

# AUDITING THE GPM

A lecture given on  
23 October 1963

Thank you.

All right, who is this? What date?

*Audience: October the 23rd.*

October the 23rd? What year?

*Audience: AD 13.*

AD 13. Who said „63“? Shoot him! Anyhow ...

All right. Well, your general—your general course of auditing affairs right now—I’ve been giving you a series of highly general lectures here just in the last few. And I hope you’ve been able to make something out of them—bits and pieces and scraps, you know? Trying to give you some kind of a viewpoint, let you take a little broader look at exactly what you’re doing and show you some of the anatomy of what you’re attacking.

The human mind is a very interesting mechanism and people can get quite goofy on the subject. Nearly every human being is so deeply enmeshed, so pressed down into life and livingness, opposed by so many present time forces—and opposing himself so many other forces, actions, personalities, considerations—that he finds it almost impossible to view this thing called the human mind. He more likely views human opposition. He more likely views human problems. He more likely views human considerations. He views such things as inhumanity. He views such things as justice. He views such things as rightness, right conduct; such things as honesty, dishonesty, criminality. In other words, he’s involved not in the human mind, but in sociology. Do you see that?

So when a Pavlov or a Freud comes along, the primary motivation for his work is obtaining some sort of an is-ness of his immediate environment and *his* immediate conflicts. Let me call to your attention that all of those things I have just named are Potential RIs in GPMs—all of them being dramatized to a greater or lesser degree. The being himself is being a solution, not a living being. Therefore, there has been no view of this thing called the human mind. There has only been a view of the particular RIs which a person is confronting or which he is being. One immediately sees a highly circumscribed horizon. He sees this horizon right close in to the individual, you see? The life and livingness of well, mothers are bad and fathers are brutal, and so forth. A study of the mind is a study of the RI called father, see? Don’t you see how this is? And therefore he’s going to study the mind. And actually he has made an identification between the thing called the mind and the RI „father.“

This is the whysit that he’s not been able to itsa. This is the thing he’s in conflict with.

So he wants to know more about the mind. I remember myself asking a question of this sort of thing. I was sitting down banging away on an electric typewriter, throwing out about a hundred and twenty—five words a minute of copy, and so forth, and I had to characterize somebody. And I sat back and I said, „Well, what the devil is characterization, anyway?“ I think that was one of the primary entrance points to a study of the mind. I would have been very happy to know what character was so that I could characterize characters more easily in stories, see? This was not a very pressing reason to understand character of the human mind, but then in actual fact I’ve never had a really—a very pressing reason to do so, which of course gives one a much broader viewpoint.

I have personal reasons along in this particular line, but these personal reasons take the human mind as a solution of a lesser magnitude. In other words, the solution of the human mind is simply a small milestone on a much longer road.

But the situation as you see life and an understanding of life on this particular planet—and probably on most planets—is simply from the viewpoint of a person so immersed in life that he sees only those facets which impinge upon him and upon which he would like to impinge. And that to him is his entire horizon. That is his complete view. And he has no further view of the human mind than that.

I imagine Pavlov had it in for dogs. I imagine dogs played a very, very large part in Pavlov's GPMs. I'm sure he had an RI called „dogs.“ As a little boy he might have been bitten by a dog, do you see? As being many little boys in many times he's probably been bitten many, many times by many dogs. So he was sure trying to understand dogs. Maybe at some time or another, why, he'd been put on a solid diet of calves' brains or something like this, so that ... Who knows? Who knows what these would have been? The fellow isn't available to us at this particular moment to go over his lineups. You may run into him someday. It'd be intriguing to know. What was the horizon of Pavlov that caused him to see the mind as a physiological entity which ran exclusively on punishments, even though he added rewards and punishments in his manuscript? Well, what was his horizon?

And Freud, living in a—in the mid—Victorian ages, surrounded by the hush—hush when—if a woman ever stepped on the steps of a horse car and had displayed an ankle below undoubtedly nonsanitary skirts that they had in those days—that skirt rising out of the dust an additional two inches and displaying that ankle could have caused a scandal throughout the entire town. You see? Just this balderdash of this particular time, you see?

Second dynamic—it must not exist, you see? And he takes this terrifically repressed second dynamic—well, who knows what went on there in Freud's background that brought him to a viewpoint to view the mind as: Repression of second dynamic equals insanity. And why did he pick out childhood? Probably he had an RI called „children,“ or something like that. You see? He's probably caught and was dramatizing within a sphere of less than five or six RIs.

His general view of the mind, however, led off into perimeters which are quite interesting. He considered such things as life in the womb, he considered such things as birth trauma, and so forth. He merely considered them, he never demonstrated they existed. He thought of a great many things and some of his students—undoubtedly said more than he wrote—and some of his students became interested in past lives (such as Jung), druidism and that sort of thing. Well, it's interesting that when the past lives came up in the subject of psychoanalysis, that it became exclusively the English druid period. I think that's very fascinating. In other words, past lives equal chaps painted blue jumping about the oak trees, you see? That was the totality of past lives. It's fascinating. You actually would have to work very hard on a preclear to get him to recall this period, particularly if he'd never been in England during that period.

Now, here we have then—here we have the limited viewpoint—the limited viewpoint. And the only reason I'm calling this to your attention is so that you can see that that is not the only viewpoint and so that you, in teaching people and looking at things yourself, might possibly be able to bootstrap yourself out of too great a fixation along certain lines, too great a motivation for knowing about the mind, which is not germane to the mind, see; motivated to know all about the mind because of schoolteachers. Well, you see, in actual fact you will wind up specializing in RIs called „schoolteachers,“ and you won't know very much about the mind. You might not even realize that it's an RI.

Now, to make a statement like that to you is sweepingly invalidative. It's horrible to make a statement like that to you. And I'd never make a statement like that to you if I hadn't made it to myself.

Can one look further than one is looking? That is the question I am asking you. Can you look further than the horizon you are now looking at in the field of the human mind? Can you extend your vision sufficiently as to escape your own aberration? That is the mark of genius and yet you can do it.

You can recognize—and oddly enough, I know how well you can do this, because it's almost a hallmark of Scientologists. No matter how hard you are dramatizing, some tiny portion of your beingness, you, is still saying, „Boy, am I dramatizing!“ Screaming like mad at somebody or other, and yet while screaming, still say, „You know, I must have overts and withholds from this bit, or I wouldn't have that—this much of an opinion,“ you see?

That actually is the mark, not of self—criticism, but of self—enlightenment. And an individual who is capable of this self—inspection and so on, there's a great deal of hope for that individual. But the individual who is always convinced completely of his own sincerity of his own dramatizations, I'm afraid there's not much hope for him. And if you wanted to describe somebody who was totally sunk in humanism, who was totally—gone totally wog, and so forth, you would describe that person as incapable of realizing his own aberrations or realizing that he had any aberrations. You know, the man who asserts that he's totally sane is always the insane man. The rest of us—the rest of us always have a little glance over our own shoulders and wonder if sooner or later we're not going to act a little potty at some time or another, you know?

But this divine doubt never enters at all into the scope of thinkingness of the *very* insane. What characterizes them is their fantastic rightness. They are completely certain of their own sanity and in some brands of insanity completely certain of everyone else's insanity. These are *total certainties* with regard to these fellows.

The Scientologist to a marked degree—not because I have told him to—but just by the process of knowing greater truths—has rather uniformly attained this particular aspect. And it's odd to think of the fact that some of the greater schools of philosophy and some of the greater schools of wisdom have taught that one thing as the highest possible peak of attainable wisdom on the part of a being. The highest possible peak. They call it in various ways, you'll find it described in various ways, but it always amounts to the fact that they are capable of the divine doubt. They are capable of a slight view of themselves. They are capable of a self—inspection. They are capable of a realization about themselves as imperfect.

These various things have, of course, sawed through and become operations at various times. So that there have also been schools which said, „When you know you're absolutely insane, why, then of course you are totally sane; and when you've realized that you're completely bats, why, then we know that you are all right.“ You know? They've exaggerated this thing to a degree, but any piece of wisdom can be exaggerated into a lower—scale mockery.

But it's interesting that we have attained something which, in the field of the Stoics or other schools of Greek philosophy, would have been considered to be a very, very high point of wisdom. And any of you walking through the states of Greece of twenty—three hundred years ago or something like that, would have been looked on as a very, very, very wise being indeed. See? Saying no more than you say, doing no more than you do, you see? Not even auditing anybody. This would be very self—evident.

So you perhaps have not looked at Scientology from the viewpoint of philosophic attainment. And yet you have attained a philosophic level which is superior to and described as one of the great high levels of philosophy, while still scrambling around and thinking that you actually don't know much and you've got a long ways to go. Do you see that?

Well now, that's actually added, that is simply an added bonus. That wasn't part of the Philosophic level. But that *you* know you have a long way to go implies that you know something or have some feeling of where there is to go, see? So now, that is a greater level of wisdom. You have some feeling about there are greater levels to go to. Well, I'm afraid that

that was totally absent in all former schools. At your lowest level, you have attained this bit of self—doubt, this bit of self—inspection, this—this attitude which was the highest peak of former philosophies. And yet you additionally know that you have a long way to go and you also, then, must have a feeling that there is something to go to, so therefore, you must then understand something of the wholeness of a being. And that has never been understood in the whole world of philosophy. The Potential of a being, that is a completely neglected subject.

We read „man is evil.“ We read man is this; we read man is that. „Man is born of sin and dies in sin.“ We read this philosopher and that philosopher and that religious preacher and this writer and we read the Koran and we read the Bible and we read the early teachings that Christ imbibed; we read Indian philosophies of some kind or another. All of these things—all of these things have a very debased idea of the character of man. They do not perceive him to be anything that he is. If you ever wanted to read a tale of lies—is a description of the beingness of man written in other times and places and periods.

What is man? Oh, man. Tsk! What is man's potential—is a completely new field. What is his potential?

Now, they say that—once in a while a poet comes along and he says he can attain to the heights of stars or something like this—just talking in some metaphorical vein—but actually doesn't embrace the real beingness of man.

What is the total Potential beingness of a being? And that is a subject that you are grappling with and that is the subject which you actually grapple with in auditing. If you are not grappling with that subject and are only grappling with the fact of, „How do I prevent myself from being impinged upon certain types of characterizations in life,“ and „How do I myself impinge upon certain aspects of life?“—if you're still involved in that and trying to audit, I'm afraid that you will have many failures in auditing. You'll have some successes, but you'll still have many failures in auditing.

Let me give you an idea of that. A failure in auditing could stem from this basis. Now, don't think this is uncommon. You have a great deal of difficulty with horses. See, you've got a lot of trouble with horses. And you've had a big auditing win on the subject of horses, so you promptly and immediately audit nothing but horses on your pc. That means, immediately, that your aspect or your viewpoint of the human mind must be that of just life and livingness—little symbols that don't amount to a hill of beans, you see? This is a person \*ho is so thoroughly in contest with the environment about him that only those factors in the environment about him that are dangerous to him could be dangerous to anybody. It's a lack of flexibility. It's an inability then—let me show you where the auditing failure is.

It would be an inability expressed like this: Little girl comes in—little child comes in and she's crying and she's shaking with terror and so forth. And she says that—she says the wind—the wind is moaning past her window. And you as an auditor—you as an auditor—this is a piece of life and livingness, not a piece of session, you see—but you as an auditor happen to rather like wind. And you rather think that's a pleasant sound. And you conceive no danger in it whatsoever. So therefore, because you have that different viewpoint, then you say to her, „Oh, nonsense. Wind is a pleasant sound.“ Now, there's no great danger in doing this, but let me point out to you, you have absolutely done *nothing* for that little girl except knock her itsa down. Do you understand?

In other words, if your knowingness about life is totally based on what you yourself are afraid of or given sensation with, and so forth—that's totally based on that alone—and you have no additional perception that other people might be upset about different and other things, then you actually can never extend yourself out of the RIs you're sitting in far enough to understand what the *other* person is going through. You have to at least be able to say—this doesn't require much; there's no great difficulty here; it's just something that you should recognize. You should be able to say—you should be able to say, „Well, Joe over there,“ or „Bill over there, don't like women.“ This is silly, but they don't like women and *know* that

they don't like women. And although you have an opinion that this is silly of them not to like women, to still be able to understand that they don't like women.

If you haven't got that viewpoint, you will never permit them to itsa any difficulty with women. Do you see how that would limit the auditor? And it's on these little mathematics alone that you can adjudicate the success of an auditor. In other words, is he capable of understanding that wind could frighten somebody when it doesn't frighten him? See? Can he understand that there are *other conflicts for other people*, see? On that alone—on that alone, you see, you could get auditing failures if he hasn't grasped it and auditing successes if he has grasped it.

Pete comes in. Pete is just going all to pieces. Pete is in shreds.

„Well, what is the matter, Pete?“

„Oh, my God! It's my car!“

„What about your ear, Pete?“

„I just worry, worry, worry, worry, worry all the time about my car. I keep it in a locked garage, and so forth, but I just know it's going to be stolen. And I just went out a few moments ago and found that I had left the ignition keys in the ignition and the door unlocked.“

The guy is shattered! He's practically in tears! Now, a person who can't project himself, see—you didn't even have to project yourself, but just understand that he might be sitting in a bunch of other RIs than you've got, see?—is liable to handle this situation like this:

„Well, your car's insured, isn't it?“

„Well, yes.“

„Well, you keep it in a locked garage, don't you?“

„Well, yes.“

„Well, all right. What are you worried about? Now, let's get onto something that's really aberrative.“

He just let him sitting there in a wild present time problem, because all these concerns are goofy—even yours! See? These concerns are not usual. They are not ordinary. There is no average set of concerns which makes a person sane or another average set of concerns which makes a person insane. There are no such common denominators. They're *all batty*! And the difference between a Scientologist is he can see that his concerns might be a little batty. He hasn't automatically assumed that because he has these concerns they are therefore the average concerns of the human race.

Now, a fellow who didn't have any RIs about lost property would have Pete come in. Pete's in shreds. He starts in the session, and so forth.

„Well, what happened? What happened, Pete? What's the matter?“ Tone arm is high and the guy is shaking and looks ashen. „What happened?“

„Well, I—I just went out and I found I'd I—eh—left the car—uh—and the ignition keys—I—I have left them in the ignition. They've been sitting there—ulp—all morning—ulp.“

And you'd say, „Well. Oh, is that what you're worried about? What is the car—car worried about? Is it losing things? Um—property'.? Um—property?“

„Property! Huh—huh!“

„Property. Well, give me some way that you've safeguarded property, Pete.“

„Oh, well! Ha—ha! God! Oh, yes, and ever since and so on and so on and so on and so on and so on and so on.“ Tone arm action, tone arm action, tone arm action, see? Everything going along fine, present time problem evaporates and you get the session underway and you're all set. In fact you've probably got your session. If you're not running R4, you've got your session in the bag, see? All because you didn't assume that he was batty for worrying about something that wouldn't have worried you.

Now your gap gets wider and wider the better you get. The better off you get as a case, the wider this gap gets. So it's something to shed if you have it and shed what little of it you do have, because you very readily get to a case gap between your viewpoints and a pc's viewpoints when all of his considerations along in this line look *completely* batty. You'll get to a point sooner or later where the fact that he eats and has to knock off for lunch will seem very, very foolish to you. But because you have been there yourself, you're not liable to cut his itsa line on the subject of being hungry by saying, „Well, that's silly. How could anybody get hungry?“ Because you know that you could get hungry, see?

But this gap gets wider. And your gap already is sufficiently great that mixing in amongst even Scientologists, you here at Saint Hill were reported at the congress of shining up to a point where everybody—anybody could spot where a Saint Hiller was in the audience, see, whether they knew them or not. It's quite interesting. This comment has come back to me. In other words, the Saint Hillers are head and shoulders above Scientologists who are head and shoulders above raw meat. Your gap is already pretty wide. You don't ever know how wide your gap is—that's what's interesting—because you are always in the Condition you are in at the moment you are in it. There's very seldom any comparative data.

I was looking over the factors of growth in Scientology, and these factors by the way would startle you—they'd startle you. They are not necessarily represented by the accounts sheets of organizations or something like that, but they certainly are represented on the dispatch lines of organizations. And opening up old folders of dispatches and going back just two or three years and looking at what was being said and worried about two or three years ago, is illuminative. It's startling! The various factors present are no longer present in organizations; many of those factors are no longer present in organizations. They have been surmounted. Organizations and the people running them, particularly—mainly the people running them—have moved up above concerns of that particular level and they're no longer worrying about these lines. There's various things that they have shed coming up the line. There are various problems which the organizations had at that time. There's the frequencies to dispatch and that sort of—say, of five years ago. And what was contained—these things look like something from another planet!

These are the factors of growth and these factors are very, very easily measured when you look back and have a comparative stick with which to measure them. But you seldom have very much to measure it by, unless perhaps you—you wrote a diary many years ago. Let's say you had a diary and you start running into this diary and that sort of thing. And you say, „Good heavens!“ you see, or „How amazing,“ or „I'll be darned!“ you know? This would give you some type of aspect.

You very often will experience this from an auditor's chair. You run out a whole GPM out of a pc that completely changes all of their considerations and the pc goes waltzing along—life pretty shifted, see—without any real recognition of the degree of shift, see, but just simply take up the new values which are there and go on rolling along with these new values, and they've simply discarded the liabilities of the old values and they aren't a matter of comment.

This will very often baffle you as an auditor, because it's a process of negative gain. You very often will feel somewhat slapped in the face because of this very thing—negative gain. It's a very interesting phenomenon and an auditor has to live with this thing and be able to confront it. This fellow's not been able to sit up. He's always had a badly curved spine or something like this and he'd always sit up like this. And you get to running down the bank, particularly running some GPMs or something like that and you all of a sudden get to that series which have that degree of influence on the body. And all of a sudden the fellow starts to sit up and you never again hear about the curved spine. He doesn't mention the curved spine. He doesn't even think, usually, to tell you how nice it is not to have a curved spine. And the reason he doesn't tell you how nice it is not to have a curved spine is now he has not got a

curved spine to the degree that he has no level of comparison with having a curved spine, because you've also wiped out the experience of having a curved spine.

And you're going to face that as auditors, and sometimes it's really going to baffle you. I've had it happen to me and I still never—that doesn't totally leave me cold, even today, see? Change a person's whole conduct, aspect in some sphere of existence in just a hatful of RIs or something like this, you know? Just improve it, utterly! Knock down barriers in all directions. They're just shining now, you know? Well, let's take some subject like miserliness, you know? Before they were always worried to let anybody know they had a sixpence, you know, and they were always afraid to give anybody anything. This is all vanished, see? They're now completely sensible on the subject. They have more money too, you see? And never have a single word said on the subject of, „Gee, I'm glad I'm no longer wrapped up in all that miserliness,“ see? Never have a word said on the subject.

If you want to be paid as an auditor your observation has got to be terrific, because it's—nine times out of ten will only be your observation that thanks you. Oh, people are basically very appreciative and they say so—and—so and so—and—so and so—and—so and they talk about it and that sort of thing. But every now and then you strike one of these things of the curved spine, see, you know? Guy's always been going along this way, you know? At the end of some session or several sessions all of a sudden there's no vestige of this and you never hear a word about it. You've wiped out all anxiety about it, you've wiped out all interest in it, you've wiped out all communication lines about it and it's gone.

Now, at the same time you occasionally hit somebody and you—they're up against the gun. And if they've got some present time comparison ... Let us say they're going to be operated on for lumbosis, see. And they are going to be operated on and somebody is going to tear out the whole epiglottis and reverberate it, you see, and so on. And you come along as an auditor and you cure it up and they don't have to be operated on. Now, they've got the doctor or somebody, is still nagging them, you see, to have a lumectomy, you see? And they are now happy that they don't have to have this additional duress. You see, that's slightly different.

Now, that person is liable to thank you every time they see you. See, because it's being driven home from some outside source, don't you see? But just the fact that they couldn't read or couldn't see, or something like this and nobody's—there isn't any exterior bang on it, and you ... They can read now, they can see, or something of that particular kind, that doesn't matter a bit—apparently. Of course, they are basically appreciative. They'd be terrified if they thought they would be returned to that condition. But they just neglect to say anything about it.

You had somebody here in the last few months who had gone blind. He was really blind, man! We made him see again. And, by George, you never heard very much about it. I never heard anything about it. And right down to the last moment, right down to the last moment, nobody ever said, „Thank you, Ron, for returning my sight.“ Because it was there, don't you see? There was no point in doing so. I wasn't even sitting there waiting to be appreciated particularly, but I was struck by the fact that the subject was never mentioned. See?

You very often run into this. So, therefore, you better be able to observe because occasionally you'll pull off a miracle and nobody will ever find out about it but you.

Now, when you go into this on the basis of Pete and his car keys, you'll have vast quantities of trouble just because you cannot conceive that anybody would be upset about the car keys—which is the threat of somebody stealing his car—and you find out he's never even had a car stolen in this lifetime, see? And you say, „Well, balderdash!“ see? Well, you won't let him itsa it. See, that's one of the main, basic mechanical penalties of this kind of thing.

All right, now let's take somebody as he goes up the line. He goes up the line and he gets into a more extended perimeter, a more extended view of existence. And here is existence spread out in front of him and he can understand that that person over there feels sad because

that person over there has an aberration about something which demands sadness when a certain circumstance is encountered. Being able to perceive just that, you can get lots of tone arm action; if you can achieve that, you can achieve tone arm action.

Well, you're never sad about having eaten too many chocolates or eaten up all the chocolates, let us say, see. You're never sad about this; this does not make you cry. In fact, you think this is quite ridiculous. In fact, you don't even really like to eat chocolates because they put on weight or something like that, see. So this person is crying—this person is crying and they've eaten up all the chocolates. Well, this is quite mad. You immediately pronounce it as being quite mad and so you do ... You might even be led to process it because you know they are mad. But you sooner or later are going to make a little bit of a mistake about this kind of thing, because your own incredulity on the basic situation that having eaten up all the chocolates should make somebody cry—doesn't seem sensible to you.

Now, it doesn't have to be sensible to you. The only thing that has to be sensible to you is that other beings immersed in life have different viewpoints and different RIs which cause them to feel differently about different things. That's the only thing you have to conceive of. If you can conceive that, you can get tone arm action off most anybody, you see?

In the field of writing, in the field of writing—this is a very poor thing but it's anecdotal and it might amuse you. A fellow by the name of Eric somebody—or—other went out to Hollywood. Well, this is a—this in the old days was a horrible place to be transported to anyhow, with all the glamour and glitter and so forth. And it was particularly appalling for a writer, because a writer always has the idea that he can write and he has proven it by having written and published, you see? But everybody in Hollywood has the idea that he—can write without the small step of having proven it or published it. So, you see, all directors are writers and all producers are writers and all accountants are writers and all the actors are writers, don't you see? Everybody's a writer. And writing, actually, is a fine art and it's quite a craft. But because you're surrounded by all these writers, you see, you always get all kinds of writing suggestions, you see, and so on, and they are quite insane.

Well, I remember this fellow Erie went out there and uh—I think he was a Western writer or maybe that wasn't the same chap—he was a Western writer and they put him to writing musical comedies. And he was going along. And when he first got there, why, he was a very unhappy man. And he had sort of filtered on down the lines and he had become the quasi level of success that people who stick with Hollywood used to become. And—ran into him one day and I said, „Well, doesn't it sometimes get on your nerves, Eric, all the advice you get—gratuitous advice?“

And he said, „No,“ he said, „I have finally gotten used to it.“ He said, „I have finally gotten used to it. Now,“ he says, „when they tell me to put a fire engine in a beauty shop, I put a fire engine in a beauty shop.“ Total apathy on the subject. See, total apathy on the subject.

No, we're not—I'm not advising you to assume this total apathy on it, „Well, all right, so he gets tone arm action on that; so he—so he gets upset about eating chocolates. All right, I'll—silly to me—but I'll go ahead and I'll process him on eating chocolates.“

Let me point out to you—let me point out to you that this would be somebody who was asserting that his entire existence should be the entire existence of everybody else, don't you see? And so asserting it, would then combine into a resignation on his part to accept this other existence, no matter how batty it looked. Let me point out to you that is the *wrong* direction to go; that's the wrong direction to go.

You forward this through understanding. If you understand the mechanics of the mind, then you actually don't resurrender any aspects of it at all. You truly understand the mechanics of the mind. You understand that this guy is sitting in a different goal and has different RIs, so then he, of course, has different viewpoints and different reactions, that's all. His experiential track added up to his postulated track gives him these GPMs and RIs and

gives him a certain behavior pattern. And that behavior pattern is understandable because he has got a bunch of RIs.

Well, even if you're running Level I, II or III type processes on the bloke, nobody is telling you you can't understand this. Then, of course, it rather leads you to understand that some of your—your favorite ideas about the environment in which you live and that sort of thing, that these things are borne home upon you by the RIs that you're sitting in. Well, nothing quite increases that understanding like having a few hot RIs run off of you. And you all of a sudden say, „Oh ho, yeah!“ Your—the right PT GPM and down the line. „Oh—oh. Well, there's an RI. Ho—ho—ho. There's an oppterm there, an oppterm 'toads.' Tumpf“ Through your mind flashes the terror and horror and so forth of gardens, of going anywhere near ponds, of being in a damp atmosphere or anything else. Here's this confounded oppterm, „toads.“

Give you an idea that it doesn't—you don't have to relive your whole life in order to de—aberrate, which is the Dianetic idea. You don't have to relive that whole life in order to de—aberrate. An auditor operating rapidly and competently, just competently, running R4 could in actual fact—could in actual fact take all of these terrors, fixations, upsets and *yalp*—*yalps* that this person had been worrying about—you know, I mean the real obsession that this person was sitting in—in the course of a few little motions of the tone arm, the blowdown and the little pumping as the pc cognites and the rocket reads as it compares, within the space of ten minutes, have listed it, found it, done the courtesy steps and totally discharged it to no fear of toads. See?

Now, that fear, that RI's duration, the duration of that one RI, might have been many, many, many lifetimes. The duration of the pair, I should say better, see—many, many, many, many lifetimes. Think how many engrams are contained in all those lifetimes; think of how many other aberrations and complications; think of how much else. But you hit it dead center, it's toads. It wasn't—he wasn't afraid of gardens because of rose thorns or he wasn't afraid of ponds because he had drowned in them—this he'd always kind of sort of thought. No, he's afraid of them because they have toads in them. All is explained, the thing as—ises, and *bow!*

That lays the terminal to view—well, what did he have to be in order to handle toads—which you may get before or after it, whichever one you're running—and he finds out that this—this is his basic fixation all the time of, „to not—to be imperceptive,“ you see? So he gets „an unperceiving person.“ That was his solution. And he always thought it was because he couldn't confront life that he had trouble with his eyes; and he has always thought it was this and he has thought it was that and he's thought it was ten thousand thousand other things. But it's just „an unperceptive person,“ and one is an unperceptive person because then won't see—one won't see toads. Between the pair they're all explained. And packages that would have turned Freud pale are just gone in that flash of an eye. That is what it consists of. Yet that pair of RIs might have lived for many, many, many, many, many lifetimes—it takes a long time to form up an RI, either side, or a pair.

Well, take a look at this. If you have an understanding of the actual mechanics of the mind and how the mind is put together, and if your understanding of that is both objective and subjective—you've seen somebody recover from these RIs, you see; you've seen somebody recover by blowing them and you yourself have had an experience of a few cognitions and taken a look at it yourself, and so forth—this enormously would improve this ability to see that another being is sitting in the same mechanics but with different significances. And that, in actual fact, is all you need to perceive as an auditor: same mechanics, different significances; same patterns, same pattern type of goals and everything else, but they're different significances—significances are all different.

One fellow has as a top GPM—has a top GPM, „to catch butterflies,“ and another fellow has as the top GPM, you see, „to swim under the sea,“ you see? This gives you entirely different sets of RIs. And even if you had two people side by side, each one of whom had a

top GPM, „to catch butterflies,“ you would still have in those two people different sets of RIs. Even if two people have the same goal, they’ve got different sets of RIs, so they have a different interpretation of significances in that same goal.

All of this is basically a dissertation I’m trying to give you—trying to give you a viewpoint here of—perhaps you’ll be able to see the pc that you’re dealing with more clearly from this point of view. Perhaps in looking back on your past auditing you will see why you just never under God’s green earth did anything for Mamie Glutz, that famous person—why you never did anything for her. And you begin to realize that she talked all the time, all the time, all the time about her feet hurting her; and you realize that you just could never conceive anybody being that worried about anybody’s feet hurting, see? And it just was not something you would have naturally itsaed. So, of course, on this PTP of Mamie Glutz, you never got any itsa at all and therefore, you never got any tone arm action, you never discharged the PTP, so you never did anything for Mamie Glutz.

This explains to you, then, differences amongst pcs and differences amongst auditors getting results on pcs. See, it explains it in this particular breadth.

So anyway, an auditor—an auditor looking over a case if he is a real expert, if he’s a real, real pro he should know—he should know very, very well the layout of that bank. He should know that if you take thirty bricks and lay them in a string end to end, with a bit of a gap between them—and I didn’t tell you in the last lecture, the bricks are long way to, you see, they string out the long way—and the long way, laying them out there, in the longest line they would possibly make with a gap between them—thirty bricks. And those bricks, as you come up from the early track, are dichotomies—one to the next, one to the next, one to the next, one to the next. And these things just roll on up and every one of them has twenty—thirty RIs in the thing, and those things are fitted together. These are the GPMs; these are the goals and so forth. And that these have wound into them implant GPMs and there’s free track floating out alongside of them. And that the pc as he sits in present time, is sitting in a terminal and is confronting an oppterm of that line and is in one of these bricks. And that every one of those bricks dismantles into the component parts. And *basically* that the first one at PT (the latest one on the line, the thirtieth brick at PT) can be found and when found will be found sometimes to be cut off. In fact, most of the time it’s only half a brick. He hasn’t had time to grow a whole brick, see?

And the pc—the pc can be moved forward, can be moved up to the top terminal of the present time GPM, now formed—the latest one formed, you see—can be run back down the track RI to RI to RI to RI, GPM to GPM to GPM to GPM; that this can happen, that it can be done accurately and that the potential beingness of the individual can be recovered by doing that action as difficult as that action might sometimes prove.

Once you’ve seen that, what I’ve said just in the last few words, you actually are looking at the totality of this thing called the human mind. That is all that’s in it that’s important. There are so many gimmicks in it, there is so much glossy hardware in it, there are so many data, there’s so much fact, there is so much livingness done by the pc, that it doesn’t look like red herrings; it looks like a blizzard of red herrings when you try to see this thing at all, see?

Now, what I’ve just told you is what is there to see, and it’s the only important things there. I’ve just spent three months chasing every red herring I could possibly chase to make sure of the totality of the GPM. I know about every kind of implant anybody ever invented anyplace, and they’re about as aberrative as a pinch of snuff. There’s time fouling up, time track jamming GPM—implants ‘ there’s motion implanting implants, there’s implants that have—that are just absolutely salted with false RIs and so forth—whole GPMs implanted. Strings of twenty, thirty—it was no accident, you see, that they chose twenty—eight goals in one Helatrobis series, see—strings of GPMs from beginning to end, you see, all of them matched up, various things and so on. Between—lives implants, wipeout stations, traps, all

the liabilities of life in this universe, and when we shake it all down *you conceived there was an opposition so you invented the solution to it*. They invented a lot of solutions, but on this particular solution there was an exact balanced solution. You then accumulated enormous quantity of mass because you weren't there, it was. And YOU didn't do any as—ising of it at all. It was just an automatic—an automatic response. It was noninspected action. You knew what to do.

The engram has some of this in it too, but not to this degree at all. The order of magnitude is fantastically different. An RI in a GPM? Oh, I don't know, a hundred million, five hundred billion engrams. It's some order of magnitude of this character, see? How long do you think it'd take you to run a million engrams? See? Well, you probably run a hundred million engrams with one RI. Takes you ten minutes to run an RI. Gives you some comparative idea of how far processing has advanced in finding the true state of affairs in the mind, see?

Well, you look at all this thing, you look at all the mischance and adventure and all of the fallings from grace and it's certain that your environment did influence you to postulate certain goals and it's certain that your environment did cause you to influence you to postulate certain terminals and it's certain that your environment was pesky enough along some particular line to finally compose an oppterm; but you had to select it out and compose the oppterm yourself even though you're having nothing to do with it. That's all very certain, this is all very true—and that you are now mocking them up, that's all very true. But the truth of the matter is, you made your own bed of spikes. I don't care how fancy the pinwheels were, see; I don't care how fancy the spider traps were; I don't care how boggy the bogies were, see? I don't care how many times you were lynched—five hundred lifetimes. You'd be walking down the street; you hadn't committed the murder; you were unjustly arrested and illegally hanged—painfully. Aberrative value: pish!

You see, actually a thetan doesn't consider anything valuable except his own postulates. He sheds everything else. And he sure hangs on to his own.

You see, the enemy never even named itself. The enemy might have had a goal, „to capture Chicago,“ see, or something like this. And that's what they call themselves, that was their GPM. But in order to get them as an oppterm, the thetan had to say „the invaders“ or some other such designation. The enemy doesn't even name themselves. I mean, you even make your own oppterms. It's pretty gruesome when you come right down to think of it. So it's your own postulate there in the oppterm. So you're fighting your own postulate in the oppterm. That gets to be pretty grim when you get to thinking about it. And if you don't think one of these RIs—one of these RIs doesn't possess beef, get one out of line sometime or another; get the whole force of somatics of an RI of your own.

These cases of arthritis, these cases of lumbosis, these cases of citizenitis, birds up here in the hospital being carved up into fresh pork—pardon me, long pig—these birds up here being hacked on and slitted and anesthetized, and emergency-ward-tened—these characters, you know—these characters are not suffering from bad livers, bad spines or any other confounded thing, you see, they're not suffering from these things. They're suffering from RI-itis. It's fantastic.

You get one of these things out of line, up against your heart sometime or another—your chest. Let somebody skip a goal on you sometime if you want to—if you want to get a real reality on things. Let them skip a whole GPM and go from, „to spit,“ you see, „to whirl.“ „To whirl“ opposes „to spit.“ *U—uhr—uhr—uhr*. How many are missing in between there, you know? They don't oppose each other. And all of a sudden, after the session, notice that you have coronary thrombosis in an advanced state. You know, these little divers they put in fish bowls, you know, that they have the stream of bubbles coming out of their helmets, you know, that sort of thing Well, that's the way your bloodstream must look to cause that much somatic, see? *Puckle, puckle, puckle, puckle, puckle*. Coronary thrombosis, man—true

advanced case. If a medico got ahold of you at that particular moment, he'd examine you, man, he'd have you in with EEGs and PDQS! He'd blanch!

I've already seen medicos blanch on just running an engram. Ran a guy through measles one time, got him—doctor took his temperature—ran him through a measles engram. Halfway through, why, the doctor stopped me and took his temperature again. He was running a temperature, I don't know, a hundred and two, hundred and three, something like this. And the doctor immediately went into a screaming fit and says, „I'm sorry, I have to order this patient to bed at once!“ I said, „I'm sorry, this is my consulting room at the moment, sit down!“ and finished off the engram. Doctor took the temperature of the patient, it was normal, the patient felt fine; the doctor thought he'd gone crazy because he'd even seen the spots of measles. All the symptoms of measles had been turned on and turned off, complete with temperature.

Well, if an engram can do that, what do you suppose a GPM can do? I'm not now talking about an RI, I'm talking about a whole GPM, see, just missed, clean and clear. Well, I'll let you in on something. You're going to miss a whole GPM on any pc you operate at some time or another. You just can't avoid it happening. So you better begin to understand and stop, because the amount of worry which is going to start entering your skull in the absence of the understanding of what is going on will completely unman you or unwoman you!

The essence—the essence of the situation is comprehension: know the tools of your trade and know what's happening. And also know that there is no perfect method of inspecting a zone or area that you yourself cannot visually see. Only the pc can see this zone or area, until you get up to be—God—help—us. You won't be auditing then; you'll be giving planets a little additional revolutions. You get up there. We got need for you up there too. We know of three or four planets that need a lot of additional revolutions. In fact we have ten or fifteen times the revolutions planned for them. Crosswise, at right angles to the way they're now going! Now, that's—that's a secret. I sh—I should take that off the tape, that's a secret.

But the point—the point is here, your comprehension must be up to your line of action. You must realize that there is no way of looking at it and taking a look at the pc and seeing where his GPMs are located and what the GPMs are and what each one is, except by the systems of processing. You can see it through a meter and the recognition of the pc who may or may not see them. Pc starts itsainging them and so forth, well, he can go so far in itsainging them without plowing himself in. He's itsainging them, he's still getting TA action, well, you let him go ahead. But you're huuh, you know—you know what you're dealing with, you know what the mechanics of it are and you very readily become experienced in knowing whether it's in line or out of line or what you're doing. There's certain tests that you can lay in. And you must also become completely, completely—not resigned to—but completely expectant of a few misses. You start running it perfectly and you worry yourself silly! An auditor couldn't live with himself at all. Because it's impossible'

I'll give you some kind of an idea of how difficult it is. Found a PT GPM. It was obviously the PT GPM; it checked out beautifully. Did a goal oppose—ran it out. Very fine. It—very nice. Ran out the next GPM; ran out the next GPM; found and ran out the next GPM; found and ran out the next half of a GPM. That's two and a half GPMs, see—two and a half GPMs now, including—I mean, in addition to this (quote) „present time GPM.“ Case all of a sudden is unburdened enough; pc suddenly looks up and says, „You know, I never have accepted the present time GPM as my GPM.“

„Oh?“

There's some English family that my family was connected with at one time or another; they had a beautiful coat of arms. It was this enormous rook who was about ten times as big as the castle, sitting on this little tiny turret, see? And the motto was, „Be surprised at nothing.“ That's a good one to adopt.

Thing ran beautifully, was giving beautiful tone arm action. But this is the case of, „Don't repair a case as long as the case runs,“ you see? As long as that case was running without any difficulty—no repair, nothing, pc didn't say anything. Well, in the last couple of sessions, going down the line, we all of a sudden started to have a tone arm which was parking itself at 5.5 and 5.75. Here was trouble. Tone arm action was diminishing. Something was wrong. A GPM had been missed—something is wrong.

However, still didn't make any trouble for the pc, because still getting within the limits of a permissible tone arm action and RIs and making it all right till all of a sudden it's the pc who itsas it. Says, „I never have accepted the present time GPM as my GPM.“

„Oh? All right. Very good.“

Took the second GPM from present time, which had already been run out but which was obviously an actual accurate GPM or it would have wound the pc around a telegraph pole; assumed that it must, therefore, be the second or some such order; and although it had been found by opposing a wrong GPM, it still was the second GPM. Did a goal oppose list against it of a page and a half long; found the right present time GPM; prepchecked it—almost blew the meter apart, such fantastic tone arm action—went up, counted the number of RIs in it ...

Here's the trick for you. How many RIs has this thing got in it? Has it got five, six? You see, truncated present time GPM would not have the full complement of reliable items. So, well, how many does it have? That gives the pc some idea of how to list it. Is it up to the crossover—the middle of it? Or is it up to the top or is it still on the winning side, you see, toward the bottom? Gives the pc an idea of where to list. „How many RIs has it got in it? Has it got two, four, six, eight?“

„Th—th—th—th—th—.“

„How many RIs?“

The pc says, „Th—th—I think six. Yes.“ And six is rocket reads. There's six RIs in this GPM.

„Fine. Let's list for the top terminal.“

And bang! bang! bang! and the pc gave me the first service facsimile found on the pc. Slightly different wording, but there it was, rocket reading like a bat, man! Just going to—bingety—bang. And it just checked out as the top form—opposed it, opposed it, opposed it, opposed it. In three hours and about a half, or something like that, of auditing found that top GPM on a repair basis; found it, found all of its RIs and two RIs that had been missed in the second GPM. The two top RIs had been missed because they were too closely connected with the missing GPM. Threw out the old present time GPM; it now proved to be no GPM even though items had been found. Items had been found but they'd been pulled out of implants and from other actual GPMs. That's where *its* items came from. There was a whole phony GPM sitting there already listed, see?

The other one now in place, pc running like a startled gazelle, tone arm moving between 2.0 and 3.0, no longer assuming the heights of 5.5 or 5.0 or anything like it. That's about three hours and a half for the whole operation.

All right. There must have been a lot—lot of auditing going on there. Yes, there was an awful lot of auditing, but it was basically this: Pc said, „I have never accepted the present time GPM as my GPM.“ And I'm sure that this was as much a surprise to the pc as to the auditor. The pc up to this time had more or less bought it but had some dim objection. But coming up scale enough to actually recognize but didn't accept it, don't you see? So there was a correction which could be done, but only when it had to be done and only when it was pointed out by the pc that it was going awry. Interesting.

Oddly enough, learned something else at the same time. All of your long RI lists—all of your long RI lists—are from wrong items. We already knew that with 3M2. We knew, but we knew it this way. You look up the line plot and find an item ticks. If the item ticks, then

the list it came from is incomplete. That's the rule. Well, actually you can do that a little bit better. If you're listing a list and your pc ARC breaks, the item is—tends to be rather long—the list tends to be rather long and you don't seem to be able to find anything and nothing will stay in, the pc is ARC breaking on overlisting and that sort of thing—you are listing from a wrong item. That solves, actually, long lists in listing for GPMs, quickly, for the auditor. It'll help an auditor an awful lot to know that.

These are little gags of one kind or another; they actually become very forceful rules. We knew before how you did this—you checked the items out. But that checkout is not actually a totally reliable pit—situation because it might be suppressed. No, it's only when you run into a long item list. And when you run into a long item list and you can't find an item on it and the pc is ARC breaky and he's tired of listing and finds it hard to list, just assume you're listing from a wrong item and correct the list just before the list that you did. Extend it, don't you see? Get the right item on this. The case will just run off like this and your tone arm action is quickly and immediately restored.

All this is rules of the game, tricks of the trade, ways to make this cat jump. And when you get right down to it from the word go, you have to be auditing every minute. But what is it that tells you? Do you know that there have now been four mistakes on the present time GPM? Four. At one time a bunch of RIs out of the second GPM were run as the first GPMs RIs. All right, that was gotten rid of and got over that. Another time, tried to go up into PT with this present time GPM—that is, get closer to PT, find items that were apparently missing and read that items were missing—so ran a bunch of irrelevant items which didn't even belong in that GPM, see? Earlier had made two mistakes of a minor nature. But nevertheless, this all added up into patch—up, patch—up, patch—up. Well, fine. But the pc getting tone arm action of a flying nature all the way. And the ease is only being patched up when the case has to be patched up and the case isn't being worried to death all the time.

Now, how can one go ahead and do that? By knowing the anatomy of a case, not worrying about this case but just knowing the anatomy of the case and having some idea of the number of lousy mistakes that you can make in running R4M2 and just accepting that as a liability. Since it's not really the auditor's liability, it's the inability of the pc to perceive sufficiently to let your meter read just *below* that level of perception. Your meter always reads just *below* the pc's ability to perceive. Your meter can read more than the pc. It is sub—itsa that you read just *below what the pc can perceive*.

Now—now—now look at this, look at this, because there's another piece of this. Your meter is not under any circumstances going to read *deeper* than the pc sub—itsa level. If the pc has got, you see, can read—pc can itsa at a certain level and then the meter can run at a sub—itsa level and itsa just below that level—that is a constant distance—the distance between what the pc can itsa and the sub—itsa line. Do you understand? That's a constant distance. And when the pc can't itsa something at all, of course, the meter can't itsa it at all, don't you see? So as the pc's ability to itsa improves, of course, your meter's ability to sub—itsa improves, don't you see?

So until you've got that well improved, don't start cussing your meter, just recognize what—what this limitation is. Until that's improved, you're going to make mistakes. It's inevitable that you're going to make mistakes because you're running there at a sub—itsa level which is unbelievably close to the surface and you've got GPMs piled in like mad. And in actual fact, the present time GPM was *not available* in this case until half of the GPM it was pinned to—the third from the top—had been run, because they are so close together—their harmonic is so close—that they were entangled and smashed together. Couldn't be sorted out. When you run half of it, all of a sudden it sorted out.

Pc at this time makes the announcement, „I've never accepted the present time GPM.“ That's because the other one is now free, so it's knocking on the corner of the skull, saying,

„Hey! Tsk, tsk!“ So the pc says, „I wonder if there’s something wrong with *this*, because that seems to be knocking around here.“ Do you see?

So inevitably, inevitably, you are going to make mistakes, if you want to call them that, in running R4M2. Inevitably. Because you can only run as deep as the meter can sub—itsa. That’s all the deeper you can run on the case. And the case is so jammed up and the itsa is so close to the top, particularly when you start the case, that of course perception is very difficult.

Now, if the perception of this is very, very difficult, how thorough does your information on what it consists of in its basic mechanics have to be? Are you in any position at all to be fumbling around with, „What are the basic mechanics of GPMs and the mind and so forth and what does the mind really look like?“ Are you in any position to be fumbling around with that when you already got these troubles of the pc can’t itsa any corner of it and the thing is so jammed up and overcharged that we can’t sub—itsa with the meter worth a nickel on it and we’re making mistakes with—there—at the same time, do we have any time to be coping with a noncomprehension of what we’re handling. Well, the easy part of all this simply hangs up on this one fact: The comprehension of it is simple because its anatomy is very simple.

The mind could be a very fancy ... You could probably write billions of words describing the number of phenomena and significances and odd bits and types of this and that in the mind. And they’re all very interesting curiosa. And a very accomplished auditor would know about an awful lot of them, because he would have run into them at one time or another.

But a few minutes ago in this lecture I was able to sum up everything in the mind in a relatively few words—that is, everything in the mind that has any bearing on aberration or is touched by auditing when auditing is successful.

And it’s just a little hatful of stuff; it’s just your thirty bricks—the goals, that sort of thing. But those bricks can get tangled up with the implant GPMs, you know? They all have goals and they’ll rocket read too. They actually derive their force and rocket reads, by the way, from the actual GPMs.

You got these various things; there they are stretched out. Your pc’s got them, except the probability of his twenty [thirty] bricks—even though he’s lived them and laid them out—the probability of those things being in a string or being undisturbed, of all the items being neatly in the proper brick, of all the bricks being separate—the possibility of this occurring is not remote but nonextant. There’s no slightest possibility that this is going to be the Condition of the bank when you begin to operate on the bank. It’s a jam mess. A jam mess.

The GPMs have helped jam it. But the pc has been enthusiastic in jamming it too, one way or the other. These things have gotten pulled out this way and pulled out the other way and pulled off some other way and chipped up this side and hauled down that side, and so forth. Oh, they’re all neat. And when you audit them they go all together like a well—oiled clickity—click machine. If you’ve got GPM eighteen and you’ve run everything down to GPM eighteen, then you can find the top—the top oppterm and the top terminal and every RI in it just as neat as you please, right down to the goal as an RI; the whole thing will blow down and blow up and that’s the end of it. Oh, yes, it’ll all perform—it’ll very, very neat.

But your difficulty comes when the eighteenth brick from the beginning of time is pulled up in advance of the present time GPM. And your listing for the present time GPM finds the eighteenth brick, „to be God,“ you see, something like this, you know? Good, sound present time GPM, you know? Crunch!

Present time GPM: „To not use my powder puff so often,“ you know?

There’s ways of recognizing these things. And when you—when you get this stuff really down, why, you’ll see what these things ... But it goes together just like that. There’s less to learn about it than building a mechanical toy or building a little block house out of kids’ blocks—there’s less to learn about it than that. But the point is, learn it and respect what

you've learned—understand what it amounts to. And then you've understood—you've understood all the basics of existence. This is what somebody is doing. This is how he did it and this is what's wrong with him. This is what you're untangling and this is what you're straightening out and so forth.

And a solid command of this delivers a fantastic amount of ease into your hands, at whatever level of auditing. This guy comes in, he's going „*Rrww, rrww*, and *smmmmlll—daa—daa—daa—raa*“ and so forth. And this is only Level II you're doing and so forth. Let's do an ARC break assessment on a List 4, phrasing it in some way or another—“Has a goal of yours been disturbed?“ You know, „A goal of yours that has mass with it, has that been disturbed?“ It'll register in some fashion or another and pat some GPM back into place, see; straighten out some RIs that he doesn't even know are RIs. You could get very, very smooth at this kind of thing. You could practically put him back together again without auditing anything, don't you see?

You should be able to handle these things well. But basically you should be able to understand these things and you should be able to understand the mind as the mind, as a mechanical piece of stuff; not as a bunch of significances and not as, „a divine creation which is given man to speed his learning and thinking and has made man into the being he is today, lord of all creation.“

Just deliver some of that understanding into your hands and you'll have a lot of luck with pcs and so forth and you will be disabused at once of tremendous worry over your pc. Because you'll be able to perceive much more rapidly what's wrong and at the same time deliver into your hands a lot of power to get results over your pc. And those two things are very desirable, as I think you will agree.

Thank you.