

ESSENTIALS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
15 October 1963

Well, I'm glad to see you back. Where you been? Have a good trip? Well, it's the first of these lectures in—well, it's the first one of these lectures now in two weeks. So what's the date?

Audience: 15th of October.

Fifteenth of October, AD 13. Actually, you would see to be all rested up, you see, from having not lectured for a couple of weeks, but frankly the lecture weeks are the relaxation weeks. We put 900 feet of film in the cans yesterday. It took us two days to put 300 feet of 16mm in the cans and yesterday afternoon and evening we put 900 feet in and we just shot it with luck all the way. This is—of course, we are shooting right on top of it and this is the Saturday congress in London.

This is Monday and the film has—this is the Monday shoot and the film had to be at the developers and so forth on Tuesday, and we hope we get it back with a print on Thursday. And we might even have a chance to edit it but we shot it with no editing. I just used—being an old Hollywoodite on these things—just abandoned all movie technology and threw in a lot of—just abandoned it utterly—and threw in TV kinescope technology, which is quite different.

And Reg got a beautiful Auricon 16mm magnetic sound camera from over in the States. You can line it up on one of these TV screens and it doesn't get the lines or anything, so it does a gorgeous job. And we can film demonstrations and so forth. That will be reduced down to 8mm, and 8mm with a magnetic soundtrack, and then these projectors—put in all organizations—and we can give them some material that will hold the line. And of course, yesterday's film—we just put everything in it including the kitchen sink. There was students and buildings and we had Nicky out here throwing a penny in the wishing well. And we had the kids saying goodnight and so forth.

You'd be surprised how long a half an hour is when you're making it up with shots, you know, different scenes and shots and that sort of thing. And we gagged it up quite a bit, and it'll probably—you'll probably see it next Saturday if you go up to the London congress, and you undoubtedly will see it at the US Eastern congress and the US Western congress and so forth; you'll be seeing this film around.

And the strain of it, however, was too great for us. The strain was too great. We began to crack up toward the end, you see, working on into all hours. And we were just so lucky that it's just almost impossible to estimate the amount of luck involved in the thing—so we'd shoot a shot and that was it, you see? And we weren't dropping ashtrays and other things like that. For instance, we shot a Model Session complete from beginning to end using Havingness as the process. I don't know what film footage we shot that on, but it was very brief. Only about a hundred and twenty feet of film for a whole Model Session from beginning to end with every step in it, and it all went off very flawlessly. And the only thing I did in error on the thing, I thanked the pc for the goals and gains after having gotten both goals and gains which is hardly anything at all because I've been doing that routinely anyhow.

But the score is that that film can do a terrific job of TV demonstration, you see, because you just give a usual routine ordinary TV demonstration and the camera is downstairs there in the lower studio or camera room, and it just takes the demonstration and you flick the meter onto the screen, you flick the picture on the screen. You could flick a picture of the pc on the screen, you see. You could put anything on that screen and then you shoot it off from the screen.

You say, well, what happens to the quality and so forth? Well, I think you'll see that Saturday. The quality actually doesn't suffer at all. It's quite remarkable. You don't see the lines of the screen because of the shutter—and you just don't see them show up. That's all. It just looks like a picture of something, not a picture of a TV screen. Your eye can detect more lines and so forth than a camera can detect on a TV screen. You can also set up the contrast so that it's much more agreeable to film.

Furthermore, a TV camera would shoot a picture in here now. Ha—ha. Try and take one on film. Now, you could set up two or three TV cameras, one up there and one up there, you wouldn't have to have any operator to it to amount to anything. You could shoot a picture of this lecture here, pick it up over in the lower studio and just by flipping the turret, shift from one scene to another scene, and the sound is just going right onto the camera directly, and so on. You got a picture of a lecture.

You wouldn't hear any whirring camera noises or anything like that. And YOU don't have to have the fantastic glaring light levels that are required for motion pictures. So we've done quite a job on that. I just thought you'd be interested in it and give you a little bit ... There is a gag that I'll let you—I'll let you be able to whisper to the people. Reg is going to pull this gag. Right at the end when we finally broke down, why, Reg and I sat down to the—my organ in my office, you see, and got a picture of us going to play a tune, you see, and as we were about to strike the keys and playing on a duet you get the first of your end titles, you see. We just blank out, you see. And got that? And we carry on with a beautiful organ piece which plays out through the end titles.

And I'll let you in on a little secret. It won't be much of a secret because you listen to this music. It's actually the „Saints Come Marching In.“ But in actual fact, it's being—it is the biggest pipe organ in the world. It's the Hub rink organ in Chicago, you see. I think 64 foot pipes the thing has got you know, and that sort of thing, and here we are sitting down to this little tiny Wurlitzer. Well for sure, you see, there'll be people at the congress though who don't get the gag.

Well, we had a lot of fun shooting that. But it was really high—pressure stuff. We'll be able to make training films, in other words, of the various types and activities. And we'll be using them here.

Now, here we have another system going in, and that is to say we can put a projector down there and put it on and throw a switch on the projector down there, and you get the picture on the TV sets here in the chapel. In other words, you don't have to have a blacked—out cinema in order to see the pictures. In other words, a little 8mm projector sits down there. This is all 16mm we're shooting this stuff on reduced to 8, you see? You can turn on this little projector down there and show a session or a demonstration or a piece of auditing, it appears on the TV screen. You watch the TV screen. And Mr. Skinner doing that—he even figured out when I asked him if it wasn't possible, why, to fix it up so that it would just shut everything off when it finished the film, and there'll be a small fee to the Instructors and so forth for that one.

In other words, you could set up a film, load it, and simply by just press a button, and you've got the—you've got the thing demonstrated from one end to the other. And then when it's finished, it doesn't even have to have anybody pay any attention to it. It simply shuts itself off. Shuts all the sets off. Shuts everything off. Turns out the light, sweeps the floor. Well, we're getting this geared up.

Communication of Scientology materials to the auditor and the student is one of the biggest humps, as you could realize, that we must have. And there are many, many things—I'm just going to give you a talk on that sort of thing and give you some data concerning it that you'll find of interest. And that is that the TV systems, the bulletins, the graphs, the materials which you have, your live demonstrations, your live Instructors, all of this sort of thing is an effort to relay information. And the idea of education is simply taking an idea from one mind and putting it in another mind. And that is really the totality of education. It really doesn't depend on whether the idea is good, bad or indifferent, true, false or otherwise: The methods of education are all the same.

And they are basically the methods of communication, so therefore the ARC triangle, to a large degree, operates in these mechanisms. And one of the things: if you can take MEST out or take effort out of the communication line, you can normally get a fast, accurate communication line. But there is a point when the communication line, not having any mass in it, becomes unstable. In other words, you cannot hold a standard because it isn't down anyplace.

Let me give you an idea. One of you goes up to London, walk through the Central Organization in London. Well, I don't say stay out of the Central Organization in London. I don't say don't answer questions asked you. By all means, talk all you please, but it is quite ordinarily followed on a Monday by a catastrophe in the HGC.

Now, your communication line to the student or the HGC staff member or something like that was probably quite accurate. But what did he tell Joe? In other words, a standard wasn't held here so that you get weird things which are then attributed to the Saint Hill students going to London. Even one time it was contemplated not letting any Saint Hill students go to London—go into the organization in London, see. That was once contemplated. Well, I finally put my foot down. I said no, no, no. I figured it out. No. They do them much more good than they do them harm. Because the false communication line does not come actually between the Saint Hill student and the organization. It comes between what—that the person who has heard the Saint Hill student ordinarily and who that person was talking to. See, you get some wild variations.

For instance, you might not know it, but you had all London in a complete panic just a week ago—just a week ago. They had heard that the TA required—minimum TA for a 25-hour intensive was 400. And they all had headaches last Monday and so forth working at this horrible data, see. Well, data like that occurs in the absence of a fixed data source. It isn't written down in a bulletin, you see. It's adrift somewhere on the communication lines and so on.

Now, we sometimes sin to this degree. There'll be data which is given in tapes which never appears on bulletins. And there are little scraps of data of one kind or another that could make all that difference in the auditing session going on in Keokuk that have simply never been published. Well, to round up all this data and put it all together is a Herculean task. It would be to a marked degree up to me to do it. But well, for instance, Reg has been working on the last two years of bulletins. He's had his secretary working on the last two years of bulletins. Getting them all together and so forth. And they finally did get all of this material together. Now they're trying to get the last two years of tape notes complete. Now, if we did that, we would have two years of total research. But still, outside of it would be left the data which I have given you walking down the hall, see.

There is always some data escapes the fixed communication line. So you have to be very thorough and you have to sort out what are the fundamentals which should be taught, and therefore, in order to communicate and in order for anybody to assimilate the information on the other end, which is part of the educational act, you have to have a condition where the data is not in conflict and is not so complicated that it cannot be communicated or cannot be assimilated. So therefore you reduce things to their

fundamentals. And this has two purposes. The one purpose is the educational purpose and the other thing, of course, is things which are reduced to their fundamentals are resolved or far better understood.

Now, the purpose we're speaking of now, however, is the relay of it. Now, the relay of that education and of data from mind A to mind B is susceptible to many alterations, many alter—ises, many omissions, many curves and so forth. It's almost proportional to mind A to mind B. All right, that's one set of alter—ises. Mind C—we have now added a new—that's mind B to mind C, that's a new set of alter—ises. Now we got mind C to mind D and that is a new set of alter—ises. And we've got D to E and that isn't alter—is by this time; it's unrecognizable.

Now this also occurs on the time stream. That datum, which was thoroughly understood in 1800, by 1900 has become unrecognizable. In actual fact, we probably have very little grip on what was actually thought in 1800—very little grip, on the opinions and activities of the time.

But I well recall in just this first half of 1900, a tremendous change of manners, mannerisms, and so forth, brought about by other communication media, such as the motion picture, television and we mustn't omit the automobile as a communication media. It is because it's a particle that can travel rapidly and independently from A to B.

The Telephone is earlier than that, but all of these things have influence and they influence a culture and they influence what is going on in that culture. But this we talk about in terms of an overloaded communication line now. And I'm not going into the five ways you can cut a communication line. They're the subject of a great many executive bulletins and all this sort of thing, but I'm infringing on that quarter right now. You can actually overload the communication line so that it doesn't communicate. There is simply too much data on the subject.

This—you sometimes feel like that. I know, see? And you wish, for heaven's sake, that you could pick out of it a few fundamentals that would sort of sum it all up and you would be able to wrap your wits around it and so forth. And that in actual fact is the subject of this lecture that I'm giving you; here is how you do this.

The situation, then, of an overloaded communication line is that there is insufficient time to peruse the material. You could get into that kind of a situation rather easily. So you can have too little communication. You can have too varied or too variable a communication. Or you can simply have an overloaded communication line.

For instance, I walked into the Explorers Club one day up in the library up on the mezzanine floor, and I wanted to know a little bit about ice, I think it was or something like that. I didn't—wasn't particularly hepped on it. I just wanted a little datum about ice, the conditions of ice and the temperatures at which ice became rotten, so called, and so on. I just wanted a little information. I asked the librarian up there. „Where's some text here on ice? Where's some text on ice? I want to look up something, some stable data about ice.“ And he looked at me as though I were mad or I'd suddenly gone mad or I was about to steal his whole library or something like this, and he waved his hand and he said, „Well, that cabinet over there is part of the material about ice.“ I looked at that cabinet over there and it contained something on the order of a thousand volumes, all of them thick. And you can frankly shut the door to learning in somebody's face with a dull clank.

Needless to say, I went down and found an old friend of mine that knew the Arctic, at the tea table that evening, and I pumped him on the subject of ice for a short space of time, and, „Oh, when does it become rotten?“ „Oh, well,“ he said, „that varies,“ and so forth, and he gave me the variable edges and he tossed it off. It was very easy for him to toss off this datum for the excellent reason that he had tremendous familiarity with the subject. But my door was closed in the absence of this boy. My door was closed. I was to sit up there

and read a thousand volumes hoping that somewhere in it I would discover something about rotten ice.

One volume said ice also becomes rotten through moss—certain types of moss. And the next thing you know, I was reading a chapter on biology. I don't know how I got off into biology. I was just looking for some rotten ice, man. See, you get off into these wild excursions and you feel like somebody who picks up a copy of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and he's going to look up anteaters, you know, and the next confounded thing, you know, he's reading with great fascination about aardvarks.

He's been totally derailed. So too much information on a subject or too many volumes of information on a subject can effectively close the communication lines. We actually, oddly enough, don't happen to be suffering from that in Scientology. You think we are, but we actually aren't. We're actually suffering from a lack of text.

You would be very happy to have a text that says ARC Breaks Level I, and that gave a five, six, eight, even ten page breakdown of all possible sources of them that gave you the cross-index conditions of the pc for each one of them. Herculean task to do things, something like that. But, nevertheless, that would be a very welcome volume to you. Instead of that, our material is actually a research record, and you are looking at a research record. You are not looking at textbook material. And as soon as you realize that, you'll have a much easier time of it.

At any given instant on a research line, that which is known is believed to be true, and it wouldn't be there unless it had some workability at any given instant. But at any given later instance on that research line, you will find that that material has been reexamined and that certain data in it which are not important have been dropped and certain data in it which are important have been clarified and added.

Now your main difficulty is looking at a time span of development and trying to pick out of a time span of development a great many fundamentals. Well, the most remarkable thing in the world was how we got along, having started with the definition of auditor. Giving the sweeping ideas here. We got the definition of an auditor as one who listens and originally one who listens and computes. All right. That's great. And we come up thirteen years, almost fourteen years later with this as a resolution of cases.

Well, that is certainly different on the research line. See, there's two different points here fourteen years apart, and one, it just says well, an auditor is somebody who listens and computes and most of the time the auditor thought the compute was more important than the listen. Then fourteen years later, we drop the compute and we put the listen in there for Level I. Wow! What a difference, see? What a difference. This little tiny change of emphasis gives us a sweeping difference in auditing.

So therefore, at some period during that fourteen years, some of the data concerning the definition of an auditor and his function must have been reevaluated from time to time, and sure enough, we see that. We see different TRs, we see this, we see that, we see the other thing coming along the line. And we see an enormous number of extraneous and additional data, all of which support what an auditor ought to be doing. Well, all of that data concerning what an auditor ought to be doing was, of course, an effort to clarify and explain to the student or to the potential auditor what his performance should be.

Well, it must have been there to this slight degree. It must have been there because the basic definition and understanding was not present. So, the more data in education ... Now you can draw these extrapolations because we're not a bad model of education if you just remember that you are studying a research line, and it's up to the old man to someday grab it all together and put it together somehow or another and assemble it and so on. And MY solution to it right now is merely expect you to be geniuses at it, see? That's all. Simple solution. It saves me time. Funny part of it is you all too often measure up to it.

But the system now of data—summation, gathering of data and so on—adds up to a very interesting datum in the field of sciences, and that is this—this is an interesting datum. It's quite pervasive. It's quite useful—is the more arbitrariness or the more arbitrary didactic solution—you must, you've got to, you must note, and so forth—there are in a subject, the further that subject is from the actual comprehension of the basics involved in that subject. Now I'll state that another way to make sure you got it. The subject itself has arbitrary data in it in direct proportion to its distance from knowing its own fundamentals. That's an elementary remark. Now I'll clarify that. How about art? Just how about art? I remember old Don Rogers mentioned this a long time ago, 1950. How about art?

Man you've got nothing but opinion in art. Opinion, opinion, opinion, opinion, opinion. „This is a good picture because the Metropolitan Museum hung it.“ Oh, brother! I've met a director of the Metropolitan Museum; I wouldn't consider that a recommendation. „This is a great picture because it was analyzed by professor Joe Blow of Krapunkin as one of the great pictures of the Screemp Century.“ That's why you wander through a gallery and you see these four dots of paint there, you see, running down into a mass of wrinkles, and there's a sign across the bottom of it and it says „Commerce.“ And *ohhhh*, which wall, see?

Well, therefore, a subject can be so way out that it is nothing but opinion. And when a subject is nothing but opinion, then you can safely assume that there is nothing known about the subject. That's one you can put in your hip pocket just as a snide method of analysis.

Now, for instance, testing: When you have tests which depend upon the opinion of the tester to say whether or not somebody is sane or insane or delirious or something, you see, and it's up to the tester to give an opinion, then you must decide two things: that little or nothing is known about testing and that no fundamentals on the subject of the mind must be known in that quarter; otherwise, the tests would not be so far out as to require only opinion.

Here once more we have the fact: The opinion present is proportional to the unknowns present. And you can get, then, all kinds of weird (quote) sciences (unquote).

Now, that's a little bit different than looking at a developmental line. A developmental line is simply a self-critical and active and ambitious effort to learn more fundamental materials to clarify and throw away irrelevant materials. Actually, it's a self-critical line that is trying to shorten its own volume. It's trying to reach minimal information.

It looks to you sometimes in this field of study as though it's trying to reach maximal investment of time to understand it. But if you will look at the materials, you find out that they are condensing, condensing, condensing. The data are getting less per section of the subject. But with that lessness comes a greater importance because they're more fundamental previously.

You can, for instance, take a Hindu philosopher's textbook, Krishnamurti or something like this, open up the chapter on time. A Scientologist would be very fascinated to read Krishnamurti science on the subject of time. He'd be flabbergasted, as a matter of fact—flabbergasted. How'd he know this?

Well, unfortunately, there's a little hook to it. His data about time, that are factual data about time, are sandwiched in at the same monotone of importance with about five hundred or a thousand other data about time which are *totally* false and to which he has given the hat tip of being fundamental.

So you can go through any body of writing, and you can find certain numbers of truths in it, but did the writer find them? I used to horrify English professors by saying—about witticisms and being very clever in writing and that sort of thing—I used to horrify these boys. You could just see their—the resistance of iconoclasm item go straight up in smoke, you see, when I would say, „Oh, yes, well, Sir Thomas Browne, anybody that would

write that million words couldn't help but say something clever.“ Nevertheless, this has scientific application.

You can't write on the subject of time endlessly and take every stray thought that comes in your head on the subject of time and put it down on a sheet of paper without having in that mass certain fundamental and sweeping truths about time. Only, now, which is the drop in the „Atlantic Ocean“ which is the important drop?

Reevaluation of information in the direction of arriving at more fundamental conclusions which have greater usefulness is the basic of this progressive research line which you are studying.

Now, it isn't true, and I am very happy to find out that it isn't true—I've been over this ground and over it—that you are necessarily studying Ron's case. As my auditor can tell you occasionally, I go pale when we walk in toward a fundamental of Scientology when I'm being audited and think for a while that that might be the reason why I have called something something, don't you see?

This whole contest has been a much more dramatic contest. It's been the effort of by the bootstraps above the level of one's own case and have at it. And when I haven't succeeded in rising superior to my own case or items and so on, I am the first one to turn slightly pink. And it was quite interesting to me—it's quite interesting to me—for a while ago running into survival—“to survive as a GPM,” don't you see? Well, obviously, this would explain so much if this were the present time GPM. It would practically explain all, wouldn't it?

Well, when I found that in session that I had such a GPM, I was very, very blushing, you see. And so much so that I pulled it completely out of line, in the lines of GPMs, and put myself in a terrible creak because it actually belongs *waaaay* back on the track lost with a lot of other GPMs, and simply had gotten pulled out by the recognition of the fact that survive was the basic principle of existence. And then that had turned around and taken this GPM and hauled it out of the backtrack and carted it up to present time with winches, and there it has been sitting putting me in a gorgeous creak, see? As soon as I recognized that this had been the action, bang! It went back into place. I haven't been troubled with it since.

The whole contest has been then to see things clearly, well knowing that one could not be on this planet researching things without having his opinions colored. And yet trying to rise above the coloration of opinion by one's own aberration and associations or even the penchants and enthusiasms of the age. These things also tend to color things enormously, you see.

Well, it's been—we have been successful to the degree that that has been accomplished. And has been accomplished to a considerable and remarkable degree. Now every time we ferret out a new fundamental, you actually lose out of your study data a bucketful of items, a bucketful of data until you begin to wonder, well, what is stable and what isn't stable in the past. That's fascinating. What is stable and what isn't stable?

Well, actually, the Axioms are in there in concrete. The Logics, the Prelogics, the fundamental material of the *Philadelphia Lectures*, the behavior of a theta, the only thing I've seen it necessary to change in that particular line is the idea of exteriorization—is the only thing that's been changed recently.

What will a pc do when you bring him up to a point where he does not have to be in a body? See? And we used to think that he would move out of his body. And that is not what he will do. He will move his body off him because we have changed him up scale to a point where he can hold a position. And if he could exteriorize, the first thing he would have in mind, if *his* body was getting in his road in any way, would be to move it over there.

Now, I think that's an awfully minor—minor thing to have shifted in all that body of theoretical information. You have the Factors. You have all sorts of—you've got all of this what we are now calling Scientology One material, you know, and your ARC triangles and

all that sort of thing, basic materials by the ton. These things are all completely accurate, see? Been no reason to change those at all. They're in concrete. So, therefore, the working field in which we have been engaged has been the field of *applied* technology. There has been no reason under the sun to alter our theoretical technology. Not even the datum I gave you just now alters the theoretical technology of Dianetics and Scientology—not a hair. That's still there. Theoretical technology? Dead accurate. Dead accurate. Nothing wrong with that.

Well, what then are you as a student seeing change? What do you see change under your nose? What's this that's going by? It's the reevaluation of data as applied technology. And you're seeing continuous reevaluation of data as applied technology. Now, because you're studying to be an auditor, not a theoretician ...

As a matter of fact, I could confide in you, you would be having a breeze if you were studying at Scientology Level Five. That's the theoretical level out of which you evolve Scientology, you see. If you were only studying at that level, what a breeze you would have. You didn't intend to apply it to any case. You didn't intend to do anything for anybody. Maybe you—all you wanted to do was know about the organization of things, the principles of things, and that sort of thing. If you were studying at that data, you would say „good heavens,“ the unchanging monotony of this stuff is fantastic. So where is it shifting? Applied technology to cases. That's where it's shifting. And that's what's giving you a headache as a student.

But let's go just a little bit further than that. What's giving you a headache as a student in applying it—if you do have a headache as a student applying it—is trying to apply what you know to a case sitting in front of you so as to obtain a result. That's where the data mills around. And if you look over your bulletins, they're all addressed to this subject. Not just because you're a student, but that's the most of the outflow and information available.

It is so rare to release any definitions of communication from Scientology Five—it was a terrible shock to people apparently to release Project 80—the definitions of Scientology. There have been several complaints about these. Well, of course, there's been tremendous huzzahs—most sensible people have said *huzzah*, and so on, but there've been several complaints, too. It was a great shock, it's a great shock because they contain three words in them that are very upsetting in the United States particularly. It says the common people's science of life and livingness, you see? I think that's fascinating. That's what's wrong with that level.

I don't think that's what's wrong with that level at all. I just think it's the derivations or the reinterpretations that you can get into with this particular phrase. But the odd part of it is everybody has spotted the lie, see? In Project 80 there is one lie and that's that Definition. Only they don't quite know what's wrong with it. And they're picking on it. There have been several letters in complaining about this. Everything is fine except that one: „The common people's science of the mind“ or something like that, whatever it says. Fascinating.

They haven't realized that they've spotted a lie. And they think that they're complaining about the common people. And they're not complaining about the common people. That phrase is not what they are complaining about. This dashed off as an example—you understand that that Project 80, this was an example of what these definitions should be. That was all. And this one was thrown in. No, that's a newspaper toss off. See? That's a newspaper Definition toss off to get people to understand it. To get people to communicate it one way or the other, and that little particular phrase happens to be untruthful because if there's anybody uncommon, it's a Scientologist. The common people on the subject of the mind left to their own devices—God 'elp us. Because remember, this is a subject which confounds the wits and creaks the brains of, and has the best thinkers and philosophers that have ever been on this planet in its written history.

And through false modesty and because it communicates better, and so forth, one backs off that particular point. These are the problems that drove Socrates round the bend, see. And we're studying them and handling them as an everyday activity. Oh, wow! Of course, you can't say then this is the common people's ...

You want to know why can't we get more people into Scientology, see? Well, you can get a lot of people into Scientology. There is no doubt about it. But if you get them in at Level I—or at Level 0 or at Level I—you've got to fairly rapidly make them very uncommon people to bring them on up the line. Correct? So it is a lie. They're not common people. This is nothing—this is nothing against those people who have been complaining about that. They're dead right.

That, of course, that particular phrase was taken out of a newspaper handout that I was kicking around and we were putting together, and so forth, and it just seemed like a good offhand definition that was simply put off as an example of how you would define it, don't you see? Well, everything else in it is quite truthful and quite factual, but that one happens to be a lie, and there have been several complaints about it, all saying, we are not common people. See? And that is not ... Now, you could say the average person—I just got one from Detroit of all places—the average person's mental science. Now that would be acceptable but not the common people. You see how far that datum is shooting'.? See how far that is missing. Well, that would then become an aberrated stable datum and it would only stick because it contained a lie. Now, out of all this other truthful material we find people paying a lot of attention to this one that: (1) isn't important, and (2) happens to be the only inaccurate rundown that we have in Scientology One, Project 80.

Now, what does that have to do with education? Why is Ron going off to this degree? No, the mind tends to fix on those things which contain an alter—is from truth. And conversely, an alter—is in the truth of the Situation is the most resistant thing to the truth of the situation.

You've got the cowboys in the white hats and the cowboys in the black hats here, see. The cowboys in the black hats are aberrated stable data. Now, I'm very sure that at least one or two of you present, if not more, have become very worried about absorbing any stable data realizing that a GPM is made up exclusively as data which has become very, very stable indeed.

And if the whole source of human aberration—running your itsa line, and so forth, and taking out solutions—that the whole source of human aberration is actually derived from stable data assumed to hold back confusions. And I'm sure that to some degree you've been shaking in your boots about postulating any new stable data. Look what it does to you.

No. It's an aberrated stable datum. The common people's mental science, see? Look at the randomness of that thing. And suddenly Confusion suddenly started entering into various parts of the country and even Detroit. See, confusion entered in. People started batting at this thing. They didn't like this. This is wrong, and so on, and so on. So any error entered into the line is apt to get battered at.

But a reverse fight also goes on. An aberrated stable datum will batter back at the truth. But where you have a slightly altered truth and you were trying to give it to someone who already has an altered truth on that same subject, the two will come into a conflict which promotes all sorts of bad applied technology. Now, this is something like saying, „Well, an aberrated auditor has a hard time auditing.“ You've heard that old saw, see. I can turn out a very nice session; I never pretended to be unaberrated. I don't believe that, see?

But I will tell you this: that a guy with some of his aberrations in place, some of these aberrated stable data ... You see, the real hang-ups are: „The way to get on in life, you see, is to die.“ Oh, it'll hang you up because it's not true. It stops. It stops a proper flow of data.

All right. Now, if you, then, are studying material which has any place in its body at all, any alteration from the fundamental that should be there, and you yourself have an

alteration—remember, it's an alteration—which is contrary to the datum—altered datum—you are trying to assimilate, you get a dog's breakfast. It becomes a real mess.

In other words, we're trying to drive a truck through a truck. We've got this aberrated, slightly aberrated datum and we're trying to push it through an aberrated datum. They've both got lies in them to one degree or another or they're slightly nonbasic or nonfactual and they won't mix. So you have this fellow with this slightly aberrated datum—“all horses sleep in beds,” you see—regarding the datum „all beds are soft.“ You see, „all beds are soft“ isn't true, and „horses sleep in beds“; that isn't true.

Now, how are you going to get these two data together? Well, they just aren't going to fit. And you'll have this fellow going around in circles and he'll have every reason under the sun why it isn't true that all beds are soft. Some beds have got to be hard. They've got to—in the first place, they've got to support up to a ton of horseflesh. Now, he actually at no time looks at what is really wrong with this datum he's trying to assimilate. All beds are soft. That's not true.

If you've ever been on an old—time sailing ship, you would know that. If you've ever slept under an airplane wing, you'd know that. In fact, I could think of some hotels that would tell you that quite rapidly. There's some landladies around here that wouldn't agree with that at all. They make it completely false.

So you've got—you've got this fellow and he's saying all horses sleep in beds. Well, „all beds are soft“ can't be true because if it was true they wouldn't support a ton of horseflesh. Imagine getting a Percheron to sleep in that bed, you see? Too soft; go right straight through the mattress. You know, the bed's got to be stiff, stiff, see.

Now look at the ridiculousness of this conflict. Is any part of this conflict going to resolve itself at all? He's finding the wrong thing wrong with the datum because he has a vested interest in trying to make this datum fit or unfit somehow with another stable—unstable, erratic, aberrated datum, see? So he can't get these two data together. Never the twain shall meet. He then tries to understand an aberrated datum through another aberrated datum, and of course he develops complications. Now, he's liable to get Professor Sweeney to write a paper on the proper softness of beds, see. He's liable to get all kinds of things, but he's actually trying to push home the data „all beds should be hard and strong.“

He's actually trying to push into existence as aberrated a datum as he's being presented with. Now, out of this conflict and counterposition, vis-à-vis and one against the other, aberrated stable datum versus aberrated stable datum, you get a crush of superimposed opinions of one kind or another, all of which rise up into a fantastic potpourri that is called opinions, logic, demonstration of this and that, and so forth.

Now, you have a pc who is a walking gold mine of aberrated stable data. Now, if any datum which you're using to resolve that ease is the least bit curved, that case won't resolve but develop new complications. Do you see this?

Therefore, the mass of technology which grows up in Scientology is, of course, centered around applied technology. And you get a swelling mass of this data which then will subside and a lot of it will be thrown away. And you get a swelling mass of this data and it'll subside and be thrown away. But it only subsides and is thrown away when a new clarification is given to a fundamental. So the greatest possible truth, in terms of fundamentals, has to be used in application. So it's my contest on a research line to leave no stone unturned to get at the most fundamental, clean, clearcut fundamental possible for the resolution of the ease because the cases otherwise will not resolve.

Now, we've gone an enormous direction. We've gone a long, long way in this particular direction and we have made some tremendous gains in this particular direction. But is there any other zone—is there any other zone, now, where we get a randomness? Yes—the person who is applying the data.

Now if you, in assimilation of data, are assimilating to the slightest degree data up against a miscomprehension or an allness which you're putting in place of the auditor, you don't get an assimilation. You have difficulty assimilating the data; but you can assimilate the data. Your trouble comes when you turn around and take the datum you've assimilated and altered in some fashion and then have tried to apply it to the case who is sitting in front of you. And the alter—ises in that data will then bring about a nonresolution of the case you are confronted with.

The only solvent is truth. And even though absolutes are unobtainable, truth—in a very refined form, the purest possible—is the only thing that will resolve cases all the way because it is the one thing that the aberrated case cannot argue with. Therefore, you as an auditor desiring results have no business whatsoever in letting yourself get bent around in circles or riding hobbyhorses with regard to the technology which you are applying because it will get furiously in your road if it has been twisted in some fashion.

Now, that looks like an almost insurmountable barrier. Actually, there's considerable tolerance and you get a resolution of cases within this zone of tolerance. There is a zone of tolerance. It doesn't have to be quite that perfect to make it work because the technology heretofore was too imperfect ever to work.

And it has been my task to bring about a recognition of fundamentals sufficiently great and technology sufficiently great to overcome a lot of this alter—is. But it is a task which is, of course, a thousand times greater than simply presenting the task necessary to resolve a case. We're not just presenting the material necessary to resolve a case. We have to present it so fundamentally accurate, so close to the purest of pure, that the auditor in applying it can still alter—is it, can apply it to a pc who is—because it's right up against his case—maybe as a person he'd be able to override some of this, but when it's applied to his case—being that makes something else—who is going to take that data already twisted and twist it further, such as in answering the auditing command, and still have a resolution of case. That's an heroic problem then.

Well, now you haven't too much to worry about along that problem line, but you do have this to worry about: The amount of difficulty you have with cases is directly proportional to the amount of aberrated or alter—is—aberration or alter—is—that you're adding to the data that you're using. That's directly proportional. Now, of course, this also is directly proportional to the purity and assimilability of the material you are given to study. I already accept some fault for that, *don't* you see, because that is a difficult one to bring off. But were in there awful close, *don't* you see? There isn't too much out.

That would get by if we didn't have an alter—is of an offered datum by the auditor which is then applied to a case which is just going to alter—is the living daylights out of it. The only universal solvent is truth. That's the only thing that will solve anything. Imagine it—we even know that the way you solve solutions is solutions. We even know how to cure cures. It's fantastic.

You know, there's practically no field of healing has ever gone in this direction at all. These are all undisclosed and unrecognized data. This guy's got lumbosis. Reg did the other day—asking what solutions has he had to his back trouble—he was asking some pc. The pc all of a sudden turns up with no back trouble. What—did he have back trouble? No. He had solutions of the back trouble.

Well, when you've penetrated that deeply into the morass of consciousness and unconsciousness, that you know what is cause and effect along this particular line, you're dealing with fairly pure information. But everywhere I have made the tiniest little mistake or thrown the wrong emphasis on something, you're going to have some trouble. And you might be able to get by with that—and might not, too—unless you took that datum—or took data—and then alter—ised it thoroughly and then shoved it at a pc, and of course, by the

time it gets to that pc, the data is very far from truth and therefore is not a case solvent anymore.

Now, it's my task continuously to look up these holes in the technology, find out where they sit, find out what misconceptions people have about these things and reevaluate the information and re—release it again. This has been done at Level IV to such an appalling degree now that Level IV does the impossible. It brings about an OT but is actually only workable at a level of tightwire walk that doesn't permit a variation of an eighteenth of an inch from its procedure.

I'll show you right now how much you can vary Routine 4 and smash a pc. There was a hole in it, but the hole didn't appear until somebody wasn't asking the exact question. There was a hole in it—I've been looking these up rather rapidly lately—and that was simply this: There are three goals that will rocket read—three types of goals that will rocket read. And we started out with just one type of goal that would rocket read. That was old Routine 3, way back when.

And those are: an actual goal, an actual GPM and an implant GPM. There could be another type which is a phrase in a engram, but that will not necessarily rocket read. But the other three, any one of them, will rocket read. Now, as you sit there and look at what you've just written there in your notes, when you regard that, you say that's not much of a discovery. Well, look, we used to have one type which was a goal. We were awful glad to see a goal rocket read. And then through this last summer's work, I found out practically all there was to know about implants and implant goals and it was obvious that actual goals and implant goals were getting mixed up. And we got at least one case in Z Unit who does not know it, until this moment, I start giving this datum just at this instant, who's wrapped around a telegraph pole.

Actual goal, but it hasn't got any GPM connected with it. Isn't that a nasty one? Any GPM may have in it upwards to a hundred actual goals, but there's only one goal for that GPM. These others are totally superfluous. They're nothing. Do you realize that the goal a pc sets for a session is an actual goal? A pc's actual goal, isn't it? And do you know that they will every once in a while rocket read? And they haven't got any items attached to them at all. They are probably a lock on a reliable item someplace—just a lousy lock. And if you take one of these things as the pc's goal—GPM—and run it the way you would an actual GPM, you can find items. Oh, where do you get them? Well, you pull them in from the nearest implants. You pull them out of other GPMs. You pull them off other locks. Hey! You can just find items, items, items. You can make the beautifulest line plot you ever saw in your life. But there was no GPM there in the first place.

Now, the patter I was using in handling Routine 4 was exactly as follows: „Is this an actual GPM?“

This is meter questions and these, by the way, are just dead accurate on the meter. You're just shot in the pants with luck because these things are always correct on the meter. There's a lot of things you can ask a meter, such as „Is this a PT goal?“ and things like that. That's not accurate. It won't give you an accurate response. But it will give you a dead accurate response on this other information first crack off the box and that saves your bacon.

You can take this—I was asking these on the meter, of course.

Find a rocket reading goal, see, and say, „Is this an actual GPM?“

„Is this an implant GPM?“

„Is this no GPM?“

And that were the three questions I was using. Ah, fascinating, because auditors have been asking, „Is this an actual goal? Is this an implant goal?“

Oh, my God, what is this? Well, it's enough to kill somebody. You could frankly just wind somebody up in a complete bang with it. That's what I mean by the eighteenth of an

inch off the tightwire. But there was a piece of technology missing where the pc's actual goals will rocket read and don't have to have any GPM connected with them. It's only those goals which have GPMs connected to them and have formed a GPM that you have any interest in of any kind whatsoever. And they're good, nice, great, big, smashing masses with—full of RIs and tremendous relief and they explain the aberration of the pc, and they can be opposed, and so forth.

You take one of these actual goals. It hasn't got any GPM connected with it. It's just some kind of a lock on some RI, you know, „to eat candy,“ you know. That thing rocket read. Do goals opposed list on it. *Ooooh*, we're going to get the pc in a mess. No, that's fine.

Let's find another one because we'll never find an actual GPM listing one against. So we're going to find another actual goal, aren't we? And then we're going to oppose that. *Ohhh*. And we're going to oppose that and we, re going to finally find a present time actual goal such as, „to not get Infraction Sheets,“ you see, or something. And by God, we could sit down and find a top oppterm for it. That's what's frightening.

Where would we get it? Well, we'd have to get it from a few trillion billion squillion years ago or we'd pull it in from some RI someplace or another or pull it out of the actual present time GPM, you see. Just pull in a random RI—anything—but usually locks on RIs. We wouldn't really get RIs. But they'd fire because they sort of fit, you see?

And you would get a nice, beautiful line plot all on the pc—but there's no GPM that goes with it. Oh, you could probably keep this up for sessions and sessions and sessions, and you could probably get tone arm action and tone arm action and tone arm action. Well, everything's going fine, and all of a sudden the pc goes *deoooooooooooooom* boom boom! Tone arm goes clink. Pc's starting to develop ulcers of the stomach, lumbosis. Frightening, isn't it? Just varied one word.

Instead of asking, „Is this an actual GPM?“ ask „Is it an actual goal?“ And you'll get a read. And then suppose that therefore, if it's an actual goal, it has a GPM attached to it. Around the telegraph pole; so that much variation in technology. But there was a missing datum there, wasn't there: that a pc's (quote) „actual goal“ could actually rocket read.

It's a good thing, kids, that I'm totally indestructible because these things usually happen to me first, don't you see? It's gruesome, gruesome. A couple of weeks ago I was ambitiously listing on one of these things but it didn't feel right and it didn't look right and it didn't oppose right and nothing was going right. It was a mess.

And light finally dawned on me. I generally wake up just as I go down for the third time, you know. I can see this stream of bubbles over my head and decide I'd better surface. I said, „You're checking an actual goal. You're not checking an actual GPM. For God's sakes, check this thing for an actual GPM.“ No read. No GPM. It's the only thing that checks out, see? Oh, my God! See, just a little, little piece of technology, see? Hardly enough to bother with. Coo! And it can throw a curve into the works like that.

You know, you could go on auditing somebody for months with this kind of nonsense and wondering why they weren't getting any better and they never have any cognitions and life would just sort of be grim and they wouldn't quite be making much case gain—TA yes, oh, yes—but fundamental error in the case just taking them down one after the other; the reality getting poorer. Something—something is happening here that is incorrect, see?

PC ARC breaky, kind of hard to handle, you know. A little datum like that. Let me show you another datum. This is a spooky one. This is a very spooky datum. I might as well leave you all gray—headed in the next three minutes, which I'm just about to do.

Let's take Level I. Nothing to learn now in Level I, is there? Got it all straight, haven't we? There's our whatsit line, see? There's your C and E, and here's whatsit. Very nice. And there's your auditor over here, of course, you see, and here's your pc over here.

And there's the pc as a thetan. Here's your communication line. There's the bank. And here is the itsa line: E, C. There's your itsa, right?

How many communication lines have I just shown you?

Audience: One, three.

How many? Come on.

Audience: Three, three, five, six.

Well, the drawing right here. How many do you see on this drawing? *Audience: Three.*

You see three. Well, how many do you see in your pc? When you're sitting in an auditing session, what are the three important communication lines? And what is their order of importance? Some of you are going to say this whatsit line; that's the most important. Some of you are going to say the itsa line. And you're wrong.

It's this one. One—first importance; two—second importance; three—third importance. And anybody who doesn't think that that line is important has got the definition of an auditor wrong. It's this delicate. This is scary when you start looking at the delicacies and nuances of definitions. Willing to talk to the auditor is very easily interpreted along these ways: such as talking to the auditor.

So, the auditor cuts this line to get the pc to talk because it is this line, the itsa line, of course, that blows the charge, he says, and so cuts the pc's communication with his bank—cuts the pc's communication with his bank in order to bring about an itsa line, and wonders why he gets no tone arm action and why the pc ARC breaks. Because the cut communication line is not perceivable to the naked eye. Not perceivable to the naked eye because it's hidden, because the pc is a thetan unseen by the auditor—to the pc's bank unseen by the auditor which causes the auditor then to basically—an auditor can do this: start running on only line three, whatsit, and itsaing on the meter. See, itsas on the meter and whatsit on the pc and therefore has this line cut and this line cut.

Now, you see the picture I've just drawn you here. This picture, taken up carefully with any auditor as to just exactly why this isn't true and just exactly what the score is with regard to this will disclose to some, some horrifying data. Horrifying! And they wonder why they haven't got tone arm action on the pc. Tone arm action has to be prevented. Well, this is the basic method of preventing it.

Now, here we are. Basically, I am to this degree on the research line—I'm not telling you I'm in error because you can't take anything out of whole cloth and then prove it and then continue to say you're in error about it—but I'm in error to this degree as far as the relay of this information. It was not all found out. And the evaluation of the importance of these three lines was not totally done. This line appeared on your early drawings but was not assigned its level of importance.

Now, this is a communication breakdown as far as I'm concerned because, of course, to me that would be all auditing was about: trying to get the pc to confront his own bank. So I'd simply neglect to say anything about this and then appear to be laying undue stress on just the itsa line, and then anybody looking at this and analyzing it and trying to pick it up and learn it with, let us say, a datum of this particular character: You can't ever trust a pc to answer an auditing question, so therefore you shouldn't get him to look at his bank because if he looks at his bank, he'll overrestimulate himself, won't he? So therefore, the best thing to do is every time he starts to look at his bank, attract his attention to the auditor and get the pc talking. *Heh—hehheh—huh—bloo!* You got that?

Now, there's probably 8,750,963—734.2 combinations of reasons why this situation can't occur. But once it's explained this way, and you see it clearly and you understand your way through it, the auditor is simply there to get the pc to confront his bank, you see. The charge blows off of it to the degree that it's confronted, and this is represented by the itsa line, and the itsa line is a report on what has been as—ised that gives it its flow. Now, that

sounds, perhaps, to you like an entirely different explanation of the itsa line. No, it's the same factors we're dealing with. I have just weighted it slightly differently to make a better communication.

Now, the reason that communication could not be accepted or the reason that communication couldn't go through would be the reason why the auditor is having trouble auditing. So I'm giving you all parts of education now.

A research perception, an investigatory perception, of the actual truth of the situation with regard to the communication lines present in a session; the communications lines of auditor to pc on the whatsit and then pc to his bank and then pc to auditor giving us the itsa, of course, includes its most important part—pc to bank.

But because it goes one, two, three in sequence, we're liable to take up that number one is the most important or some other aberrated consideration with regard to it and so auditing would not occur. But the breakdown is simply my failure to recognize exactly *what* these factors were in a lucid way and then to communicate it and have media by which to communicate it that would bring this through rapidly and then have it received. And you have all points of education and you have technical result occurring if that is done. If you don't have that being done, you don't have technical result. And that is about all there is to be said about it.

Now, any auditor who cares to reevaluate or look over his considerations concerning this and why these things can't occur and what really exists here instead of this very simple rendition—you actually would be able to sit down and coach a fellow very carefully with this little drawing as elementary as it is and get all the reasons why and et cetera and what a pc is liable to do if you—and you know, and so forth, and what really blows the charge and where it actually exists and where it doesn't exist. Take this all up in full, you're going to find a whole hat full of aberrated data fall out: wrong stresses, alter—ises and that sort of thing. That's because you're presented here with a relatively pure datum. Therefore, that datum would go through and resolve the rest of the way.

Education, then, is basically successful to a technical end only when it is in a very pure, comprehensible state and is relayed well. First it must be conceived very purely and then it must be relayed well. If we were not teaching you toward the final devastating result of „did it work on the pc or not,“ if we had that horrible test out of the road, then we could teach Scientology V, and you would be sitting there being very happy to learn all the axioms by heart and straighten it all out and have some cognitions on the thing and everything because the data would never actually be subjected to any final result. That's what makes Scientology different than any other mental study that has ever occurred. Somebody comes along and says, „Oh, I know what Scientology is. That's just like Taoism.“

Just like Taoism, huh? Whoever got „Tao'd Clear“ or „Tao'd better“? Nobody. That's the answer to that. But it's a beautiful philosophy and there's a great deal of truth connected with it. But if this truth is never put to the acid test of performance, who cares? But your technical gains on your pc depends first and foremost to take responsibility for it—for the purity of the datum which you are given for application and then depends upon your ability to perceive that datum and apply it without a great deal of alter—is so that it arrives in the direction of the aberration in which the pc is involved in a sufficiently pure state to as—is and knock out of existence the case; that is, the aberrated condition which he is confronting. That sounds terribly elementary. That sounds terribly simple. Actually, it is terribly simple. It's an action which can only be complicated. It can only be complicated. It can't much go the other direction. But there's the acid test of result.

Now, no pc—no pc is going to resolve in a minute because you're up against all the reasons he can't get well. But in an auditor who is alter—ising data which comes his way, you're up against all the reasons the data can't be relayed. So therefore, education to this degree lies in clearing the line. Get the line cleared up so the datum can be applied. That

becomes a highly important activity. And I invite you, one and all, to look at that little plot there as simple as it is. Look over those three lines and decide for yourself Decide for yourself what the relative values of this thing are or how this thing all adds up and all the reasons why it can't be done or won't work. And you suddenly will stop cutting the pc's itsa line, and your pc will stop ARC breaking, and so forth, because you've laid out for yourself a series of clear-eyed understandings with regard to exactly what you are doing.

It is fundamentals of this particular character which make breakthroughs. The itsa line itself is a tremendous breakthrough. Now, a clarification of the itsa line is absolutely necessary. We find out the most important part of this particular communication pattern happens to be a totally hidden line. Where your auditor neglects that hidden line, where he doesn't understand that hidden line, where he can't integrate it or to do anything with it, he's going to fail. But as I said, that long number I gave you is the number of reasons why and the number of methods why these three lines can't exist. And they will be voluminous.

Therefore, education also carries with it de—education. And when you're studying on a research line, you have to become very flexible indeed because you have to de— educate yourself by a clarification and understanding of materials you thought existed—and so did everybody else—existed in a more complicated state five years ago. And you'll find one of your great difficulties with an auditor is he's glommed onto and made an all out of one of these old data of some kind or another, and he's got it standing there in his road.

But all of this comes down to one other simple fact that I can't forbear to say anything about even though you're going to be able to come fifteen minutes late tonight. And that is simply this: No datum I give you is a substitute for you. That is the burning thing to remember as an auditor. No datum I give you is a substitute for you. You put a datum in an auditing chair and tell it to audit a pc and it isn't going to. It isn't going to. The only thing that can be in an auditing chair is a live theta, because only that can handle the communications and confusions which arise.

Now, if you have a very complicated theta, this theta starts doing forty—seven and a half other things besides just sitting there handling the situation, he's riding on a bunch of data. But what do you have essentially.? You have some other data sitting in the auditing chair you didn't know was there. So the one thing for which there's no substitute—you've got to have technology because nobody was ever able to make a breakthrough on it or your technology exists and it exists in a fairly pure state—well, there's one thing for which there's no substitute whatsoever. And that is a live theta in the auditor's chair. And no amount of textbooks sitting in the space which he occupies will ever audit the pc. And I think you see in that a purity of truth.

I notice that I do best as an auditor when I just sit there—oh, I use all the routines—but when I sit there and I handle the pc in the session, and I'm there and I'm alert and rolling along down the line and rolling with the punches and shifting this way and that, my eye on the situation. And I audit worst when I'm trying out a theory because there's a theory sitting there. See? There's a theory sitting there.

Well, let me show you this. We do know now that a successful session moves the tone arm adequately throughout the session. And that's the final test. Now, at higher levels not only will it now move the tone arm, but is the auditor proceeding along the line which will continue to move the tone arm and not have it break down somewhere up along the line? Now that—we're describing Level IV because he can get tone arm action on Level IV that dumps him over a cliff and gives him no tone arm action a week from now, see?

So we have this final criteria: Not only is there an acid test of the technology in the field of application, but there is also an acid test of an auditor. Does he know his business?

