RELATIONSHIP OF TRAINING TO OT

A lecture given on
7 November 1963

What's the date?

Audience: Seven November.

Seven Nov. AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

You are very fortunate people. You are very, very lucky people. Come down all the way down the track, lived all of those years, did all these stupid things, and you wind up here with a chance out.

The chance is as good as you can audit, and it's not a bit better.

The number of raw meat that's going to go out through the roof will be numbered on a nonexistent Chinese abacus from the Ming dynasty, which has long been lost. They won't make it.

You can patch them up, you make them feel better, but that's about it. Unless you train them, unless they become actually a fully trained auditor, they really don't have a prayer. This, at this stage of the game, is not, "It is a good thing, if anybody is to be fully cleared or go OT, for them to be trained" organization policy. Moves out of that zone and area into an entirely different zone and area. "If dey gonna make it, dey gonna have to have been trained well."

So I can see you now with your sleeves rolled up, sweating dubiously, with three or four people that you're auditing, something like this, over a "Hubbard mind trainer" - putty on the end of your nose, little pointer in your hand - saying, "This is a GPM."

And the fellow's saying, "Huh?"

And you about that time saying, "I wish to God Herbie was here!"

Yes. "No matter what I thought of Fred last year, if he were only here now." You know, this type of state of mind. And then you'll sock ahead with this, see - sock ahead, and you decide, "Well, why don't you go - why don't you go to Los Angeles or Cape Town or something and take an HCA Course?"

And you keep asking - they keep asking you these silly questions, you see, about "Well, you say something about - what is this thing called a Tone Scale? I didn't know I had to study music in order to.. ."

You say, "Well, why don't you go to - down to Cape Town or Los Angeles or someplace and take an HCA Course? And when you come back, I'll give you the hot dope here, don't you see?"

Because in the first place, they're not really worried about becoming OT, they want to cure their lumbosis. And of course - lumbosis, slumbosis - who cares about that, see? It's nothing; no importance. And they're all worried about their present time problems. They come into session, you see, and they want to tell you about the fight they had with their wife, you see? And they want this all cleared up as a present time problem. But actually it's their son they're really worried about. And then there's - there's Aunt Agnes and so forth. She has committed a terrible overt act against ... They got a motivator: she didn't die and leave them her money. And so forth, and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on.

And I can just hear you now straightening all this up, saying, "Fine."

And the guy says, "Well, what's all this wonderful power I was supposed to have?" and that sort of thing.

"Well, I tell you, ahem. It's like this: You have to be very learned indeed in order to put your little feet upon this road to glory. And you have to have attained certain philosophic poise." Something like this.

And they'll come around, "Well, all right, I've read some textbooks. Now have I attained philosophic poise? Am I now capable of right conduct?" and so forth.

And I can see you now: "By the way, why don't you go down to Los Angeles or to anywhere, take the HCA Course? When you come back, why..." and so on and so forth, and there it will go. You - you wait. You'll do just that.

Why? Because your raw - meat case is very easy to audit - very, very easy to audit. They're marvelous. I mean, of course, you're sitting there with so much knowledge of cases and that sort of thing, you could hardly fail to get some kind of a result no matter what the fellow did. But the facts of the case are - is you can audit the fat off the top RIs. These cases are fat; they're fat with charge. The charge is leaking out of their ears. They remind you of a boiler which was designed to contain two hundred pounds and has been pumped up to fifteen hundred pounds per square inch. In other words, you've got charge here, man! There's voltage coming out of their ears! You just touch them with a glance at the E - Meter and they bleed charge, don't you see? Because the top of the bank is fat.

Present lifetime - got lots of reality on their difficulties; the case is fat. See? Good and fat. And all you have to do is take a little bat at either one of these two top RIs, the terminal or oppterm, and it bleeds charge. So you can just sit there and bleed charge and get good tone arm action, and straighten out how Aunt Agatha didn't die and leave them their money. And you can - charge, charge - you can - just - service facsimiles and aahh! and so forth. And the tone arm fl - . Very easy auditing, because you're auditing fat.

And the reason why a Scientologist appears to be a tougher case, which he isn't, is because the fat has been taken off of him. No more fat left on those two top RIs. How are you going to bleed any charge off of them? The only way you can bleed charge off them is find the two top RIs and go on down the bank. That make sense to you?

So how you're finding - in the lower units here at Saint Hill - how you were finding any charge or tone arm action on the pc at all, I don't know, because it's probably the totality of it was removed several years ago. I've made some kind of a side remark on this in an earlier lecture, but I think you must be a flock of geniuses to get charge at all. See?

That doesn't - that doesn't restrain me from insisting that you get tone arm action! But realize that in all honesty I'm totally aware of the fact that you're attempting the near impossible. You get a case parked into its first or second bank, you get that goal in full bloom, you've got this case all ready to find that goal, and the longer you don't find that goal, the harder and tougher that TA is going to get stuck.

I've seen a case well straightened out - nothing really wrong with the case at all, just lined up beautifully - in the second GPM ready to list for the third GPM, and that tone arm at 5.5, man, and going higher. And there were errors to be straightened out in the case - there were some errors there in the first and second GPM that could have been straightened out beautifully. But even straightening out These errors made no slightest difference to the tone arm. That case was ready to roll on the third GPM. And that case had already - huh! as one found later - had thought of the next goal. And that was it! No tone arm. I mean, the case could have gotten wound up in legal actions and every other kind of human difficulty you

could name and been charged up with it, and you could have put in the Prepcheck buttons on their PTPs, and you could have just done everything you could have thought of, because - I know, because I did it! And there it sat - 5.5, 5.6. Next session - 5.7. Next session - 5.75 and so forth.

And finally got around in the department of case analysis to find out what's wrong with this case: well, the case had thought of the next goal. And the full charge of the next GPM was sitting there just pong! all ready to go. It was the next charge up; nobody was touching it, nobody was doing anything with it at all. And until that goals list was completed, that tone arm stayed at 5.5. Not even case analysis would put it down.

Why? Because the case was rolling. The case was running. Do you understand that? I was solving just this one mystery, is how did this case come back into session with a tone arm at 5.5 when they'd left the session at 3.0? After two sessions or something of that order, I found out. They'd thought of, and actually had written down, four goals - and one of them was it. It brought the whole GPM right back up there and it wasn't any between - sessions charge, it was the next goal.

All one really had to have done at that spot, of course, was just to continue the R4 and you had tone arm action. And immediately R4 was resumed and tone arm action went back to forty - five divisions per session.

Well, what's - what's the matter here? Well, the auditor wasn't running the next thing to be run on the case. Do you see that? Well, the auditor wasn't running the next thing to be run on the case. This next thing was so germane to the resolution of this case that there wasn't anything that would have alleviated it except doing it.

So Scientologists are sitting there ready to roll. You want to know the truth of it: You can do case analysis and patch up the bank and get some tone arm action, and get goals that have been found, analyze these things - these things you've got to do anyway. And you get some tone arm action and square it up. But think about somebody that has his present time GPM. Has it. It is it. Unfortunately, the only real tone arm action you're going to get on that case is finding the top terminal and opposing the next RI.

So, your lower - level case runs on fat. They're fat with charge. When this is blown out and straightened up, their life looks much simpler to them, looks much better and so forth. Well, what's wrong with them now is the whole stretched - out bank. And that is sitting there ready to be run. You're not going to get anyplace if you don't run it. And you can't run it on somebody who doesn't know his mind - the mind - and so forth, backwards and upside down and also right way to.

So what kind of a situation does this put us into? This is a series of data which are forced upon us by technical facts - not by my hopes, not by what we would like to believe, not by optimism. And they're very, very cold, harsh facts. The tone arm action which you're going to get at case levels I, II and III are the fat that exist on the two top RIs and incidental fat that may be on the rest of the bank disarranged. And that's the tone arm action you're going to get. And those RIs are going to be cut down, they're going to feel easier, life is going to be easier, those things are going to have less punch. When you find them, however - when you finally find them - they're going to have bang, they're going to have punch in them still. You cant take I - , II - and III - level auditing and do anything, really, to an RI. When it's put back in position ready to be found, and so forth, it still fires and blows down and opposes everything and so on. These things are practically indestructible. So don't get too worried about "the case was messed up and so some of its RIs are missing." That's never going to happen. You can even find them in the wrong banks. And when you put them in the right bank they fire and blow down as usual.

They only disintegrate when exactly and properly located, and when they are opposed or up against the item which they oppose. When the companion items around them are released and

so forth, then they disintegrate and you haven't got any more RI. That's the end of that. Now trying to find it again, now, can actually cause a fantastic ARC break on the part of the pc. You found it properly with R4, it is gone, you now tell the pc, "We are now going to find it." You want an ARC break? Take a pc who's had the first, second, third bank run out and say, "We are now going to run out the second bank." He can't! See? You've told him to take stock out of the shop that isn't there.

You say, "Now, see that empty warehouse? Good. Move everything out of it."

That, in actual fact, is the only way you can get rid of goals, GPMs and RIs - is run them properly by R4. All right. Somebody that's had his bank chopped up, fifth GPM from the top found sometime in the past by R3, bunch of items run out of the thing and that sort of thing, that fellow - that bank, if it was at all well run, is going to cause you trouble when you finally connect with it, because the next goal isn't now going to fire. You're trying to empty the warehouse that is empty. And the way to get around that, if you ever run into that situation, is to make sure that you have every goal that's ever been run on the pc, and do it by dating. You can confirm by dating.

Because you can date an RI even though it has been discharged. It's the only thing you can do that is left to do with an RI. You can date it. Even though it's gone and the bank is gone, you can still get reactions on where it has been on the track, because of course it was pulled slightly out of position to be run. So the reorientation of it still has the bang left in it necessary to locate it on the track. Interesting, isn't it? It's just the idea is left, and you're really dating the idea; it has no mass with it or anything like that anymore.

So if you ran up against that proposition, why, you can solve the thing by dating. Let's say the bank "to know nothing" has been run out of the pc, and you've got - for some reason or other you've come across the goal "to know" and you've just run it out and you're doing an oppose, and it doesn't conclude with anything; you don't wind up with anything. Well, you finally have to assume that if the pc had been run on R3 earlier and some GPMs run out, look them over. You'll find in that list a GPM that will oppose it. You'll probably find, see, "to know nothing." And you get some kind of a situation here; you can confirm it by dating. You can date the bottom of the GPM - the RI end of the GPM that you just left - and you can date the top of the one that has been run out. The two dates should coincide - should be within a short distance of each other. Trick. Well, but it's a necessary trick to know.

Now let's look over this general situation. I'm sure that somebody sooner or later is going to get around this, going to take one of these big tables and a bunch of clay and he's going to train somebody up who's unusually smart and get them to know all the parts and definitions of the mind and that sort of thing, and get them groomed up to a point where they can call them all off and know what he's talking about and so forth, and find the present time GPM and go on down the line. Somebody is going to do that sooner or later; and that will be the exception, however, to the rule.

You have not realized how much aplomb you have acquired with regard to the mind. You have no concept of how much aplomb you have. Pavlov, his approach to the mind - nervous old - maid aunt. You know, just "Uhhhh!" Nervy, man. If you'd talked about the mind to him while he was on an E - Meter, why, it would have banged across both pins. Why, of course, nearly everything theoretical was a lie on the thing, but he was still nervous. He had no aplomb about this subject at all.

When you start training somebody in an HCA Course and so forth - you've had that activity; that's been part of your activities - you remember how nervous these people were, amongst them, how nervy they get? You tell them to sit down and say something to the person across from them. Well, they will do this very happily maybe in a co - audit, because they haven't even looked at what they're doing yet. It's all unreal to them so it's perfectly all right to do this, you see? And you'll see this in PEs all the time. Well, that - they're not saddled with any responsibility; they're just doing something there because the Instructor told them to do

and they're not taking any responsibility for anybody's mind. All right, you get them into the lower levels of HCA Course, and the D of T or Instructor starts chewing them out for the subject of having gotten somebody into an ARC break because they didn't complete the auditing question or something like this, and all of a sudden they're saying, "What? Somebody is actually requiring me to be responsible for the conduct of a session? Ohhhhh!"

Actually, there's little gradients many Instructors have dreamed up, trying to get people to actually sit there and take some responsibility for a session. They give them Self Analysis or something like that and have them read questions out of Self Analysis to the pc or something like this, just to get the idea of it. The approach there is quite interesting.

Well, actually, these people are all preselected out of the races of Earth today. They're preselected: They arrived and enrolled. That's interesting, isn't it? They arrived and enrolled. Well, they're preselected people to begin with - that they're there tells you that. So it's not any cross section of the population at all. This is a very great minority of the population, certainly composed of the upper tenth of the intellects of the world today. So this is a preselection. And if those people coming into an HCA Course are showing any degree of nervousness, they're already people who have a potential of aplomb on this particular subject. And they get nervous.

Now you start running them up along the line a little bit further, and you start getting them into the zones and areas of running the pc's goals and itsaing the pc's goals, you'll see them a little bit nervous, because they're - they've now got a further zone or area. Getting the read on the meter is a source of nervousness. Not getting TA action, they get nervy. Any of us do - me, you, all of us. And we sit there over a session and we see that TA isn't moving, man, and "Hoo - ah! Wha - what's - what's going on? Wha - wha - what's - what's the matter here? What's the matter here? Wh - why - why didn't that run?" Lie awake half the night: "Why didn't I do that? I wonder if ss - mmm has got something to do with it. Wa - wa - wa and did I so - wab - ba - ba," and this sort of thing.

Well, you're smart enough and bright enough and got enough aplomb to get up to that level to get nervous. I think Pavlov himself, he probably would have gone into a complete nervous breakdown. He probably would have been howling, if not slavering! But there's your level: You're dealing with preselected people, and these people have a tremendous amount of training. Even people - non - certified people who hang around an organization have a tremendous lot of training and aplomb on this particular subject. It's quite amazing.

So you're dealing with a specialized group, specially selected, and then these people are moved on up with further selection by advanced levels of training. And they're moved on up - their confront, their persistence. Look at the things that are required of one of these people, you see - the things that have been required of you, in actual fact. And sticking with it and the disappointments and the upsets and the reasons why you shouldn't have and all this, and the lack of success you've had with this one and that one and the trouble you've had someplace else and so forth. Boy, if you don't think that isn't a process of preselection, you should take a look at it someday. Just going on being in Scientology, see? It has its rewards, but it also has its liabilities. And the liabilities, particularly the last few years, have been very great. Rolling along on a research line, mostly living on hope and the next and latest technique - this sort of thing, has taken its toll. Don't think otherwise.

And those that have survived this particular process and so forth, are not to be congratulated; that has nothing to do with it. They have simply demonstrated the fact that they will obviously someday make OT. It's as simple as that, don't you see?

All right. Now we walk along this line a little bit further and we're suddenly confronted with brand - new demands of auditing. A new style of basic auditing. Not too different, but requires some neat adjustment of sitting in there as an auditor, not taking the pc's itsa away from him and yet not abandoning the pc to his own itsa. Man, you make that adjudication! That's a rough one to make; you have to make it yourself At what point - at what point do

you take over too much of the pc's itsa, and at what point do you take over too little? Where is the exact middle ground of these two points? Discover it for yourself You will, sooner or later.

The reason you have to discover it for yourself is it varies from pc to pc. There's a Variation here. It's not - doesn't vary from auditor to auditor; it varies from pc to pc. Some pcs are quite bright, their perception of their bank is quite good and so on, and you mess up their itsa, you've really done something, don't you see? They know what they're talking about. They say, "There is a cat sitting over there," see? And the auditor that doesn't pay any attention to this at all and doesn't weigh the fact with that particular pc is going to be in trouble.

Similarly, you'll have a pc, he says, "There is a eat over there," and you can be absolutely sure that if the - he said so, that proves it isn't the case. See, pcs are different. He's maybe trying to make a good show for the auditor, he's not trying to look at the bank or itsa. He's trying to put on an act, or - or there's a lot of other wild factors enter in here. Well, how much responsibility do you have to take for him?

And the reason you should learn to adjust this, is as your pc moves on up the line to higher and higher case levels, his perception gets better and better, his ability to itsa gets better and better - dependent on whether or not you yourself have engaged in a promotion of his ability to perceive. Have you increased his reality on his own bank? And if you have, and the case is rolling along the line nicely, why, he will wind up with higher and higher levels of responsibility for his own bank. And finally, running on to OT and going actually on down the track and knocking out GPMS, you'll get to a point where it would be very perilous to challenge the pc's perception of the matter. I mean, it would be just foolhardy. Not that the pc would do anything to you, but it's just foolhardy. You're just making trouble.

Pc says the next goal is "to scat." It rocket reads, blows down - that's the next goal. That's your goals list, see?

Now, if at this point you said, "Well, let's take a list here, and we're going to list this thing out," and so forth.

And he'd say - he'll keep saying, "Why? What do you want to list it for? It's sitting right there. That's it; that's 'to scat.'"

And he says, "The top terminal - the top terminal is 'those who scut,' and 'somebody who can't stand scutting,' a 'non - scatter.'" And your meter's going wild - what are you going to do at this point? Say, "No, no, we've got to go back, and we've got to trace all this back, and really, we'll go back, and we'll first do the goals list, you see, and we want fifty past the last RR," and so forth, and so on. Three sessions later your pc's going into a decline. You say, "What's the top oppterm?"

He says, "Oh, to hell with you!"

The horrible part of it is, the same Condition can exist, apparently, on somebody who doesn't have any GPMs run out. He says, "My next goal is 'to scat,' and there it is right there, and the top oppterm is 'to play on a piccolo,' and the terminal is 'to eat meat.' " You buy this, the pc's wrapped around not one telegraph pole, it was something like sticking him out through a train window as you were going by the telegraph poles, you see? So there is your - there is this adjustment. How much responsibility do you take? How much of the pc's itsa you take, and so forth.

Well, it changes, not only from pc to pc, but it changes in the same pc. Furthermore, you can go reversewise: The pc has had some bad loses, his itsa can deteriorate for a little while. Had some real bad loses, you know, some kind like this: You ran out the present time GPM, only it wasn't it and it shut off the RR. You got him stuck you don't know where, in what.

Incomplete list; this, that, the other thing - something is wrong here. Case analysis is coming to the fore, and the pc is all snogged up.

Well, maybe a short time before you did that he could have itsaed it well, but now that this has happened he cannot itsa for a little while very well. He can't spot these things. He really doesn't know, and he gets frantic, and he gets wild, and he starts giving you various ideas and hints and so forth of what you ought to do; he starts giving you auditing directions which are based on unreality and you wrap him around a half a dozen telegraph poles, too - having wrapped him around a telegraph pole, don't you see?

Wrap a pc around a telegraph pole and his ability to itsa will deteriorate. That doesn't mean it won't improve immediately that you straighten it all out again, but you have to make these allowances.

So, not only different from pc to pc, but plus and minus in the same pc. And can not only improve but also deteriorate in the same pc. So these are things that when you say, "This is exactly how much responsibility you take for the pc at any given instant" - well, how many - how - this is the much - the degree of responsibility you take for itsaing for the pc, you see, finding out and showing him what it is - is not a constant. It's highly inconstant. Varies session to session.

Pc comes in with a big present time problem. He's been reliable - he's been reliable as a grandfather clock - tick - tock. He'll call his shots all the time. And he comes in this session, he's got a present time problem. He's a bit overwhelmed, he's a bit bothered by various things. And in a gesture of impatience or something like that, why, he gives you a wrong datum. You're very accustomed to - well, you haven't estimated your pc for that session. This is not something that takes a great deal of study, but it takes some experience. It's something you want to watch. Pcs run good and they run bad. Pcs run well in the morning session, bad in the evening session, see? Some pcs run well in the evening session and badly in the morning session. See, that's - it varies. One day your pc who always runs badly in the evening session comes in and runs wonderfully in the evening session, runs horribly the next morning.

So, the final solution to it is you do what you have to do to get the case done right, at any given instant of auditing. And every moment of auditing is a different moment of auditing than any other moment of auditing - particularly in this business.

Where you can produce change in a pc, you of course are changing the values by which you audit. You ever look at that? Now, some auditors back in the old days solved this by simply not changing the pc. And they'd express it this way: They'd say such and such a process ran well on the pc, so we will now run it, and this is the only process we are ever going to run on this pc. And, of course, the thing - long since flat, you see?

I remember one time somebody a long time ago ran on Mary Sue - one of her auditors - ran her for forty hours or more on, I think, "failed to endure." At the end of that period of time she sure was failing to endure! Very successful series! That's because she happened to be running well on it at the beginning, you see, and then they didn't know how to shift their gears. It's happened to all of us at one time or another. And also the reverse has happened, is before a process could bite, the auditor had changed it, see? All these various casualties occur.

Well, these casualties occur by a failure to estimate the state of the case at the moment the case is being audited. The case is always different one moment to the next; they are never the same case. They are always different. For one reason, they're in a different period of time, don't you see? Time has changed.

All right. Well, let's get back to this problem of you audit the fat off the top RIs and you've got a R4 type case. Now it requires a real genius to get any TA action off the case at all, you

see? He's taken something that has no fat left on it and is trying to find some fat. And of course he has to be more and more adroit about the kind of fat he finds, and he can get quite remarkably adroit at this. It makes a good basic auditor because at this particular time he, of course, is running into a case that has no fat to be run to amount to anything, and he is yet running some, so therefore the case is more liable to ARC break and becoming critical of auditing. So it works two ways, and it makes a fantastic auditor.

Not only is there no - nothing there to get TA action on, but there's a greater liability to the whole zone of auditing, because he's more likely to get ARC breaks and upsets in the session. Pc is more likely to develop present time upsets by reason of auditing. So by the time you get through that preselection, why, you're practically a screaming genius, man.

Now let's move into the field of - let's move into the field of what happens after somebody has gotten up the track. What happens? They're in a position of doing R4. Well, at this stage of the game they're probably trained. They're probably trained somewhat. They'd certainly have to be trained further, in spite of the preselections and other things that brought them up along the line. They'd have to be pretty well grooved.

It's almost grimly factual that Saint Hill will undoubtedly make more OTs in the final run, for various reasons. Data first on the firing pin, and it's being sorted out all the time; there's terrific evaluation of this data, reassessment, re - sorting the data continuously occurring and so forth, cases being very carefully adjusted. And right here, of course, we have more people that know more Scientology than any other place in the world, naturally. And - on the staff. And you get into a preselected situation, already, by reason of technical knowledge. And this is expressed right now, that there's only about - I think there are four or five cases at this moment in the whole world that are headed directly, immediately and straightly to OT without another quiver on the line. I mean, they couldn't be stopped, just give them auditing and they will arrive, see? There are only that many cases in the world right now that are in that particular state, and they are all at Saint Hill. That's interesting, isn't it? So we can suppose that this area of dominance and forward progress will continue.

The best way and the most sure - fire way to get to be OT, then, is to be a top - rank auditor, and that for various reasons, you see, including the aplomb it takes to confront the bank. You have no idea how mu - . We had somebody here (I would - I won't mention any names) but we had one case that was running very badly ...

I call a case on the way to OT, by the way, who has had the first bank run out. This proves it. This proves the top GPM; this squares it up. First bank run out, second bank coming up, and that case is surely in the channel and on the road.

It isn't just that we've found somebody's goal and we're fishing for the PT goal and that sort of thing; I don't consider that case en route yet. It will take that case anything up to two years to get into this other situation. Anything up to that. Might only be a month. Might only be two months. Just because somebody has found a goal on this person is no guarantee of anything. But I might add this snide, cynical and horrible comment: There is one thing it is a guarantee of, that the case who has had a goal found on him - between that point and the first actual GPM run out, finished and the next goal found, between those two points, is more hell, upset and uproar than any being ever thought he would have to endure. That is absolutely ghastly.

I'm talking now about actual empirical experience. I've seen these cases. Now, these are - lack of technology is some of the explanation for the length of time in this.

One of these cases at Saint Hill had the top GPM found - imagine it, it was the top GPM - and its top RIs listed for, over the better part of two years. I think more than that. Horrible! The reason it could never make any progress is there weren't any top items - it was a truncated bank. And it never occurred to anybody to go down into the bank and run it as a truncated bank. Technical, of course, has caught up with this type of thing, but nobody ever suspected

this was the PT GPM. GPMs have been listed for, above it and below it and around it, and discarded, and I've seen goal after goal presented as something closer to present time on this case in the last few months. And misery and bow and upset and so on, and - oh, me! Misery. Agony.

Even when you've found the PT GPM, that agony isn't over and so forth, because one might miss a couple of items in it, and one might shoot that sideways. Now, now the real trouble begins! This is the toughest period of the case. Top GPM found: Will it run? Is it the top GPM? And I myself have been knocked around for thirty days on just answering that question, session after session, misery after misery and so forth. Other things being found for it, being found above it, being found below it and so forth. And then we found out that it had been run out. How can you make mistakes like this? Well, it's very easy to make mistakes like this, because the present time GPM is the one in which all a person's present time problems sit. And he has practically no perception on it.

You go back - you go back ten GPMS, you can probably run one of those out. Pc won't run it with any reality and it won't do him any good and for God's sakes don't do it! That would probably run with nice perception and everything going along swimmingly. And you move up into the present time GPM, all of his present time problems are sitting on this present time GPM.

Now, do you see what I mean about preselection? Because at any time during that period of finding a goal and finding and running out the perst - PT - the first GPM on the case, life can become so horrible, so unbearable, so unlivable, so many creaks occurring of various kinds whatsoever, the fellow's just liable to pack it up, man. Raw meat won't stand there and - they won't understand anything about it. They won't have any hope; they won't have enough confront to go through it. A little creak turns on, "Well, I've been audited and I don't feel so good, so I don't think I'll be audited anymore." Well, let them go creak till the end of time. Who cares? Preselection didn't operate.

"Dere was many called, and few was put into de first bank!"

Now, these are the facts. These are the facts I'm giving you. These aren't any gilded thoughts of any kind; these are just the grim, horrible facts.

Now, once you've got the person into that first GPM - you know it's the first GPM, there's no doubt about it whatsoever - you can maybe for the next two GPMs worry about whether or not it was the first GPM and be prepared to find two more above it at any given moment, because the bank is liable to straighten out suddenly and so forth, and you find yours - . But this is much more - less likely to occur than has been believed in the past. And a lot of case time and auditing time has been lost in taking the first GPM and then knowing it is the GPM, checking it out, and then for some reason or other not running it or not really handling it, and even after running it, not knowing whether or not it was it, and therefore do something else to prove something else was it.

Because this horrible datum has just emerged as a very important datum. And that is, an actual goal invalidated will then behave like a wrong goal. It's terrible! I mean, a datum like that - that's terrible, man. Think it over for a moment. An actual goal invalidated will then behave like a wrong goal. Well, you probably haven't measured in everything there is to be measured into that simple statement. Because it means this: that that invalidated actual GPM will now turn on the creaks and ARC break the pc just as though it were a wrong goal, and just the way a wrong goal would ARC break the pc.

And when you say to the pc, on the meter, "That's a wrong goal," because it reads that way, "we've found a wrong goal, that's a wrong goal - 'to spit' that's a wrong goal," the pc will say, "Oh, well, what a relief."

Proves it, doesn't it? He will feel relieved, because you've just added more not - is. This is not - is coming in. See? But he won't feel very happy. He'll go on being ARC breaky around the perimeter here someplace, but not on that one. That one's all taken care of, isn't it? We knew that was a wrong goal, didn't we? Because every time we say it's a wrong goal it turns off the creaks and the pc's happy and cheerful and doesn't ARC break now. And every time it comes up and gets restimulated, why, the pc ARC breaks, so that's a wrong goal, so we just say it's a wrong goal. And the pc doesn't ARC break now, and it straightens up beautifully. So we obviously know what it is.

Isn't that terrible?

That's why, now, you've got it contained in your lines, where I gave you that program: after you got through checking everything - after you got through checking everything, you know, all the case analysis on the thing, then you prepcheck everything you found.

That's why that's there. That's - probably you've been wondering. Well, it was there just as an elementary caution to begin with, but it was just my instinct that it ought to be there.

Now I've found out why it ought to be there. Because you could have carefully, with great relief to the pc, laid aside an actual GPM as a wrong goal in the case analysis, simply because it was so heavily invalidated that it behaved like a wrong goal.

Now, I don't know that the reverse is true, but I would be - I would expect now, just by extrapolation - I don't know that this is true or will hold true, but this horrible specter might rise, too: that a wrong goal is sufficiently validated to behave like a right goal on the meter on a case analysis. Pc has asserted, asserted, asserted and everybody's asserted, and everybody knows that's the right goal and so forth. And somehow or another it's got now the value of being a right goal while being a wrong goal. I don't know that that particularly will obtain, but I would expect that sooner or later we might run into instances of this. Because if one side of it is true - if you can say that a right goal is a wrong goal and it will then thereafter behave like a wrong goal, you should be able to say that a wrong goal is a right goal and it will then behave thereafter.

There's only one thing wrong, however, with that second statement, is any actually wrong goal - it's no GPM - or an actual goal run as an implant goal will turn off the RR just like that. Two items, three items - no RR, no falls, nothing on the meter. Gone, see? This is the guy who won't get any tone arm action, he won't get any meter action, he won't go - lah, lah, lah. You try to - so you're saved, you see, from making this second guessed - at mistake, because it shows up almost at once. You won't ever run, then, a - you won't ever run a wrong goal. That I can absolutely guarantee. You won't have any RR to run it with. That simple!

You'd have to sit there and just lie to the pc. Say, "Oh, well, we found an item, yeah. We found another item" - the meter is absolutely frozen, see? It won't run. So you never really will.

Even though a goal is an incorrect goal, it could only be incorrect for its position, it could never be incorrect for its wording.

You can sometimes - you can get items for an implant GPM, you can get a wrong line plot for an implant GPM, without turning off the RR. But you can take an actual GPM and try to run it on an implant pattern and it turns off the RR right now. Off goes the RR. Off goes the falls. Off goes the tone arm action. That thing will just stick - not necessarily a high tone arm or low tone arm - it just won't - nothing happens now. And the longer you try to run it and find items and so forth ...

So the surest sign in the world - this is sure, you know, like it is daylight when the sun comes up: If you run a wrong goal, the RR or falls or any other meter action will turn off, completely aside from the ARC breaks of the pc. So that one isn't dangerous.

What is dangerous, however, is that the pc's actu - an actual GPM of the pc is so thoroughly invalidated, you know, by various things - it's so thoroughly invalidated that it now reads as a wrong goal and so will be consistently discarded by the auditor. He and the pc both know and agree by actual test that "to spit" is a wrong goal. And they're going on looking for the next GPM in the line, or the PT GPM, or something like this, and they can just go on looking forever. Because, you see, you can't find something in a place where something you know isn't there, is.

It's these errors which take up time in R4. They are not, in the broad analysis, destructive. They're merely hell to live through. Hell for the auditor, hell for the pc. The pc's got nothing but screaming ARC breaky sessions, he's not getting any improvement, his tone arm action is minimal, he doesn't know where he's going, he doesn't know what he's doing. He's starting to itsa all in the wrong directions and dish up wrong data at every hand, invalidate everything that's been found on him and knock everything out left and right and rearrange his data, and he's getting into a worse and worse condition. The auditor's sitting there tearing his hair out by the roots. Tone arm isn't moving, is - he isn't getting falls. His goals lists aren't listing properly. He can't find anything. Anything he does find today checks out perfectly and tomorrow is invalidated and won't check out and it's all different, and thuh - thuh - bua - uah, my God! - that it should happen, you see?

And there's absolutely nothing will ever be done to make it any other way. That's horrible. Because that is the condition of auditing with the very best auditors and the very best trained pcs there are. That's something to think about, isn't it?

Now, you get a square look at this. Many are called and few ever hit the top of the bank. See that?

See, given all the training, given all the data, given everything else, it has great and wide liability. It can be worked out. Somebody who's started in this line, if he's had that much preselection all up along the line, and enough training and so forth himself, and so forth, is not going to bail out until it is done. But remember, two years have elapsed. Of course, the technology was not up to it in many instances and so forth, but two years have actually elapsed between the actual finding of a PT GPM and running that same GPM. And the interim covered with trying to find the pc's goal, trying to run the pc's goal, trying to audit the pc and so forth. That has actually happened.

And even with all the technology you're sitting there right this minute with, it has been many months of a very skilled auditor and a very well educated pc - many months to finally sort the thing out, finally, and get it running.

We got better technology. We can shorten the time. But don't go around in the happy dream that it can't happen. All the best training in the world makes it possible for it to occur at all, see? The best training makes it possible for it to occur. This is exactly the state that it's in, see? And even with the best training, it occurs sometimes very smoothly and very luckily and very slippily. Just that morning you got up and you were wearing the right halo. And you sailed in and for some cockeyed reason were actually able to bust through the line and really run it and it started running. Just figure it for what it is. It's a high degree of skill compounded with a phenomenal bit of luck. That's what it is. It's - you just got up that morning, and you - your shoes were in the exact correct position alongside of your bed. And that was it. You're just lucky.

Now, this is a sober look at all these things, and I perhaps might sound to you as though I'm depressing your morale. I'm not trying to depress your morale. I'm trying to keep your morale from departing from a reality. And the reality of the situation is that if you're very good and if you're very well trained, and if you know your business very well as an auditor, and when as a pc you are audited by a very skilled, very capable and very able auditor, and you have a great deal of luck, you wont suffer many catastrophes (get the level of action

there: you won't suffer many catastrophes) up to the point of having the first bank found and run out. And that's exactly your level of expectancy.

Now, the actual running out of the bank can furnish difficulty. You can get into the fourth bank or something like that and all of a sudden the pc invalidates the goal. It's out of session, see? The goal is, for instance, "to be a snob." See? And the pc says, "Hey, I don't like that goal. I've never - no, I've never been snobbish," and so on. They're caught up somewhere up around the top terminal, don't you see, and they start dramatizing the top terminal, which is "an humble person," see? They say, "Well, us humble persons, you know" (they don't know what it is yet), "us humble per - . We hate snobs, you know. They're no good, and uh - and so on and so on and so on."

Or unfortunately - unfortunately, they see a great big limousine going down the street with a guy in a top hat or something in it, you see? Something keys them in suddenly. "That goal couldn't be my goal. That - it couldn't be my goal." And they come back in - you've got some items in this thing, see, already. Put them on the meter, so forth, check it out. The pc nattering, ARC broke, see, "Nyah, nyah, nyah, nyah."

You figure something's wrong here - something's wrong, something's wrong. You check this thing out: "'To be a snob.' All right, is that an actual GPM? And is it in proper sequence?" And - no read, see? "Is it an incorrectly worded GPM?" Tick, you see? "Is it a wrong goal?" you see? Clang! you know? It goes practically - rocket reads, you know? "All right, is it out of sequence?" and so forth - there's no read. It's just a wrong goal, that's all there is to that, see?

So you say, "All right, now let's try to do and extend our little goals list that we were doing from the upper GPM." At this moment you have sealed your doom for maybe the next two weeks of auditing. It'll look so reasonable to you and the combinations are so varied, you'll fall for it. It's inevitable.

You try to clean this thing up: "Well, did you think anything" - knowing this, we might shorten it down, don't you see - "Did you think any invalidative thoughts about the goal? Let's get in the mid ruds on the subject of the goal: On this goal, has anything been suppressed?" Blah - blah - blah - blah - blah - blah. And all straightened out and ...

Pc spends the whole time you're getting the mid ruds on it saying, "Yeah, but I've never been a snob. I never had a goal like this. I never had a - so on and so on. I'm a - I - not me! I couldn't possibly have had a goal - and so on and so on." So even the mid ruds are converted into a total invalidation of the goal, see? So this thing - this thing still reads "wrong GPM" - must be, the pc's ARC broke.

And you say, "Well, let's get the pc out of the ARC break." "All right," you say, "that is a wrong goal."

And the pc will say, "Whew! Boy, that's a relief!" See, you add to the not - is that they're trying to pull off, of course it complements it and so on.

Now begins the silly rat race of trying to find the right goal which occurs in that place. One after another, we get three goals to read - actually fire, actually check out as an actual GPM. See, everything's awry now. And we get one after the other. And we start - and we find their top oppterm and we find their top terminal and we lose the RR. That's the end of that RR. Well, it must have been a wrong goal, hu - hum! So we throw that one away, and we get another one. We take the same goals list and we work and sweat over this goals list.

And the reason, of course, a goals list will read if you work it over hard enough, unbelievably hard, under a circumstance like this where you've already invalidated the correct goal on it, you'll find other items will start reading on the same list, whether you extend it or not.

So, you find another goal, and you put it in the same place. Pc has eventually sold you "to be humble," see, something like that, motivated by the RI they're sitting in. Only you don't know that and neither do they, see? Top oppterm, top terminal, everything's going along - well, we're really rolling now, got beautiful blowdowns, you see? We get the third item up - erk! "People who hate humble people. (I don't know what it says. No read.) Let's conti - extend the list a little bit more." That needle is just freezing. It's getting tighter and tighter. There's less and less read, there's less and less fall, there's less and less tone arm motion.

"Well, that's a wrong goal." All right, we throw that one out, see? "All right, now let's find another goal that goes in this immediate area and so forth." You're groggy, the pc's bank is all messed up. He couldn't - he actually couldn't itsa bright red paint in front of his face by this time, see? You've got his bank looking like a GPM pretzel! And then sometime down along the line - we hope it will be in the next few months - somebody's looking over this folder - you're looking over this folder or somebody's looking over it or you notice it and so forth: The goal you were running ran seven items without turning off the RR. Must be a right goal from someplace. Well, we better orient the thing.

So we put in the ruds on it and we get it sorted out and we eventually straighten it out, and all of a sudden, bang! it was the right goal in the first place. And the RR is beautiful, and it's on, and everything is going along gorgeously. And here we go now, and we go on down and finish off and we find we were only two items from the bottom or something stupid, see? It isn't that that was that short a GPM, but let us say we'd found eighteen items in it, and maybe stopped on the last RIs - something like this. This sort of thing happens. See? The one thing you'd never imagine, because it all checked out. Everything checked; everything checked. But it read as a wrong goal because it had been invalidated.

All right, let's take the exact same situation. Remember, we're walking in the dark, here. These six - foot rear - view mirrors: When we've got it all done we say, "Of course!" But at the time we're walking into it, man, that peephole in front is about one - thousandth of a millimeter in diameter. And we are going up the line, one way or the other here, and we say, "Who or what would 'to dance' oppose?" And we get - and it reads, and everything is fine - "to not dance." Obvious! The exact goal! Everything is fine. So we take this goal and we run it and it doesn't turn off the RR. Pc is beginning to look mighty pale and the tone arm's pretty high. We're not getting much in the way of blowdowns and the falls aren't very pronounced, but it's running.

So we say, well, we wont make trouble for the pc; we will go on and run this a little bit further. It's all checked out, everything is gorgeous, you see, and so forth. And it gets worse, and it gets worse, and it gets worse, and we're not quite sure what this is. And the items start to look rather odd to us, so we challenge the pc. We say, "You aren't listing the auditing question. Now, you must list it." Yes, he is; he swears he is.

And he's getting the goal, you see, "to not dance" and . . . 'Tain't running right, though; nothing's running right. It's going to pieces. Tone arm action's degenerated, tone arm high or low and pc's morale kind of bad, they're dragging around, and they shouldn't be operating like this. Hard to find items, hard to get them to blow down, and have to prepcheck every item to get it to blow down, and all kinds of stuff like this is occurring, you see?

Finally you get bright and you say - you start looking at those items and, "Gee, you know, those look like an implant line plot." And hurrah, hurrah, it is! It is. And you check it over on an ARC break and you get this - you get a tick. Your first clue, maybe by just inspection, which it probably should be, but if you didn't get that, you'd get something like an incomplete goals list is the reason for the ARC break. Well, you've completed every goals list you can think of, so why should it possibly be an incomplete goals list, you see? And so on.

We find out that there is a GPM, an implant GPM, "to not dance," and the reason the RR didn't turn off is we were running an implant GPM, and of course an implant GPM doesn't

turn off the RR if you're running it. So why should it? If an im - if you're running an implant GPM with the wording of an actual GPM your RR will go off You know, you think you're running an implant GPM, you're running it by pattern and you're trying to run the actual GPM by an implant pattern, you wont have any more RR than a rabbit. But the other isn't - the otherwise isn't true. You found an implant GPM, the only thing that's wrong with it is, is you're just finding some misworded items in it, and the RR isn't going off, nothing's going off, thing is apparently running, everything's going along all right - except it isn't running well at all. The pc's pretty upset and so forth. You got an incomplete goals list.

You go ahead, and you did your - you finish up your goals list, and so forth, and you'll find out that it was "to be sad" or something, see? And that was the right goal and you're back up at the top and you're on your way again.

How many auditing sessions did it take you to find this? That is the question. How many auditing sessions? It's actually as many auditing sessions as it took you. That is the exact precise statement of time. Because it could take you anything up to thirty auditing sessions to get a blunder. What takes time in R4 is the mistakes. You'll find this time and time again.

The time consumer is the mistake. You make the mistake, you're in for it. Well, that doesn't mean you should go on trying to be perfect all the time, just be as good as you can. And you'll make as few mistakes as possible and lose the minimal amount of auditing time if you repair them as quickly as possible. But this statement will still hold true, that the time that is consumed in R4 is as a result of a mistake. Mistakes consume the time. You make one blunder, you buy the wrong goal, there you go! You've had it!

Now, actually if you'd found the right goal you would have had the whole thing run out in the next session or two. See? Would have been all gone, and you'd have been on your next list. Instead of that, here you'll be, idling around, fooling around - not for just this session, but the next session, and maybe the next session, and maybe the next session, with your pc getting less and less capable of straightening it out, and you getting more and more confused. And everything you're trying on as the error here, you see, is not working out, don't you see? And then you're invalidating things that are true, you see, and validating things that aren't, so that your analysis of the situation is getting poorer and poorer, don't you see?

Well of course, you could say, quite handily, and possibly some day in future ages some Instructor will say it, "Well, of course, the thing to do, obviously, is not to make mistakes in the first place." That's not possible. That's merely a snide, not an obtainable perfection. Where absolutes are unobtainable, that one is peculiarly so, because it depends exclusively upon the pc's ability to itsa. And the auditor auditing with the best possible talent, technique, attention to duty and so forth, is sooner or later going to run into a zone or area where the sub - itsa, as represented by the pc's ability to itsa, is very peculiarly shallow. And he's going to hit that point, and he's going to say, "Well, it's this way and this way and this way." And what makes this - and he's going to be wrong.

But what makes this peculiarly true that you - nobody should go around saying, "Well, you shouldn't make mistakes in it" - what makes it peculiarly true about the matter is that the mistakes that you make are consistently trying not to make mistakes.

Pc's running like a well - oiled dream - I've done it myself - so you decide, just to be sure we haven't made a mistake, we will go back up and patch up ... And then find that the next four items I found in the patch - up of the goal above it actually belong in the goal below it. And we got a pc wrapped around the telegraph pole and the tone arm's sitting over here at five point f - if I'd just kept my mouth shut and just gone on the way we were going, all would have been well!

So, you see, you can strain so hard to not make mistakes that you wrap a pc around a telegraph pole. I'll give you an idea how you do this. This is one of the reasons mistakes are impossible to avoid. They are impossible to avoid in R4, because you have to do this but you

mustn't do this, see? It runs like this, you see: "All right, is that an actual GPM? All right, that reads. I'll check it out the rest of the way. Is that an implant GPM? Is that no GPM? Well, those don't read. It's an actual GPM. All right. Good."

Pc is sitting there, smiling, happy, everything's all ready to go, you see? You got it made now, see? You're all set. All you got to do is say the last RI down to the next oppterm and get that list, and you're away like the hounds, you see, after the red fox, you see? But you don't do that. You've just got through wasting two weeks on this pc through having wrapped a couple of telegraph poles around the pc, and then the pc around the telegraph poles for good measure. You're all set now, so you're not going to - you're not going to get caught this time. We know this now.

All right. "You mind if I check that again? This - is this an actual GPM? Is this an implant GPM?" "That - that reads. Did you protest that?"

"Well, no."

"Is this an implant GP - ? (Gee, tha - that reads, you know.) All right, do you - you - you mind if I get the - get the mid ruds - mid ruds in on this goal?" And we come back and we check it again: "Is this an actual GPM? Is this an implant GPM? Is this no GPM? Is this only a goal? That reads. All right. Let's get in the session mid ruds here just to make sure that everything is straightened up all right, because we've got to be sure. Just - uuuh! - wasted two weeks on this other GPM. All right, good enough now. Is this is a - is - is this a - only - only a goal? All right, that - that's fine. Now, let's get in - let's get in these - only a goal, yeah. Well, let's get in - let's get in a couple of buttons on the session mid ruds anyway and get these in. In this session, has anything been protested? So forth, so on, so on, so on, so on, so on. All right, thank you. In this session has anything been decided? All right, all right, all right, good, good, all right. Now let's continue this goals list. All right, let's continue this goals list. Is that okay'.?"

Pc sitting there, "Huh? Find it very hard to list," and so on.

"Well, just - just go ahead. On this list, has anything been suppressed?"

"Well, you sort of suppressed the idea that we already found the goal. I thought the list was complete."

"Well, all right, fine. Got that, thank you. Now, all right, who or what would 'to dance' oppose? All right."

Pc obligingly gives you a whole bunch of new goals. Meantime the actual GPM is all being beautifully suppressed. Then two weeks after that, you suddenly remember that there was a point where the pc was running well and you went back to it to see what was happening at that point, and find out that you had the goal in the first place. And the reason the thing changed from the read of actual GPM over to the read of an implant GPM - the reason that changed - is because the pc was saying to himself and didn't bother to tell you, "Why the hell aren't we running it? Why aren't we running this?"

And he thought that at the time you asked the question, "Is that an implant GPM?" This factually you'll never recover. You understand? You don't get that datum back, but that's actually what happened.

You were going to be very careful and you were going to double - check. So the second time you checked it, the pc's objections give you an incorrect analysis. That's many complications.

In another case, the reason why you're going to make mistakes, and that's for sure, is the pc is not ready to have an analysis done. The tone arm is still moving. The needle is still blowing

down. The pc is still cogniting on this goal, see, "to be a snob." There it still goes, pshewww! Every once in a while you'll see it go out from under. You think it has now quieted down.

Now, actually the impingement of your voice on the bank, of your voice on the pc's bank, is enough to cause - during a particularly blowdown period when waves of heat and that sort of thing are coming off the pc - your voice against the pc's bank is sufficient to produce a rocket read.

Well, look - look. The charge is blowing off, see, and every time it blows off you get a long surge, and you're watching that tone arm come down by long surges - sporadic, occasional surges. Well, look, it got down here to 3.25 and it's all ready to blow down to 3.0, and all it does is need the slightest zephyr breathing upon it, you see, to trigger it. You get the idea? I mean, it's all set to be triggered, if you'd sat there just a little bit longer and let it blow down all the way. But you thought you estimated it properly. It's still got a way to blow down, don't you see?

Pc's a little bit introverted thinking about this thing of he's - how he's zuh, zuh, zuh - this - this accounts for the fact that he can only have Daimlers, you see, or something like this, but he can never afford them and that sort of thing, and really doesn't like them, and so on. He'll say, "That's zuh, zuh Daimlers," and so on and so on and so on "and that's why I always went round with tall, blond girls, you see," and so on, so on, and on and on and you know, like this. Still very introverted.

You think the blowdown has stopped. So you say, "All right, we're going to check this now. Is that all right with you?"

And he wakes up, "Oh, yes, perfectly fine, life is wonderful," you see, in a sort of a foggy, dope - eater's daze, you see? Life is wonderful. "Oh, yes, it's all right," and so on. "You - oh, you know best, you know. Good old little auditor. That's fine, we got this - we got this nice goal here, 'to be a snob.' All right."

"Now, now, good enough, good enough, now. Okay. Now is this an actual GPM? Hm?" There's no read there, you see? "All right. Is this an implant GPM?"

"What! My goal an implant GPM?" See? "No!" See? Rocket read on the protest and the triggered charge. That goal will now continue to read as a wrong goal. And with all of the cares of observation and everything else that you can do, you still can't avoid, once in a while, making one of those wild everything - was - just - exactly - wrong - at - that - moment - for - you - to - have - said - whatyou - said - in - order - to - get - that - read. See?

So anything that can make a meter go out, or any condition which will give you an erroneous read on a meter, is then susceptible to throwing out a case analysis. And your own efforts to straighten out a case analysis are susceptible to throwing out a case analysis. And a case analysis can be wrong in the first place.

All right. Those are the nerves with which you live. At least know you live with them. Something like the Gentleman who was going to teach his young boy his first lesson in business, and sent him up to the top of a stepladder and told him to jump, that Papa would catch him. And so the little boy jumped and Papa stepped aside, and there was a tremendous upset at this particular point, and "Why didn't you catch me?" He said, "That was your first lesson in business: Don't trust anybody - not even your papa."

All right, now, that's the way it is - that's the way it is with your E - Meter, see? That's the way it is with your E - Meter. And yet if you don't trust it you'll never get anyplace either.

These, in actual fact, are really the exact conditions under which R4 is performed.

So you see very clearly that if there are three zones of auditing - basic auditing, the technique or process as your second zone, and case analysis is your third zone - you see that with all these conditions occurring, you haven't got any time to be worrying about how you perform the technique or your basic auditing. You haven't got any time to be worrying about those things, because all of that is going to be subtractive of the real and terrible liabilities of case analysis. And the liabilities I've just been giving you are simply the liabilities of case analysis.

No matter how carefully your basic auditing was performed, no matter how well you knew the technique, no matter for all of these things, your case analysis is still liable to error. And will always be liable to error, because you're getting your case analysis from a blind man who is lost in the dark and doesn't even know who he is, where he is or what he's looking at, even though he's perfectly well trained and beautifully educated in the subject to know. The best blind man caught in the dark isn't going to be able to tell you. The only thing that's going to be able to tell you is a meter, and that meter, while when it reads is perfectly accurate, what is it reading on? We're not quite sure of that, and so from that point on we have no time at all to be worrying about our basic auditing.

That's something you should be able to do. You got a headache, you got a backache, you haven't had anything to eat, you feel dizzy, you feel confused, you are very faint, you have just had a terrible session yourself, you are halfway through a wrong goal, and life is looking awfully grim - you should be able in the basic auditing division to turn in a flawless session. That's part of the preselection: to be able to turn in a flawless session. There's no excuse for not doing so. Why? It's very easy to do. Providing you can do it. So there you are.

Technique? Man, this bank and this pc that you're facing - to keep seven Indian clubs in the air is a simple action compared to getting them to sit there all assembled and not ARC breaking and running down the wrong corridors and getting everything upset, even though they're trained and they know what they're looking at and they're well grooved in and their case is not in bad Condition and they've still got the ability to confront their bank to some degree and they're not scared to be a pc and horrified at what might happen to them. That's still like keeping seven Indian clubs in the air simultaneously. See?

So your technique: You've got to be able to sit there and dish off a list, a goals list - plaff - ploof, who cares? Goals list, fifty - odd down the line, well write it upside down, it doesn't matter, see? Basic auditing going off perfectly; goals list, blah - blah - blah, it doesn't matter and so on, down the line, all flawless, perfectly, every read recorded over here and everything's fine, perfect.

But you haven't got any time to worry about being able to do that. You've got no time at all to worry about any: "Let's see, how do I head a goals list? Let's see, how do I head a goals list? I was supposed to write the question up here, I think. Yes, let's see. And how do I write this first goal down? Let's see. I'm having an awful time keeping this. Where do you keep a meter here.? Write a goals list. You - you keep a meter from out here, so on and so on. That's - can't really see the meter. It's - it's this ... Can't really see the front of the meter while I write the goals list, and so forth - I'm not - excuse me, I'm having an awfully hard time trying to get this meter oriented . .

It's perfectly all right to have problems like that, but let's have them all smoothed out before we get into the raw meat of running a case, see? There's all kinds of interesting solutions that auditors make with regard to it. The paper slides up this way and that way, and they work these things out, and they start subtracting things from the things they can record and keep track of For instance, how much tone arm can you keep track of while doing a goals list? Well, I frankly can't keep track of much more than doing a fall and a blowdown while doing a hot goals list on a pc. I'm doing very well to keep track of the falls and blowdowns and the amount of the blowdown. And that's why you need a counter. And a counter which won't subtract you. The first counter that was developed, by the way, I rejected categorically because it distracted the auditor too much.

So you see, at this point you have no reason for the technique to be posing you any difficulties at all, because you've got no room for it, that's all. You can't be having trouble with technique. How do you do a goals list? See? How do you do an items list? These things should not be an enormous puzzle to you. Otherwise they just take that much out of the session; they cause you to make a lot of mistakes, in other words. You got to have those things licked. And this leaves this tremendous zone of case analysis.

And you should be able to think bank. That certainly sounds funny, doesn't it? Because a bank is for thinking. A bank thinks. A bank pushes thoughts off on people, so forth. Well, there's another point of preselection. You should be able to think perfectly and accurately about a pc's bank which you're not looking at except through an E - Meter, and by signs and data, and you're thinking perfectly about a bank, and the bank is something that thinks. And your bank also kicks around a little bit while you're thinking about the pc's bank, inevitably, a little bit. And so the final analysis is, that's enough trouble. Because that is a big point of randomity. And in auditing R4, that should be the only point of randomity - is, "Exactly what is happening with this - with this bank I am handling? Exactly how is it going together? What are the contributive data I have to make up my mind about the situations in this bank?" And that is plenty for you to handle.

I know, it got plenty for me to handle. I don't - I don't want to handle anything else but that, see? Because that's plenty. Because that's the one that gets you mistakes. And with a perfectly free mind and with perfect education on the subject, you're still going to make errors. But if errors are the things that cause you to stretch the case out endlessly, then we want to minimize these errors. Well, the way to minimize these errors is with perfect training in the zones, oddly enough, of basic auditing and technique, and then the elements of case analysis. And with that three - way triangle there of training, you can make OTs and you can be OT, because you only really get auditing of the level which you yourself give, in the final analysis.

If you don't give good auditing, why, you actually don't tend to receive good auditing. It isn't for the reason of the overt - motivator sequence, it's just the people who will co - audit with you. I mean, there's one point, you see? You can always get worse auditing than you give, to some slight degree, so if your auditing is pretty poor, and the auditing you're going to get is worse than your auditing, think what happens. And that gets to be a grim scene, doesn't it? In fact, I can almost guarantee it. You'll always get slightly poorer auditing, ordinarily - you can view it safely from this viewpoint - than you yourself give. Therefore, if you're a real whiz - bang, your auditing you get wont be so bad.

Now, the training levels and so forth, then, and training, is definitely, definitely, definitely a part of the route to OT. Definitely. Degrees, levels, training. This is something that it's not nice to be a part of, this is something that is a vital part of becoming OT. And I would say that we have gone and - we've gone up to a new plateau here. Because you've noticed here, in the last few lectures I have given you particularly, I've been talking to you pretty straight from the shoulder about this sort of thing; I've been giving you exactly what the score was and so on.

Now, the best reason for that is, is there are several people rolling up thing right here at this moment on the goals channel, going right straight to OT. And there isn't any quiver on that line; there's just the incidental mistakes of straightening out the goal and that sort of thing. In other words, we are on our way, definitely. And it's from this factual data that one can view this other with aplomb. Our interest in the state of Clear is so microscopic as to be a yawn, see; it's of no importance at all. The state makes somebody more comfortable - so what? You can make a sick man more comfortable by putting a pillow under his head, see?

Raw meat - very nice. You can make them well. Good. Fine. Well worth doing. There's nothing wrong with that at all. You can make a marriage run better and a kid be happier, and you can make life tenable and so forth. But actually you have to know to audit well in that

direction just to make life tenable enough for you to be able to go on through to OT. That's a necessary zone, too. Actually a non - Scientologist is so surrounded by Confusion that their present time is insufficiently calm for them to have any progress in the direction of OT.

These are other preselections and so forth. Many are called, few are chosen. There are many reasons why this track and path is a limited track and path. Now, it isn't going to say that eventually everybody won't make OT. But certainly, certainly and definitely and positively, it'll be a very, very long route for others, and you'll still be getting around to some hundreds of years, thousands of years from now. There'll be somebody picking it up, saying, "Well, let's see, what's this thing called tone arm action?"

Now, when you look up the line on that and get a real view of the situation, you realize where you are and where you sit. You're right up in the front seat of the first breakthrough that's ever been made in this universe on the subject of the road out, the way through - that sort of thing. You're right there. You're fortunate to have moved up into the situation that you're in. And the only thing I can ask you and point out to you is that you're in a position where you shouldn't waste any of the potential which you have immediately at your fingertips. You shouldn't waste any part of that. The only thing I ask you to do is to make the most of what you've got.

I've tried to give you an outline of training, its use and application, and its relationship to state of case and future of case, and I hope it has been of some assistance.

Thank you.