off does a person have to be to be unauditable? How bad off is he? Well, it's pretty bad; it's pretty bad. Now, I'll tell you what makes them unauditable: it's how many overts they are secretly committing during the period of auditing. That's a factor.

Now, if you have got somebody so poorly under your thumb as an auditor, see, his control factor in the session poor, and goes out and goes this ... You don't have them show up for sessions by reason of the fact that they're dead drunk or in court or something like this. Don't you see? There are a lot of things getting in the road of your auditing all the time. You see? Well, that's what makes them unauditable more than anything else. Or he keeps coming into session with a dirty needle. You clean it up today and he comes in tomorrow, and so forth, you see. You just can't...

Now, the person who can be cleaned up and who can somehow be bludgeoned into keeping his snoot clean long enough for you to read his needle, see, all right—that is the lowest level of auditability.

Now, below that level you have the fellow who won't tell you, who will never give any of his overts up, who will not cooperate with you or be frank with you, and from that point on there it all is. I mean, right on down to the fact that he can't talk at all. See? From—for our purposes, the communication level at which auditability ceases is where the person will not talk to the auditor frankly. See?

Now understand, an auditor's got lots of tricks and he can force a lot of people to talk to him. And he can force them under control and dire warnings: "You come in here just one more morning with that many overts the night before and I'll pick up this E—Meter—I won't audit you tomorrow—I'll just pick up this E—Meter and break it over your head. Do you understand? Then you'll owe me for an E—Meter. See? Got the idea? When you go home tonight, walk only on the left side of the street. Don't say a word to your wife. Go to bed quietly. Don't have any fight this morning at breakfast because I'm not going to spend another two hours cleaning up your breakfast quarrel. Now, keep it easy now and we'll have you through the knothole," see.

You know, I mean you could be that tough. But that person that you could do that with that that would work on, you see, he's still in this band of auditability—the person that can be almost bludgeoned into giving up his withholds. Oh, you—auditor has lots of tricks this way: "Well, I'm willing to sit here the rest of the night. There's the read. Where's the overt? I'm willing to sit here the rest of the night until you tell me, but are you?"

Just fold up the E—Meter and sit back in your chair. Yeah, you've got all kinds of forcing tricks, but you see there's a band of people on which this doesn't work. Below that, is only the people that you can't force to give up any overts. You can't force them to be frank with you. You know, just can't make it any way you can possibly think of Comes in here, needle going: bang—bang—bang—bang—bang, bang—bang—bang—bang—bang—bang, bang—bang—bang—bang—bang—bang—and you say, "What have you done?"

"Nothing."

"What crimes have you committed in the last 24 hours?"

"Nothing." Try any trick in the trade. "I haven't done a thing. Oh, I'm telling you the truth. I've always told you the truth!" See, now we're getting down.

Now, whether that personality is psychotic or neurotic or badly bent or anything else, we couldn't care less. See, the personality is a fact. See? We don't care what classifications or labels gets assigned to the personality. We can't break through to smooth this case out enough.

Now, it isn't that our meter won't read. You see? That's not actually—that would be on the apparent surface of it, the debarring factor. Of course that makes it impossible too, but it's actually that this guy's not going to sit still long enough and he's got so many curves on the line that you're never even going to clean up one goal. Look, if you can't get him to talk to you, how are you ever going to get any rudiments in or anything else? You see? Regardless of whether you were auditing him on a meter or not. If you were to just lay a meter aside and try to audit him up the line on the something or other, you'd just get a pack of lies, and of course, the meter—at the end of the session you'd have to clean everything up at the end of session, you see. It'd be a mess!

So it—that person, you see, goes down into this other category and you're now down into the CCH band. Now, we call him “unauditable” for purposes of clearing, but he is preparable. Almost anybody, if they're not dead and can talk, is preparable—almost anybody. That will be one of the great studies of tomorrow, see—that isn't necessarily you study it today at all. I was doing some work on it a year or two ago. I was thinking, “Well, how do you get a whole institution of people—pull the psychiatrist off their neck—how do you get a whole institution of people to—some of them come through it. You know, I was thinking about, well, it's rest and some food and give them some large objects that they can sit around in courtyards and just look at, you see—good stable data. Other trickery of this particular character, but you see, they can't be audited, but they might be prepared for auditing.

Now, let's take another level of extremity of prepared for auditing. This fellow has a cut artery and is pumping what gallonage he has in gore over the local pavement. Now, he is not at that moment auditable. You see, by the time you had cleared the auditing command, you see, he has no more fluid to pump through the blood system. Now, now there is a comparison between that as an immediate emergency action and preparing somebody so he can be audited, see.

Well, naturally, the thing to do is to put a tourniquet on it and bandage him up somehow or another and square him around and get the emergency off of the situation, and then you can probably audit him—and undoubtedly should, to get a nice clean healing of such a wound. But you're going to find that on a broader sense a lot of human beings come into this category—a lot of them. They're quite a few. There's Betsy Ann who has migraine headaches and who won't talk to the auditor and who doesn't want to listen to anything about Scientology, doesn't want to hear about it, and yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap and is very angry with her husband all the time because—because he goes off with those Scientologists and so forth. And he is interested in that, and he don't—and so forth, and— isn't it terrible, and so forth, and they're a bunch of raaaaa and raauw—raauw, raaaruw and raauw and so on—and my migraine headache is killing me! And yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, you see. And finally, the husband comes around to you and says, “Well, look, why can't you audit her?” Well, he's asking you to look down the long road, you know. CCHs or maybe even just rest, you see—something of this sort.

Now, there's some fellow who has had the latest psychiatric operation. They take an ice—cream scoop and go in through a hole in the top of the skull, you see, and empty the gray matter out, and so forth. And he's lost all of his coordination. He can't do anything, and he can't talk, and he can't do this. Well, he's not necessarily a throwaway—not necessarily. You might be able to by CCHs and other drills and—but, even more fundamentally, just by letting him recuperate a bit and so forth, he might get up to a point where he could communicate to you somewhat.

There's a fellow lying in a coma. He's a CCH case. You can generally pull them through that. You see, you got all kinds of these cases down there. They're—you might say, they're not

immediately auditable. They are preparable for auditing. Now, don't forget this: that that fellow's going to kick the bucket—the unauditale case—sooner or later and he's going to pick up another body sooner or later, you see, and you catch him up the track somewhere so he's still not all the way gone—providing the technology is still there. See. That's the little question mark on that fact.

Now, I wouldn't spend any more time on any of the unauditale cases—now let's get back to some very factual facts here—spend any more time on an unauditale case than is necessary to put them into a state of finding their goal and listing it out. Now with some case, that's five years—that's five years of rehabilitation, see. A manual, operating with weaving or something, you know.

And with somebody else, that's five hours of Prepchecking. See, it's that variable. There is no case that can't be reached except the case that isn't there and will never hear of it. Now, if the case is never there and will never hear of Scientology, yes, he comes into the absolute. That is a theoretical absolute, don't you see? He's way out of sight. See, you're never going to lay your hands on him, but to some degree, others are preparable and some are just auditable. You just sit down and—well, you got a banging needle and you say—use some of your trickery. You say, “Now, let's see, Gracie Ann. What question would be the most nerve—racking question that I could think of, Betsy Ann?”

“Well, am I a virgin?”

“Well, are you a virgin?”

“Oh, of course, yes. Ha—ha—ha—ha. Oh, yes, yeah. I sure am.”

Now, you really get a rock slam, see. And you say, “All right, Betsy Ann. Now, let's level with it.”

“Well, I can't—can't talk to you about it, you know.”

Well, you've ended the session. You say, “Well, when you come back to see me tomorrow, I want you to have made up your mind whether or not the withhold which you have there is worth going the next 200 trillion years in misery for.”

And she comes back in and you say, “All right now, Betsy Ann. How about this question you didn't want me to ask you?”

“Well,” she said, “there's Bill and Joe and Pete and Tom and Dick, so on and so on, and the priest in the village and so forth.” And the needle quiets down; the needle quiets down. You run a little bit of O/W and the bank stops shifting around, and you say, “All right. Give me a list of your goals.” You got the idea? Whatever trickery; whatever duress that is put on her is justified by those means. That's safe. That's it, that's up to you to get the fellow or the girl to talk to you. That's the case. That's the lowest rung of case you probably will be having too much to do with.

Now, if you take somebody who is a habitual drunk, and he goes out and robs service stations every night to pay for his liquor every morning, and he's doing this and he's doing that, and he's doing something or other and he runs up five overts for every one you pull off, don't you see. His level of responsibility is just horrible. And he can't seem to stay with it, as far as you're concerned—he keeps giving you all kinds of trouble and so forth. Well, please recognize you're dealing with an unauditale case. Like the case needs a—needs a tremendous amount of therapy of some kind. You probably need a stockade, man, you know, and turn the key on him and let him sit over in the corner under the sorrel brush and think it over for a few days on water. About the time when the dt's are ready to kill him off, say, “Well, it's horrible what a reactive bank can do, you know.” Slip it to him. But it doesn't come under the heading so much of auditing.

You can spend fantastic quantities of time preparing a case that is almost unpreparable and your heart will only get broken by that case. See, he's apparently auditable. He actually isn't auditable. You have to make up your mind about this, see. You can't force him into a groove. Oh, the case that can be forced into a groove any way you can do it, is of course auditable, but this fellow can't really be forced into a groove. He can't really be made to go into session as far as you're concerned, and so forth. Recognize that at this particular moment we don't have the tools of therapy necessary to handle such a case which is possibly a stockade and a bottle of water, you know? And if we were to put him in the backyard and chain him to a tree for a few days, even if he's a chronic alcoholic, do you know that neighbors—neighbors being what they are—they'd probably complain. Therefore, the littlest good to the fewest number of dynamics.

Frankly, the audibility of people depends in a large measure on the sphere of influence of the Scientologist, see. And when his sphere of influence is big enough that—all of them become auditable. See, here's Grandma and she's going nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah at the family and that sort of thing and she's raising hell with them. She holds all the purse strings, tells them they can't do this and all that sort of thing, and so forth. And, well, right now there wouldn't be a thing you could do about it, but in another age you possibly could say, "Grandma, why the hell don't you get off your overts?" you know? And she'd say, "This is a Scientologist talking to me. I had better start singing." You get the idea? That's what reputation will do for you.

Now, not advocating rough stuff or anything like that with regard to such people, I'm just trying to make it clear to you that you've got a wonderful gift in your hands.

And you start spending five years trying to set up an alcoholic simply because his brother has a million gabutnicks, all of the people you could have cleared in five years remain unclear. That's interesting, isn't it? And probably at the end of the game, because your sphere of influence isn't as great as it should have been because you weren't in there creating it, you won't have even cleared this guy's brother, see—not him either. I can see it now.

So you've got your sphere of action that would do the world the most good, is the auditable case—the sphere of the auditable case—who can be audited. Gosh, that goes down pretty far. I could pull some people in off the street that would make you blink on the subject of whether they were auditable or not. And I'd say a person is perfectly auditable; go on and audit.

One day a girl comes in—a girl comes in, walks up to Suzie and she was sitting at the Registrar's desk in Phoenix, Arizona—many, many, many years ago—and says to Suzie something on the order of. "I want Ron to audit me." And Suzie says something or other, something or other and take it in a matter of course, and starts to write the girl's name down, and says, "All right. What's your name?" You know, I'll at least put her through the formalities here. And the girl said, "Well, what is my name?" I think she even sat there trying to invent some names for herself or trying to guess at it. She didn't have a clue, man—she didn't have a clue. And I think I gave her two sessions—an hour—oh, something like an hour and a half and something like an hour and three—quarters. Life straightened out; she went out and got married. She's still around. Memory came back. Everything's fine. Obviously unauditable: Couldn't think of her name, couldn't talk, couldn't sit still, on the run, didn't know who she was—strictly spinbin stuff, don't you see? But the difference was that she was perfectly willing to answer the auditor's questions. She was still in communication. And although for a while, that needle might have been slamming around on the meter, it calmed down pretty fast, don't you see? So do you get the difference here? She was auditable. Strictly spinbin stuff—you know?

Now, a psychiatrist would have said, "This is a very sick, neurotic girl." Yes, she was. She had a compulsion to turn into a prostitute in order to get even with her parents who were Presbyterians. She had a compulsion to. She was making a good job of it too. But see, by all the textbooks, this is a spinbin case and by our textbooks she was quite auditable.

Another girl, because she had been in an institution, came in and saw another Registrar one time. She's—had an institutional history long as your arm. The Registrar says, "Well, the person isn't processable—couldn't be. Look at the history, you know: out of this institution, into that institution, and here and there and the other place, and wow!" See? She was even a rather gruesome—looking character. And I said, "Well, I'd—I better see about this." And I didn't audit her, by the way. But I wanted to see whether or not she was auditable. So I had her come in and put mock—ups in various corners of the room, hold them there—various kinds of mock—ups and hold them there stably. And she could mock up anything and put it there, and it would stay there just as it was and move it around. Perfectly in control of her mental pictures. Interesting, huh? Quite auditable. She got audited and away we go.

Another girl comes in: nice family, everything is fine, background beautiful, all polished up, so forth—beautiful parents, very pretty, she's well dressed—she's this, she's that, she's the other thing. Augggggggggg. Shouldn't happen to an auditor. She's got one of these automatically shifting banks. She can't sit still one moment or the other, one minute to the next. She can't answer questions. You say, "Did you eat soup for lunch?" And she says, "Hitler's no good, you know." Unauditable without a terrific amount of rest and preparation and everything else and so proved to be.

You see, it isn't what life has labeled them. See. Now, furthermore, it really doesn't much matter how buggy they sound. They could sound awful, awful, awful spinny and still be quite auditable.

The difference, I suppose, is this: The fellow knows he can get better or that there's some hope or he should take a crack at it and the other fellow who was unauditable knows there isn't any hope and there isn't any reason to take a crack at it and you couldn't get better anyhow, see. I suppose that would be the handiest little rule of thumb by which to judge these two things—just fast like that.

Fellow knows you can't get any better, knows he isn't any better, knows he's absolutely right in life and it's everything that has been done to him. You add all these things in, don't you see. He knows it's everybody else's fault but you can't do anything to him that would ever make anything of it better and so forth. Thinks he's being totally sincere about it—knows that any efforts to help anybody are based on trickery, quackery. I could run you off a whole lot of this stuff, but you've heard this in part or in full many times. Well, you try to get that guy on the E—Meter and try to get him to talk and you can't read the needle and you can't do this, and you can't do that. But on the other hand, you still might be able to straighten him out and change his mind, don't you see. Such a ease you'd have to find out. Now, it's you who are the judge of this.

Now, it doesn't matter how buggy they sound to you on some of their ideas. They can come around to you and say, "Throgmagog" is going to tip over the Empire State Building at any minute and I worry all the time because I own some stock in American Tel & Tel," and you wonder what the devil this has got to do with anything. Well, some people can have a nutty idea and know it's nutty, and other people have a nutty idea and they don't know it's nutty.

Do you understand that, how a person's goal could make them sound utterly batty, whereas they're quite auditable. It's just a goal, see. "To keep buildings from falling down," you see. Let's say that's the person's goal and the person is always found with their hand up against the side of the building keeping buildings from falling down, you know. Police would lock them up. You put them on an E—Meter; they're quite auditable.

So we get down to just this one criterion: Are people auditable? Well, how much preparatory auditing should you do? Well, to make them auditable on goals processes, and that's the full answer. Now, you can sit on somebody's chest that is doing some of the wildest things and still find their goal, but I wouldn't make it any tougher on myself than I had to, because look—a—here, finding a goal is a terrific stress and strain on the pc. Now, nulling by mid

ruds makes them much better, makes them feel better, is a much calmer procedure and that sort of thing, but they've got to answer your questions.

And if you had a pc who had sporadically dirty needles and wouldn't communicate with you and that sort of thing and you've tried to do something with, and you get four goals nulled in a three—hour session, you know—ha—ha—ha—ha—oh. Next day you get two. You're missing withholds all over the place and so forth. I guarantee you about the third day you'll get none. See, that's—that is hitting it too early. A person is not really sufficiently in—session to have a goals process run on them. See?

These are things which you have to develop a judgment about. I could lay you down a lot of rules of thumb and so forth, but the best way that you'll learn is to do just exactly what you will do, regardless of what I tell you. Here one of these fine days, why, you'll be sitting there and somebody says, "Oh, a Saint Hill graduate. Gee—whiz! Ha—ha. Well, I'll pay you an awful lot in order to find my goal and I've always wanted to have my goal found," and so forth.

And you say, "Well, I—I guess so. Yes. All right. Fine," and so forth. And you say, "Well, I have to really do a little bit of preparatory. . ."

"Well, no. I—no. No, the only Condition under which I'll be audited is if you find my goal right away without wasting any time on this other stuff, you see, because I'm a really very high—toned person."

And you'll be pulled in. You say you won't, but this will happen to you, all of you, sooner or later. You've got your list of goals and you start down at the top. "To catch—to catch catfish. Ahh, it's null, I—I guess." You're in for it, man, because this will get worse, not better, because the pc is never as calm as he is at the beginning. He gets less calm as he goes on. Now, if there's anything wrong with the case at the beginning, it's going to be multiplied before you get to the end. Oh, well. That will be up to you.

But I want to tell you this about clearing: There isn't anything wrong with anybody except he's upped himself a basic purpose of some kind or other for reasons he has not. No—no reason to it. And there it sits and then when this is disobeyed and so on, then it's all blocked off, and then you get a bank developed and then a bunch of other purposes that he doesn't want, get hooked up onto this so he does those; and then pretty soon he doesn't know who he is, and he picks up a body, and here we go, you see. And then he gets all kinds of this—a's and that—a's and the other things and he is indecisional and he is upset about this and he's upset about that. Well now, look. How you going to audit it? Well, how you going to audit it with a lick and a promise little, old, light process?

I'm appalled at our impudence. I am, you know. When I look at the tightrope walk that it takes to get somebody through to Clear, see. When I look at it from a research viewpoint, it's absolutely impossible to have ever found a tightrope. See, you couldn't find that tightrope in all those Grand Canyons for you didn't even know what canyon you were trying to cross, man. And yet it works out very simple and there's really nothing to it.

You've got yourself a—you got yourself an action here, like trying to chip away at Mount Rushmore with a small Boy Scout hatchet. And after you've been slugging at it for a few hundred years, you see, why you've made a slight dent—inches deep. Now, there's no doubt but that we could do things nobody else could do. We could bring about a cessation of aches and pains and straighten people out and run grief charges and do all kinds of things. This is all quite remarkable, but when you look at it in comparison, it doesn't compare.

In the first place, almost anything you did to somebody was sooner or later going to cave in again. He either had by some confidence engendered in himself—could get a gradient scale of peeling it off if he wasn't too solidly in the GPM and he could blow clear of that and park that over there someplace and he could live quite happily with it. That was a Clear. At any

time this guy had the threat of this thing coming in on him again, see. So he lived just a little bit of a nervy life because he must have known this—instinctively, he must have known something of this. He knew it wasn't all quite gone.

Now, when you start at it—peeling it down from the top, like, “From where could you communicate to a head? Thank you. From where could you communicate to a head?” His goal, by the way, is “never to communicate to anyone,”—you have this chance factor floating through all of your processing. This chance factor is there all the time. Lord only knows what it will be. Only you and a complete assessment will be able to tell and it'll be some chance factor. And that factor could be for you or that factor could be agin ya. But in any event, that factor is the monitoring factor of any results that you get.

All right. We get this girl and we say, “How could you help your father? And how could your father help you? And how could you help your father? And how could your father help you?” And we eventually find to our horror that her goal is “to destroy all families.” Now, how the devil could we ever have opened that up at all or got anyplace with a lesser process? Weird part of it is that we did. But per hour of processing, there's no comparison like goals processing.

You sit down and you get this person's basic purpose and then you—the bank starts falling apart and all these other things take place and they clear, and you haven't got any bank there to go back on the track or to go up into the future or to be connected with or not connected with and it's gone. Well, that is infinitely desirable, but the change that it makes in an individual is best viewed by you by the amount of havoc a wrong goal, found but not run, can make on a case.

Now, here is your index: Take anybody who has had a wrong goal found. Now understand, not run, see. This person—they had a wrong goal found. And just sit down with a meter, and—don't do an Instructor's check—just handle that goal as you would handle the “to be a tiger” drill, see. See, whatever the goal was—and just clean it that way. And check with your pc and make sure that you clean it until all sensation and pain has gone off of it, see. That, as an additional little action—just make sure there's no more pain left on that thing. Clean it very carefully, just with a drill, with also attention to pain, and you will strangely enough see more case gain than you have seen for some time.

Well, you say, “Look, to the degree it must have caved him in to have found the wrong goal...” No, you're looking in the wrong barrel. That's what I thought the first time and then I finally got my wits wrapped around it and found out what was happening, because it was fantastic. Just that you had found a wrong goal on this person—that must have caved him in. It must have ruined him, because look at all the good it did to clean it up.

No, it's not the finding of the goal. The finding of the goal did a key—in of what was there anyhow. And it could have keyed in at any time and possibly has. But you just pick it up as a found goal, and of course, you clean up the whole goal. In other words, you call his attention to this goal. He's become familiarized with this goal now by its suppressions, invalidations and that sort of thing. He's looked at it and he's confronted it, and to a large degree it's blown and it has no further effect on him, which leads you to one of the wildest Problems Intensives you ever wanted to run. And I don't know that anybody will ever run this Problems Intensive, but they might and it's one of the steps of finding a goal.

You say to a person, “All right. Write me out all the problems that you've had in this lifetime that you want to do something about. Just write me out a list of these, see.” He gives you a list of 60, 70, something like that. And you say, “All right. Now, what decision” (you can call it anything you want to) “would have solved “ and you take problem 1, see. What decision would have solved problem 2, see. What decision? What decision? You keep writing down this list of decisions.

Now, you don't date them. They're really goals, you see. You don't date them. And you just go back to the beginning of them and you dust it off lightly with the "to be a tiger" drill, see. "To never drink again," you see, that was one of the things—that the decision would have solved that problem, see. To never drink again. All right.

You say, "To never drink again." You get a read. "Has that decision been invalidated?" You know? Go right on down through your "to be a tiger" drill, don't you see. And clean up that whole lot and, man, that guy will have thought he will have had more processing than a hundred and ninety—nine hours of anything else you could have run on him except goals processing itself. Makes an interesting Problems Intensive, doesn't it?

See, it's just a little chunk of doing a goals list and yet it works out into a complete Problems Intensive. And you'll be utterly flabbergasted at the amount of relief the character will get off this. It'll look completely phenomenal to the person. The reason you possibly won't do this—although this may turn out sooner or later, I shouldn't condemn it in advance—I should announce it to you of what it is. It's just a discovery of how to run a Problems Intensive and I shouldn't further evaluate it because you might be able to do this on somebody and find out mysteriously that they will go into session now and that they become auditable whereas they were only partially auditable before so it might have more value than I have experimented with at this moment.

But I'm just giving you the value of a decision—the value of a goal. Just the value of a goal with the mid ruds cleared on it on the nulling by mid ruds technique gives you more cessation of somatic, more release and advance of case... Look, these aren't even the guy's goals, see—they're nothing. He's given you a list of 60 "What decision was?" Oh, he's made all these decisions at sometime or another—you just clear them up. Just as—is; nothing fancy about it—pocketa—pocketa—pocketa. Well, how long might it take you? Three—hour session, something like that. The guy's liable to come out at the other end of this session saying, "Wow!" you know and just flying, you know. God! He's no longer an alcoholic and he doesn't beat his wife and, you know, things are marvelous. Gosh!

How did this ever happen to him? Well, that's simply the value of a decision, because what is the reactive bank then, but the basic decision or the basic postulate or the basic purpose which has on top of it then, a concatenation of purposes—all of which are locks on the basic purpose. Every time—this is horrible—but every time he makes a decision, he puts a new lock on the case. Wonderful way to do oneself in, isn't it? And he did it gratuitously to himself, too. Nobody twisted his beams to make him do it. Yeah, he will postulate.

Anyhow, this action might serve very well as a tremendous training drill before somebody did 3GA, but actually it's simpler, unless you had some remarkable difficulty with the pc that made him unauditable. Basically, it is simpler just to get somebody to list 850 goals, straighten out the list at the other end and start nulling. Do you see? That fact has such value that it makes this other very important discovery kind of null and void. That's an unhappy fact, isn't it, when you get down and look at it.

Make this tremendous thing, you know, you can—we've just made a discovery whereby we snap our fingers to the right and left and say abracadabra and a spaceship appears, you see. Well, that's nothing because it's standing in the shadow of a discovery whereby all we had to do was go whoooo, and a planet appeared. It's sort of dwarfed. But there's—there is something that if you wanted to get a reality on the somatic value and other values of cleaning up somebody's goals or decisions—you want to get a reality on just what that will do for a case—you could do that little drill and you've—and waaaah! Wow! This is nothing compared to what clearing is going to do, but wow! What would it do? It'll do a lot; do a lot for a case.

Now, possibly it will turn out suddenly to have some interesting value of its own or be—you can expect sooner or later that we may suddenly have alcoholics you do this with or something like that, you know. Something might come up.

But there's clearing, and there isn't any substitute for clearing. And if you can clear people, there's no reason to do anything but clear people, because it makes all that difference.

And it's all right to say well, so—and—so and such—and—such, and we ought to really prepcheck them a lot and we ought to do this and ought to do that, but frankly, if they're auditable and if they've been prepchecked up into auditability, there's certainly no reason to go on prepchecking them.

The person's sitting there and they're being good as a pc and the needle stays clean and well, what more do you want, man? Well, I always say the fellow—that this fellow isn't auditable. I can hear this argument going on someplace, you know. This fellow isn't auditable. Why, he just talks all the time about committing suicide. So he talks about committing suicide. What's that got to do with clearing him? Nothing. He just made the decision too many times and he can't stop deciding it, that's all. He never is going to commit suicide while you're trying to find his goal. He'll be too curious to find out what it is.

You see, actually, the out of session behavior of the individual has nothing to do with it. It's only the in-session behavior of the pc in which you're interested. And if that in-session behavior is adequate to clearing—which is running down a goals list and getting his goal and getting him to list the four lines on it and blow it clear—well, there isn't any reason whatsoever why you should do it. There's no reason under the sun because if there's anything wrong with his morality or his ethical level or something like that, it isn't going to straighten out by putting him in jail, but it is going to straighten out by clearing him. So here's the answer to this situation.

I hope to some slight degree I've solved for you perhaps some ethical problems with regard to this matter and cleared your mind up on: Who do you clear?

Audience: Mm—hm. Yes.

Female voice: Yes, very much so.

And when should you start clearing.

Audience: Mm—hm.

What we have in actuality is a technique which is sufficiently powerful and sufficiently big and overwhelming that it actually a bit defies grasp—a bit defies description. It's a little bit hard to realize you're there, you know. It's a little bit hard to realize it's there or it can be done. And you really don't start realizing it until you clear somebody or until you yourself find your goal and suddenly say, "Whoo—whoo—wha—wha—what's this? What's this? What happened? Ah! Look what we got our paws on now."

But frankly, ever since this has—has been squared away so that the—now that you're finding some goals in nulling by mid ruds, I was waiting until that proved itself out that way—and these other things, there's—the lid's off. There is no limit on the forward road, believe me. There is nothing.

We are at that point of the crossroads for which we have been heading for a long time. And we were right there and we have arrived. It's going to take you a long time to realize it perhaps. It's going to take other people in Scientology a long time to realize it, but to grasp exactly what this means for this planet, takes quite a little bit of looking at—quite a little bit of looking at. Three—quarters of Asia became civilized just because a few guys hoped that somebody might sooner or later be able to do it. Hey! Three—quarters of Asia, just because somebody hoped they could do it. You know they never did it? Well, what are you sitting with now? And what do you suppose is going to happen from here?

That's why I say, it's just a little bit hard to confront this thing. And of course, you're in there. It looks simple to you and so forth. It is. You're learning to audit this and that. It was only last night in a TV demonstration—you saw how easy it was. And looking at all that, well, I invite you just to lift your head just a little bit from the technical fact and look at the broad implication of what has happened here this summer of 1962. It's quite interesting. May you never be the same again.

Okay. Well, I didn't mean to get too serious about the thing, but it—I've been just kind of sitting looking at it lately and saying: well, Ronnie, I—one guy suddenly got the idea it could be done and started operation bootstrap and some other guys came along and they started working on it and so forth. And always in the past we have had the beautiful dream that the Messiah comes down with sandals of gold with a neon sign around his skull—and he blows on this silver trumpet, see, and everybody's Clear and that wasn't what happened at all.

There was some guy, who was just a guy, and he started figuring and some other guys started to work on it, and everybody was working on it, and so forth—and it happened. Perhaps it's all out of scheduled from the archangels and perhaps it isn't on the blotter in the Galactic Council but it is happening.

And it didn't have to wait for the second coming of who was it—Baal? Or whoever it was. Okay?

Thank you.