

SUMMARY OF LOWER LEVELS—CLEARING AT LEVEL IV

A lecture given on
10 March 1964

Well, I'm glad to see you looking so well. What's the date?

Audience: March the 10th.

March the 10th. Ah, well, 10 March AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And you today are going to hear a summary of lower levels and clearing at Level IV, in which you will be very interested indeed.

Now, I've been beating my brains out—not being inside them it's a fairly painless activity—trying to find out how, how-having shot the moon—we got our feet back on the ground.

Now, there has to be some bridge between 0 and V. Obviously V is becoming the catchall level by which the individual picks up and refines all of his knowledge of the mind and so forth, in order to kick off into the astronomic altitudes of VI. We have made the gun in VI, that's—that's there. In fact, I don't know of anything very much you have to do in VI.

Well-trained, this is very easy. Untrained it's impossible, see. And so having shot the moon, what's that leave you? Well, it's - I think Alexander, an old-time enemy of mine—every once in a while somebody comes along and says, „I'm Alexander the Great,“ don't you see, or something like that, or „I was Alexander the Great,“ something like that. They don't quite realize the hair going up on the back of my neck, don't you see. Because he got to a point where he had no more worlds to conquer. That's the traditional contribution of Alexander the Great to literature in history. And he had no more worlds to conquer, don't you see. Well, that's great. But he might have figured out how you got from Greece to India. When he got to India there were no more worlds to conquer, that's for sure. But had he conquered anything from Greece to India? That was the question. And he went and sat down in royal palaces of satrap and pined away, hadn't realized that he in actual fact had not conquered up to the point where he had no more worlds to conquer. Because that empire fell apart like a bunch of confetti at a wedding. And it was gone and in the dust in very short order.

Why? Well there was no way to get from India to Greece or from Greece to India. That's the fact. So he never made any bridge. He not only had no more worlds to conquer, he hadn't conquered the one he was living in. So we're in danger of getting up to the esoteric levels of VI and looking around and realizing we had no more worlds to conquer and that leaves thirty or forty of us as OTs and that's it. That's the end of the push, don't you see.

In the first place, you can't take somebody off the street up here and say, „All right, this is the way you go about it. You do this list, see, and you take the meter and when you get rocket reads and so on, why, you null that thing out and then you plot that on a goals plot as the actual GPM, and so forth, and then you do its opposite, and so forth, and then you add twenty-one and so on, and that's all there is to it.“ And I'm afraid about this time he'd be standing there with his jaw dropped.

Scientology progresses on reality. He's not in a position to recognize any part of an actual GPM and so he's really not about to get any reality on Scientology. So the lower levels is the contest of achievement of reality. It's not really the contest of making somebody better. It's the contest of achieving the stepping stones of reality. Of course, at Level 0 you're taking somebody who doesn't even know the world's here.

Reminds me of the position I was in when I was four-five in this lifetime and I used to look around this great bowl of the hills up in the Rockies and in a dim sort of caved-in way wonder, wonder if there was anything beyond those hills, don't you see? Very dim wonder. Not sure, not sure, just-just wondering. And that's all very well, but so is this guy. He looks at his kitchen and at the environment of the job where he works and the wrath of the boss and the inclement weather of his wife, and it's like looking at this bowl of hills, you see, „Is there anything beyond this?“ See. And he isn't at all sure that there is.

Well, unless you can show him there's something beyond that he's never going to take any step further. You've left him in that little Depression of hills and that is that.

How do you walk him out of there? How do you get him from that point to some other point so that he can take off? Because, believe me, he must be walked from a point of no recognition of reality, to a point of some recognition of reality, before he can take off to an ultimate reality. It's done by gradients. One of the oldest tricks that we have and it's quite peculiar to Dianetics and Scientology-the idea of a gradient. Doing it a little bit at a time.

You jump too big a step in a gradient and a person goes unreal. Now, I was studying unreality the other day and I found out that unreality was associated with charge. Charge and unreality are the same thing. They are the same. If you overburden somebody too heavily with a bunch of suppresses and that sort of thing, he is incapable of understanding an RI. Be a perfectly obvious RI-the auditor sitting there, „Does 'to be hungry' bring about 'to eat'?“ See? And the auditor's looking at this, „Hah, bvo, ba, of course, 'to be hungry' brings about 'to eat',“ yeah, so what. And the pc now has invalidations, suppress, overcharge, he's sitting in the middle of the rat race, and so forth, and he says, „Well, 'to be hungry,' well, 'to eat'. Hmm. Well. Let me see, let me say that over again to myself Would 'to be hungry' bring about-I don't know. Let's see, to be hungry, w-and so on, so on.. .“ Wildest thing you ever wanted to see.

Now you get the suppresses and the invalidates off of these things and all of a sudden why he says-you know, you get it straightened up, get the burden off of it-and he says, „Well, 'to be hungry' bring about 'to eat'. I mean that's - what's so hard to understand about that?“ But just a couple of moments before by reason of overcharge, in other words, too much-too much charge, too heavily burdened-he's a fellow with a ton of coal sitting on his head, don't you see, and you're asking him to look around and see the environment. And of course he can't see out through a ton of coal. You move the ton of coal and he says there's an environment, see.

It's very funny, I mean because you can take the pattern items at Level VI and just throw your session ruds out badly on them. And the pc won't understand them. It's an interesting clinical study of understanding. Understanding then is directly related to charge. And a person who has too much charge on his case can't understand. Therefore, he doesn't have any reality. So an overcharged individual is incapable of achieving a reality. And a reality is necessary to the understanding and gradient steps that he has to take in order to go totally free.

Now, do you see what binds him in? Overcharge. His wife's always yapping and yowling at him or her husband is always yapping and yowling at her, don't you see. Here we've got yap and yowl. And we've got this and we've got this and we've got worries and so forth and all of that sort of thing, and finally people under those circumstances will do the stupidest things, see? Because their environment's too heavily charged. It's the actual active environment in which they live, it's too heavily charged. And they can't understand beyond

that point. Their understanding is swamped. And of course they don't understand it either. They don't even understand they have a wife or husband. It gets down to that point. What is a wife? They will go around mutter, mutter, mutter to themselves, you see, „What is a wife?“ „What is a man?“ you know, mutter, mutter, mutter, mutter. It's just too heavily charged. All caved in on the subject.

Every once in a while, you'll see a couple go get married who have been fighting consistently and continually, see. They didn't do nothing but fight and worry and worry and fight, and fight and worry and worry and fight, and one day they walk down and get married. You say that's a stupid thing to do. Well of course, they've created themselves a mutual environment of overcharge to such a point they have no comprehension of what they're doing. You see that? If you want to see somebody do something silly, why, start piling up the charge on him. Give him lots of conflict. Give him lots of duress. Give him lots of this, that and the other thing. He'll do something silly. I didn't really - wasn't really at that moment trying to explain to you the workings and functions of an army or a government, but if it applies, apply it.

Stupidity then comes about from charge. What do we mean by charge? We mean it's unreleased masses of energy. Unreleased, unresolved, stored masses of energy, that's charge. It's no more than that. The significances aren't-don't enter into it. You get somebody to sort out his problems by significance and he's likely to not solve them. Because in actual fact it's his overcharged environment that is making him too stupid to solve his problems.

And we've got an awful lot of stuff in getting this bridge together between 0 and V-we've got an awful lot of stuff that's quite miraculous. And we've done an awful lot with it. And it's quite surprising what we have managed to do over a period of years with this material. You yourself know you can do this or that or the other thing with a pc and very often it works quite marvelously, don't you see, and you can do all kinds of oddball things and so on.

What's straining you is an effort to attain a consistency of result. That's your main worry: consistency of result. Joe, Bill, Pete. Now how do we get Joe, Bill, Pete bailed out of it. Well, obviously we've got to get a result on Bill and then when we've done that get a result on Joe and then a result on Pete, don't you see? We've got to get a consistent result. And what breaks an auditor's heart is to get a beautiful result on Bill, no result on Joe and make Pete sick as a dog. See, that's an inconsistent result. So therefore, to get a consistent result you would have to deal with the common denominator of difficulty with Joe, Bill and Pete. And attack that common denominator, not the individual difficulties of Joe, Bill and Pete. You see how you could achieve a consistency of result?

Now, you see unless we can achieve a consistency of result on the Levels from 0 up through to V, unless we can achieve some consistency of result, nobody will ever make the bridge. So we're posed-in putting in the processes and activities of an auditor, between 0 and: V-with the problem of giving the auditor a consistent result and enough result to bring about not only a reality on his own part, but on the part of the people he's processing-a mutual reality on the situation-in order to persuade them on forward.

Now if the thing that is making them stupid is charge and if this is the common denominator of no bridge-overcharged environments, overcharged individuals, the guy hasn't got a reality on something because he's just too plowed in, don't you see, he's got too many tons of coal on the top of his head-then it's quite obvious that what we have to charge and attack at those levels is this matter of charge. We've got to make somebody brighter and we've got to get him to be able to see further and we've got to get rid of, of course, some of the things he's worrying about. And then we would achieve it.

So that the only thing we can do - the only thing we can do - at Levels 0 on up to V, is get rid of charge. But in view of the fact that the basic charge on the case is the actual GPM, and as the person at that level-those levels-is incapable of attacking those-and that is said

very-very advisedly, they-I mean very factually-they're not capable of attacking these things-and if that's the basic charge on the case and if we can't get anywhere by putting the pc into it but trouble-and believe me, we are going to get no place but trouble if we try to put the person into it at those levels before he's ready to and before he has any education on it-why, then quite obviously what we want to do is bail him out of the charge rather than get rid of the charge. So we have Level 0 to V devoted-that's up to V, that's not including V-0 to IV inclusive-devoted to destimulation. The skills of destimulation. Which is to pull the pc out of the charge, not try to erase the charge.

A certain amount of erasure is bound to take place-bound to take place. But if we're concentrating on destimulation we will be achieving the same ends. We're getting the individual out of these masses of charge. So what we're really attacking at those levels are key-ins. We're trying to destimulate. So obviously Level 0 to IV inclusive, which is up to V, are addressed to the whole subject of destimulation. We're studying destimulation. Now, what do we mean by destimulation? Well, we're trying to knock out the key-ins that keep the charge pinned to the individual. We're not trying to destroy the charge or get rid of the charge. What we're trying to do is bring the individual out of it. And that is an art of a very high order.

We're trying to pluck the individual out of the roaring whirlpools of energy by tripping those little items which keep him connected to it. Now we're not going to restimulate anything until we get up into actual GPMs and then we're just going to throw him to the lions. Then he can get rid of all of the charge and as-is the whole ruddy lot of it. Because that's all contained in one process-R6, see. And that's a-that's a completely rounded up proposition.

But the funny part of it is, the individual with all of his restimulations pinned together, is in actual fact incapable of recognizing an actual goal. So, if you take the actual goal and pile on top of it all of the key-ins, trying to get the individual now to recognize the actual goal is going to be very difficult indeed. So the right way to go about it is to pull the individual out by disconnecting the key-ins, pull him out of the actual goal, let the whole thing subside and then at Level VI shovel it all off into the gutter. You see that as a different proposition?

Now, if an individual standing on a pile of coal looking at a lifesaver - let's take a lifesaver and put it on the concrete and then put a ton of coal on top of it and then put the individual on top of this pile and say, „Now, all you've got to do is pick up that lifesaver.“ And he says, „What lifesaver?“

„Lifesaver right down there, of course, you idiot!“

„Where?“

„Well, you see, really, it's underneath the coal.“

„Well, I don't see any. Well, I'll take it on faith.“

All right, let's do a list for the lifesaver. Let's do this for the lifesaver, let's do that for the lifesaver. You can't find the lifesaver. Why?. Well, now, that's not too perfect a metaphor. But, here is the position you find the individual in. You could get him back to a point where that pile of coal wasn't all piled up. But if it's subsided and lay across a low level-was only a couple of inches thick around the lifesaver-he could see the lifesaver. Then by getting the lifesaver, if you could imagine that the lifesaver would hold the coal there, the moment he grabbed hold of the lifesaver all the coal would disappear, then you've done the trick, don't you see? But that's what you're up against. If that ton of coal represented all of his key-ins and his upsets, why, he isn't going to get anywhere close to that lifesaver. Now that's perhaps not as smart a graph as I could make you on the subject, but it tells you what you've got to do with an individual.

Now, if an individual can be in the midst of an actual RI at Level VI and not understand it, merely because of some session invalidation, so forth-the auditor overlisted and the guy didn't think it was it and they found it once and they abandoned it and then they came back and picked it up again and suddenly he can't understand it. And then we brush off a

couple of suppresses and destimulate its connection with the session, you see. Now, he all of a sudden can understand this RI and it blows. One has to understand RIs or they don't blow, because of course they are not in printed English. They're a thought. And a thought requires understanding.

Now, in view of this, if an individual can do that in the middle of a session, on an actual RI, what do you think he's going to do in life? These GPMs and the whole track and that sort of thing are so jammed up and so locked up with everything under the sun, the individual with his attention, gruesomely and howlingly concentrated on some little-not even a pile of coal, but concentrated on just a lump of coal-well, you've got to show him he can do something about the coal. He can do something about it. And he gets a big reality and a hope factor and his confidence resurge on this basis: that if he could get his attention off just one lump of coal for a few minutes it would make him feel so different and so interestingly alive compared to how he has felt that now he gets a big upsurge in reality and you can get him to tackle four-five lumps of coal, see. You got a gradient. You got a gradient by which this can be done, see. And it's a matter of confidence knocking out the charge, destimulating him so he is brighter and so forth. And that's the problem between 0 and IV inclusive.

How do you do this? Well, you take this individual and he's so mired down in the middle of his family or his job or his social security work or something that he hasn't got any time to do anything and he can't even lift his eyebrows long enough to do anything and he can't spend any time trying to get out of this, he's just barely able to hold it at bay. It's like-he's in the same frame of mind of-you're trying to sell a lion tamer a padded suit, you see. And he's fighting forty lions, forty, and they're all about ready to come off of their pedestals, you see, and the chair's broken by this time and he's running out of blank cartridges. So you say, „Hey, I'd like to sell you this suit,“ see, „It's-it proofs you against being chewed.“ And you know he wouldn't pay a bit of attention to you. He can't take his attention off these lions long enough. Well, the thing to do-the thing to do, of course, is to take the lions-the immediacy of the lions-away, lion by lion. And then he begins to get the idea that maybe he doesn't need the blank cartridge pistol, and so forth, and you sort of play it back and forth and you destimulate his environment.

Now, an environment can itself be a present time problem. That fellow who was being charged for murder and who was going to be sent to the electric chair is very, very hard to interest in much of anything. He's-it's like the fellow who is going down a toboggan slide or like one of these-one of these Swiss ski runs that goes ninety miles an hour-right about the middle of the run you can't unload, see.

So there is a point of an individual being in-so involved and his environment so charged, that there isn't anything you can do about it. So the first level of processing happens to be-and this of course would not include all cases, but it's the most extreme case, which delivers it into your hands - most extreme case is the unconscious person, they've just gone down for the third time, you see-but that one point is, is you have to remove the person from his present time environment to some degree. And you'll find out that if you're ever called upon to handle the insane, the removal of the individual from his environment which is restimulative and overcharged, and giving him a nonrestimulative environment where nobody is bothering him, and where he can get some rest, will be your best route. You do very low-level processing.

Well, you say, well, some of these blokes are going to sit there and starve to death and they won't eat and so forth. Well, I think they're probably not eating because they're under such duress that they may be treated or they have to answer questions or something like this. You look around and all you do is keep removing charge from the environment, to the best degree you can. So some of them starve to death. Well all right, they go through the betweenlives area and pick up another body. There's your lowest level of action. In other words, this is giving somebody a nonrestimulative, relatively so, environment. Removing him

from the restimulative environment. Well, that's a pretty low level. But it exists as a processing level.

Now let's go from there-let's go from there-and we will find the individual is now so engrossed in his present time problems that he is obsessively solving everything under the sun, moon and stars. And he's just obsessively solving his present time. And his solutions are so pyramided that you don't dare touch any corner of the pyramid or you'll get a collapse of the lot. And you find out that that quite commonly states the average person in the street. You find the housewife going to market-if you were to walk alongside of one and say, „Now what are you thinking about right now, what's the stream of consciousness going through your brow?“

„Well, if I do this-and so on-I could get Johnny's-so on-and then I could do the-so on and so on and so on-and if I could save us a little bit of money out of the grocery money why that'd give *us-waf, waf, waf, waf, waf, waf*, waf-and I might be able to get that new dress if I could get Mrs. Jones-*waf, waf, waf, waf, waf, waf, waf, waf*. It's just a wild string of solutions. They're going on and on and on, one right after the other, solve, solve. Well, now you can come up to your lowest level of actual processing on the basis of itsa on solutions. Tends to take over that automaticity.

I'm just showing you the scope of something-I'm not giving you the fixed form of these things, I'm just showing you what could be done, see.

And now-now, let's look at the first-what in actual fact would be the first processing level that would-you would really saddle as an auditor, as a pro, that you would call processing. And that's your repetitive question or your objective processes at Level II. Now right up to this point-up to this point-you are not confronting-we, of course, have bypassed assists and so forth, there are other processes that do things at those levels which, of course, assists is just acquaintance, familiarity with the thing that hurts, or something, or where it was hurt.

But when you get a repetitive process, HQS level, now, that certificate - what is the bug from there on up that might make processing dangerous and that would give you loses. And that is the question your old man here has had to - had to answer and it was answered in this fashion. What isn't in an actual GPM? See, what isn't in an actual GPM? Is there something that isn't in an actual GPM that could be processed with impunity? And there is. There is something that isn't in an actual GPM, and that is a noun or a pronoun.

Now there are some pronouns in actual GPMs-there's such a thing as „myself,“ there is sometimes „I,“ and-but they're part of the wording of a goal, so pros-pronouns are not absolutely safe. But at Level II you're so far from the actual GPM you could probably use them with impunity. You're at such a distance, there's so much coal between you and it, and these things only form a very tiny portion of some goals that there's no reason to debar them at Level II. But as the pc progressed from Level II on up, I would begin to get wary of using a pronoun. And I'd begin to get leery. Because you do have to-“to help myself..... to forget myself,“ things like this, don't you see; those things do appear in actual goals.

But aside from that, one little observation: There are no nouns in actual GPMS. None! There is-nobody has a goal „to be an assassin.“ Nobody has a goal „to be a God.“ Nobody has a goal „to be a wife.“ Nobody has a goal „to be a goddess.“ Nobody has a goal „to be a criminal.“ They are not actual goals, see. And nowhere in it do you have a terminal, „a sultan“ or „alcohol“ or „cats,“ „kings“ or „coal heavers.“ See, nowhere. There are no such terminals. There are no such opptterms. There's ‘-nesses“ and ‘-ties“; there's „nervousness,“ you see, „ability.“ There's things of this kind, you see. The adverbial and adjectival nouns are present, so you don't use those: „-nesses,“ „-ties,“ ‘-ions,“ „communication.“ „Think of a communication“ is liable to be sending you right straight down the route toward an actual GPM. „Think of a communicator“ and it wouldn't. Got the idea? You could process with

absolutely-impunity „an assassin.“ You could prepcheck it, you could run brackets on it, you could do almost anything you ever heard of in the way of processing on the subject of „an assassin.“

And we suddenly come to why the 20th ACC made Clears and the missing secret, why it wasn't general: it's because nouns were processed on brackets. Accidental, see. So you'd actually key out actual GPMS. Because „an assassin“ might very well be the hundred-and-fifty-first lock on an actual RI, „death.“ So the individual's alert to this idea of an assassin. All right. „On ‘an assassin,’ has anything been suppressed?“ Here we go. Fine! What are you going to do? You're going to key out that actual GPM. Destimulation. All of a sudden it's over there and the pc's here and his needle's flopping. *Interessante*, huh?

Well, now listen. What is an actual GPM? What is an actual RI? Completely aside from the other considerations anybody at Level IV-and this is what I'm teaching you today is Level IV-should at least know that these things exist and they are a mass with significance. Now that's really what you have to know at Level IV what they are. They're a mass with significance. That mass is very big and massy, too. And the significance is very significant. But they are mass with significance. So therefore masses with significances key in actual GPMS. What is the key-in of an actual GPM? A mass with significance.

What is a mass with a significance, aside from being an actual GPM? Well, I don't know, a man is a mass with a significance. A fireplace is a mass with a significance. A house is a mass with significance. A tree is a mass with significance. A desk is a mass with significance. A room is a mass with significance. A piano is a mass with significance. E-Meter, that's a mass with significance. Easel, that's a mass with significance. Pencil is a mass with significance. And every one of them is a potential key-in of an actual GPM or an actual RI. You's walkin' around in present time that is just full of restimulators! You's haunted! And I think we know now why everybody is in present time. It's the most haunted area.

Now, you think it's a significance that keys in the actual GPM. No. Of course, if you've got an actual RI that's-has „communicating“ or something like that as an actual RI and somebody says that to you often enough, I can guarantee that it will key in. There is no slightest doubt about that! I don't think it'd be very safe to process, because the individual's going to go down, but he hasn't got the actual RI-he probably even hasn't got it quite correctly worded. So if that was processed directly you'd have trouble.

Supposing you had an actual RI „help“-and there is such an actual RI. „How could you help? How could I help? How could you help? How could I help?“ Cut your throat, man! You're sending him right down the chute and the next thing you know he's going to be in the middle of a goal which is not in sequence, not his present time GPM; you haven't got the goal that goes with it; you've got the pc now into an RI; he's going to turn on some somatics and he's going to have a ball. He may have some fever and chills to go along with it.

Well, how's the process become at all safe? Well the lowest level of safety on such a process is, „How could I help you?“ and „How could you help me?“ And it's the „me“ and the „you“ that salvages it. Why? Because it's a mass with significance. But you normally don't look at the pronoun as a mass with significance. See, you tend to forget it. Now you think it's „help“ that's doing all this. We don't know that it's the „help“ doing it at all. We might get just as much bang out of the process by just running „you, me, spot you, spot me, spot you, spot me,“ don't you see. Because you've got mass with significance.

Now, I'm not advising this as a process. I'm simply giving it as a sample of process, is „Recall a terminal.“ Terminal, of course, is mass with significance that is capable of receiving, sending or relaying communication. Boy, aren't we back into the old days when we were giving forth with this kind of stuff, see. „Recall a terminal. Good. Recall a terminal. Good. Recall a terminal.“ Why does old ARC Straightwire work? Well the laws of life of course are senior to the GPMS. We have laws of life which are not dictated to us by actual

GPMS. We've got the laws of life which come about and make actual GPMS. And we had already entered it at a higher strata than that level, fortunately for the lot of us, see?

Now, the law in which we're involved there is that ARC Straightwire worked as long as it had pronouns. „Felt some affinity for someone.“ „Communicated with *someone*.“ „*Something* was really real to you.“ Now what were the little hidden bugs in those process commands? Those things were chosen empirically. These, out of a great many commands, were found to be commands that were workable. And I'd never sorted out of them exactly what it was that made them work. And we turn-turns out to be the „*something*,“ the „*someone*.“ That was the workable aspect. Isn't this fascinating.

Therefore, you can prepcheck a mass that has a significance. You can run it in brackets. You can add up other commands and significances to the auditing command, as long as it's there and you're running it. Now Level II, we don't have any assessment. So how do we get the auditor across this band? Well, objective processes of course, having him touch a wall, is a mass with significance, isn't it? And the control and the communication and the havingness involved in the action contain principles of life that are senior to actual GPMS, so those things added up-control, communication, havingness-added up to the mass with the significance, which is a wall, gave us 8-C as one of the highest level workable processes we ever had at that level, see. Isn't that interesting, see? But it was the wall. That was basically what it was, it was the wall. The mass with the significance.

That wall was very likely to key in actual GPMS, see. So when you got him familiar with the wall, the wall would key out. The actual GPM would resi-would-would go away, see, destimulate. Die down.

So, because you can't do-there'll be other devices of this sort of thing - because you cannot expect anybody at Level II to assess, therefore, can't expect them to assess, so therefore you would tend to depend on pronouns and objective processes such as walls and so forth to give workability to processing. You'll find things will get very real to this fellow. Level I, the basic mass with a significance that he gets familiar with and begins to trust and so forth is the auditor. Somebody to listen to him. And that's all you could really expect him to do at Level 1, was just get-get the idea there was an auditor there or somebody he could talk to.

But Level II you could introduce other things like „them,“ you see, „*someone*,“ „*something*,“ and add some significance to the auditing command, and then you've got the regularity of the auditing command helping you along too-the repetitive nature of the command you see. Because your auditing cycle is in there, working. And very probably the best process at Level II was the process which is never noticed at Level II, which is simply the comm cycle. You ask a question the pc can answer, the pc does answer the question, you let it-making sure that he answered the thing completely and you acknowledge it, see. It's that cyclic action which is the process which makes Level II.

Now, how come-how come „auditor“? Well, an auditor's a mass with significance, but an auditor's a lot more than that. An auditor is apparently senior to masses with significance, see. An auditor carries hope and aliveness, and so forth, along with it. This is something new. Something different.

So an awareness of just the existence of such a person, and so on, is terribly therapeutic. A friendly mass with a significance that will give him a hand, see? That's all. Well, that tends to take the curse off the horrible masses with significance that are around, see. Here is one mass with a significance that is not an enemy.

Now, the nature of this universe is a two-pole nature. This is a two-pole universe. Ol' Bucky Fuller was sweet enough to come over one time and give me a lecture over in Elizabeth, all by my lonesome. I was very appreciative of that. Taught me a lot. Two-pole universe. Singles can't exist in this universe. Doubles can. And we look how thoroughly that is, we get the principle of the motor. Motors. Motors don't operate unless current is

circulating between two poles. And those two poles have got to be fairly close together, but if the current can circulate between two poles, pole A and pole B, and you girls don't have to know anything about electricity, you probably know more about electricity anyhow than I do, because I've laughed off most of man's science, in the field of electricity. It's too incredible!

I ruined a whole university education on the subject for Mary Sue. She was utterly betrayed. I happened to remark to her one day that man had never seen an electron. See, he's seen only the manifestations that one might exist. But he has never seen an electron. And he really doesn't know what the pattern of them is and he really doesn't know what molecules are-these are all assumptions. And it was such a terrible betrayal that she threw away all of Rice Institute and the University of Texas into the wastebasket. Was very upset about this, because she'd had to memorize exactly how they looked and how many sides they had, you see, and how much they weighed and all this sort of nonsense.

Well, man does know that these things exist by third- or fourth-rate evidence, you see. But he's just guessing what they are and that he hasn't guessed right is obvious, because he has no flying saucers. See? He really has none of the energy devices that he should have. For instance you-to really get somewhere in a civilization you've got to have power-little packages of power of some kind or another. You don't want long cord dragged out, you see, a hundred and seventy-five yards of cord, with a fellow with one drill on the end of it, you know, everybody falling over this cord. Impractical. And he really has no source of power, so he can't know very much about electronic structure or molecules or anything of that character, otherwise he'd be able to convert it to power, see. Costs him I don't know how many million bucks to turn over the wheels of one atomic submarine once, you know. And, I think they feed them pills, at relative intervals, and somebody told me-I was very surprised to find out that they only cost three or four times as much as fuel oil.

Of course in space opera one gets used to a little button one slides into the side of a gun that runs the gun all year, you know. Blows mountains down. But-packaged power. So don't be too upset because you think I am asking you to suddenly understand man's scientific-ha-equations in the subject of electronics and electricity. I'm not. I'm just asking you to fall back on the fact of just one thing, that every time you see a motor or any interchange, and so forth, it's got two poles and these two poles are standing there side by side, and that there's a magnetic interchange between these two poles. And as long as these two poles are rigid and don't collapse, why the push-pull in between those two, you can do things with. But it takes two.

Now, to give you how simple this is: take a single electrode on the E-Meter and hold the single electrode, but let the other electrode go to blazes and see if your meter reads, see. And your meter isn't going to read, see. And then take ahold of both electrodes and you'll see that the meter reads, both electro-I'm not talking about a single-hand electrode. If you get a single-hand electrode, it has to be split in the middle. You've got two poles in a single-hand electrode. So you have to have hold of two cans in order to make the meter read. That's to complete the circuit. Well, that's an evidence of the two-pole nature of this universe. And that's all there is to it. And things don't operate one on one-well on one pole. Now I've put myself over the jumps considerably to find out a little bit more about this and solve this a bit better in the earlier-well, I guess it's only a month or two ago. And I sat there with a one-hand electrode-double pole, one-hand electrode-and ran me out a whole actual GPM. It wasn't too gruesome an experience, but I had to find out if these things could be self-audited. And so forth.

Well you can plot goals yourself. I had to find out, see. Because you might get parked on Exnoo, or something of the sort and how-what do you do about it, you know, if you haven't gotten it cleared up and so forth, what does somebody do if he hasn't got an auditor? Is there a road in that particular line? Very well may be one. You'd probably be better off

running them out that way than not running them out, you understand? I mean it's that-but it's touchy.

But what was different about that session? No TA. I who get lots of TA when audited by an auditor, running exactly the same materials with no ARC breaks, any kind, nothing-no TA! A little thresh of the needle, RI falling about that far, returning almost at once, blowdown represented by the fact that it didn't return from a little slash that big, you see. Usually find a real RI, it's anything from a half a division to a division and a half tone arm blowdown, see. No TA. Well, this revealed-this revealed something. This is a research exercise. I wouldn't wish it off on you. But it revealed that fact: In the absence of an auditor a pc who gets TA doesn't get TA. I consider this very, very interesting indeed.

And I think it actually describes any pc you've got who isn't getting TA. I made that point fast, didn't I! You got it?

So the amount of TA a pc gets is proportional to the two terminals-ness present in the session. If you haven't got two terminals in a session, you've got no TA. If you've got one terminal in a session, you get no TA, see? And if you've got one and one one-thousandth of a terminal, you get a little TA and if you get one and one one-hundredth of a terminal sitting across from it, you get a bit more TA, and you get your highest-flying TA, of course, when you simply had two terminals. You understand? So that we've got the auditor, sitting there, has to be real to the pc for there to be two terminals in the session. Isn't that-isn't that elementary. In other words the pc doesn't have an auditor, he doesn't have any TA.

Now this is not the auditor's fault. This describes the state of case-the native state of case of the pc. It's only the auditor's fault when the auditor isn't remedying it. Well, I've noticed something very interesting in plotting actual GPMs and in engaging in any new action. I can generally start a gradient on my pc, it starts at about forty-nine or fifty TA divisions down for two and a half hours of auditing and then begins to get some TA and goes fairly rapidly-a session or two later you'll find there's about seventy and then two or three sessions later, about ninety and two or three sessions after that has progressed up to about a hundred and three, you got the idea? In other words, here's an increasing amount of TA.

Pc is not introverted now on the newness of this exercise and activity and so therefore is more easily able to have an auditor-you got-less introverted into what's being done and more capable of having an auditor. So a new process to which the pc is very strange is also a factor in addition to the auditor. The pc is sufficiently introverted-he doesn't see his auditor, so to the degree he doesn't see the auditor he doesn't have TA, you understand? He's so-so involved with this mental exercise he's trying to do that he doesn't notice anybody else is around. And then the next session he's not that involved with the same exercise, don't you see, he's a little more familiar with it, so he's got a little more auditor, and the next session why he's even less involved with it and he's got more auditor, don't you see. And so you get a gradual increase of TA independent of whether the process is doing him any good or not.

Now therefore we were ... Boy, I'm really dragging them out of the old history icebox here-but therefore we've got our „only one.“ Remember, „only one.“ Mind you, today I'm handing you significances and terminals and here's the „only one.“ And the „only one“ gets no TA. Ain't nobody else alive. See. There being nobody else around why, naturally-he very easily assesses on self, by the way. That would be a natural assessment for such a person. There isn't anybody else. So he doesn't get TA. Funny part of it is, he wouldn't have had any TA years ago, either. That's the point you miss. It's very easy for an auditor to miss that the pc has been going through life without auditing, in the condition he is found in, in the session. And very often-very often, the auditor adds it all up that it just happened, just this instant, in the session, the pc is like that now, you see, and he doesn't quite wrap his wits around the fact that the pc's inability to answer the auditing question, the pc's complete driftiness and dispersal and inspecificity on the subject of anything under the sun, has been characteristic of

this pc for quite a while. And he is just confronting a life product. This is where this pc has gotten to.

In other words, charge has accumulated on this individual to a point where he no longer understands that anybody else exists. See, charged up to a point where there is no reality on a second terminal anyplace. So, therefore we never get an energy interchange with anybody else. We've got a standing wave-an animated standing wave-walking through the society that blocks all incoming and all outgoing flow. Well, that's how he's trapped. There is his own trap-tailor-made-right where he is at. No flow. Now, he could be stuck on a win or on a series of loses. He could always talk to Joe, but Joe is dead. So he solves this by being in continuous communication with Joe. This, of course, denies him any other terminal. Because if people aren't Joe, they're nobody. See, that's one way it can happen.

And the other way it can happen, of course, is-he wasn't in communication with Joe either. Or anybody else ever, so just the fact that something might tick him a little bit that it might exist, causes him to clam up. It's like the psychiatrically treated patient who had learned through long treatment in psychiatry to keep his mouth shut.

Well, that's what life has taught this boy, you see. You mustn't be there and you mustn't communicate. So nothing else is real. And he is very, very heavily charged. Now“keyed-in are a lot of actual GPMs and so forth, but he's not capable of reaching in any direction to achieve these. Tremendous key-ins involved here and we're still talking now about the Levels II on up.

To get TA we would have to rehabilitate other-terminalism. And at II, we would do it with pronouns, because we can't assess-you can't assess at Level II-it would have to be object or them or, you know, something, „recall a time you communicated with something,“ you know, ARC Straightwire, that sort of thing.

At III you would move into a nebulous zone of no assessment, but observation. Actually, it's observation by assessment. We have worked out a Level III assessment which is a whole intensive. Just keep going over everything with the pc that is on this consecutive list. And you just discuss each one of these points with the pc and at the end of the discussion, of course, you do have-you have come up with a lot of conclusions but the pc has probably blown them by cognition by this time. In other words a dig-out, so you-you could make Level III-as close as you could come to an assessment-would be do the whole thing by assessment. You know, do nothing but discuss what really at Level IV becomes an assessment. See, you dig the whole thing out by discussion. But then you don't do anything much with what you dig out, because it wasn't to assess to a certain end or a product anyway.

You were doing this, we were talking about it, it was fitted into glum areas and that sort of thing. You get what I mean, in other words it's just by going back and forth by meter steering and that sort of thing-we would finally wind up there. Well, there's better ways to go about this.

Along with a terminal we get a period of time. Time is the single source of aberration. The wrong mass at the wrong time or the right mass at the wrong time and this thing will lock up at any time. Time is very important. Very, very, very important. So much so that if a person has a somatic, if we simply date the somatic, it'll ordinarily fall away. Quite interesting. That's putting it in its proper time proportion. This is an interesting method of destimulation. Because all restimulation depends on a mistake in time.

Pc thinks it is Tuesday, last week. And Tuesday last week he had-he barked his shins. So he's made a mistake in time. So he has a pain on a Tuesday a week later, in his shin, because he thinks it's Tuesday a week ago. It's not actually sufficiently difficult to be able to teach-the time aberration. And therefore it gets very easily overlooked by an auditor. It's not something that you can easily teach. Once you've said he's made a mistake in time or there's a lie about time connected with the thing, you've just about said it, see. He thinks it's Tuesday last week. Now-now you can go out and you teach all sorts of things about engrams and

everybody gets all bogged down into the mental image picture of the whole thing and so forth-the basic lesson you are trying to teach and the reason you dragged in these other things is the pc thinks it's Tuesday last week.

He actually can't have a somatic. Well, he's got a headache, you see, in 1964. How can he have a headache in 1964 and why does he have a headache in 1964? Well obviously the headache came from someplace. This is one point where medicine and ourselves part company. Medicine considers all injury sourceless. Injuries do not have sources. Psychosomatics have no sources. There can be malfunctions without cause. That's sort of a grim, hopeless, apathetic look at it, isn't it? No, we claim the headache, don't you see, has a cause, see. And the basic cause of the headache is a mistake in time. Time errors.

He hit his head in 1960 and he has a headache in 1964. Why? Well, because he thinks it's 1960, of course. So, therefore, you date the somatic accurately to 1960, and the mis-the proof of the pudding is in the metering. You date this thing-you date this thing and he ceases to have a headache. Gor, this is cool! You can do this-a lot of people have experienced this weird phenomena, particularly when it's well done. The only thing that keeps you from doing it well is that if it's been wrongly dated you'll get the date of the wrong date. See. That's the-about the only thing. You date another mistake in time. And this is the most baffling of all baffling experiences to an auditor, if he doesn't know that he can get a beautiful date on a wrong date.

Let's say the pc last Tuesday said it was last Friday. So you'll get the date of last Friday. Unless you straighten it all out and remove that. It's very easy to detect, don't you see. And that's how you miss. And that's about the only way you miss in dating somatics and getting rid of them. You always get rid of the somatic if you accurately date it. But what gets in your road is the fact that the pc has been there ahead of you. Pc has already wrongly dated it and you're liable to find the pc's wrong date or you can find the date when the pc wrong dated it. And then this is overburdened on the actual date. So you find these others and then you re-date it and then it-pretty soon you come up and say, „Well, the E-Meter doesn't accurately date because I've gotten three dates for this one incident.“ You didn't realize you got the time when the pc wrongly dated it-first you got the wrong date the pc gave it, then you got the date when the pc wrongly dated it and then you got its right date, see.

Now, in view of the fact the pc may have wrongly dated it four times, you see, it can look very involved. But you can straighten that out. You can say, „Well, is this when you dated it?“ or „Is this the date you dated it to?“ or-see, something like that. You can straighten it out, within those limits. Why, you get this weird fascinating phenomenon of the fellow has a horrendous psychosomatic and you find out that it was on October the third, 1957 and bang and it sort of goes zzzzzz, like a little punched balloon and it's gone. Where'd it go? What happened? Well, you just discovered its source.

Now, in view of the fact that you cannot run terminals-in view of the fact you can't easily run terminals that have not been accurately assessed-you mustn't really play around with terminals that haven't been well assessed, you get yourself into a lot of trouble. If somebody doesn't know anything about assessment at all, who is busy assessing something, then comes up with his product and runs it you can expect hash. You know, the pc is protesting like mad, „billycans.“ He never heard of them! He never heard of it and you keep getting this read. It's because an E-Meter's a charge-meter, not a lie detector or truth detector-all it detects is charge. That's all it detects-Charge. It's a charge-meter. And so, of course, if your pc is all heavily charged up on the fact that he's insisting it is not „billycans“ on the list, you of course will get the result „billycans“ and then you are running what you should have been running protest on, in the session and you're saddling him with „billycans“ because it read so well. You see it's just a lousy job of assessment, that's all, see.

Well, that's where that gets you in trouble. So therefore, at Level III, whatever other process we use we prepcheck at Level III, and so forth, we prepcheck at Level III, and do

other-many processes at Level III, but I don't think that very much assessment should be brought in at Level III. We are given this beautiful thing of time factor. And so at III we could do a lot of tricks with time. Time factor. So we get a Problems Intensive as a very nice process at III. Now, of course, that takes a sort of an assessment, doesn't it? It takes an assessment of sorts. But it's an assessment which is then run for a long time, so it can be done by a higher-level auditor on the basic assessment. They had to do this in HGCs all over the world. They've had to take a higher-class auditor and get them to check out and do the Problems Intensive assessment. And where they did that, assessments were very, very successful, and their Problems Intensives were successful, you see. But where they didn't do that, why, it wasn't successful.

But time factors are something that can be used at Class III. The present time problem done any way, shape or form, don't you see, where the individual keeps saying he has a present time problem, and then whatever the present time problem is with, in terms of a terminal, you prepcheck. That's elementary, see. He has a present time problem with his wife, all right, now he talked about that in itsa and it got better, but by this time it's worse again, so you prepcheck „a wife“ don't you see, something like that. Very arduous. But it's what the pc says and what the pc seems to be worried about.

So you can get-you-continuing to use repetitive processes and doing Prepchecks on things selected on terms of time-or using-like your Problems Intensive-or using, just the other side of the problem. „Who's the problem with?“ you see. Any other old problems-any other old problems process we ever had, see. We've got a grab bag right there. Now, if you throw into that class any other grab bag process we ever had, why it makes a class. Anything that mounted up to that.

Then we move into IV and we make IV a clearing level. Now, I'd like more time to talk to you about Class IV and so forth, but let me say that the technology of the 20th ACC-perfectly accurate technology-and that Prepchecking was probably much more successful when addressed to the terminal found than the previous process of running in brackets. Running help in brackets or that sort of thing in brackets, on what was found, Prepchecking is more successful than that. So just an ordinary Prepcheck on what's found.

Now that leaves us what? That leaves us assessment. And Level IV is an assessment type process and you can make a Keyed-Out Clear. And this is why we didn't make a Keyed-Out Clear in the past, was just the assessments were bad and the eventual process that was run on the terminal found was very poor. The process run, well, like we specialized too much on some button. Well, maybe it wasn't the pc's button, don't you see? We were using Prehav Scale assessment to move in, in back of this terminal and so on. No particular reason to do that. You've got the Prepcheck buttons, so why don't you just prepcheck it.

Now the object of Class IV then could be a destimulated individual to the state of Clear, making the certificate HCS quite real indeed. I'll probably talk to you some more about this, but actually there probably isn't too much more to talk about. How do you make a Clear? Well R3, with those difference of processes mentioned, would make a Clear. R3 was very valid. Let's do a list of the pc's goals and let's find the goal that's stuck in. It's going to be a wrong goal, so what? Not going to be the pc's right goal, so what? So it's going to be an implant GPM, so what? It was the goal that came up, isn't it? That's all we are interested in: it was the goal that came up. We don't care what kind of a goal this is, if it's only a goal or what kind of a goal, we're going to get a goal. Elementary.

All right. Now having gotten a goal, we're now going to do a terminals list for that goal. Also a brief list. This is a brief goals list, see. They just list this till the needle is clean. See, on the terminals list you just list it till the needle is clean. So you get a goal, „Well, what goal might you have?“ There's a perfectly good question, see. Well, he's about as likely to give you an actual GPM goal, see, as a penguin is about to walk in that door, see, it's just not going to happen. I just unmocked him! Now, you don't care in the first place if he gives you a

wrong goal. So what! Somatics don't come from wrong goals. They come from right goals that are suppressed and invalidated.

So you take this short goals list-this sounds like old times, see-you take this short goals list, just list till the needle's clean, and then, „Who or what would have that goal?“ was the magic question to list the terminal with. „Who or what would have that goal?“ Well, let's list a few. And let's not go overboard, let's just list the needle clean on the thing and then let's assess it. And while listing it, let's take peculiar and particular attention to any big, steep, horrendous falls or any excitement on the needle, see, to record that later. You're going to find a terminal. And having found a terminal on this list it should give you some little nice-nice needle action, see. It's all we're asking for. Particularly if we unsuppress it and so on. The only thing we've got to be sure of is it's a noun. Noun. So we actually could go to the degree of say, „Th-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh!“ to the pc every time the pc didn't list a noun, see? See.

Pc lists „nervousness,“ see. We say, „Uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh-uh, thank you very much. Now, on this list, has anything been suppressed?“ Very clean, clear understanding. We want nouns. We want cats, kings, coal heavers, see. We want wives, we want kitchen stoves, you understand. We want masses with a significance. And what do you know! What do you know! We’re going to find ourselves on that list something we can prepcheck. So we knock a Prepcheck into this thing, *bokity-bok*, and we prepcheck it up to a point of high-level cognition where it just simply blows-and we won’t get TA action after that-or we simply process the TA action out of it, keeping our session rudiments in. Well, that’s great. We’ve had it. We’re not going to do a single other cotton-picking, doggone thing with that goal and we’re not going to do anything more with that terminals list. We’re now going to find another goals list and we’re going to find another terminal. Got it?

We flatten these things reasonably, but try not to plow the pc in. We're going to wind up at the end of this run with a completely free needle and a Clear. But that's actually all the mechanics there are to it. Providing we never upset the pc about what goal he's to put on the list, don't you see. He can put any goal on the list, providing we keep those goals lists too, for later on. And providing we don't overlist madly and providing we get a terminal there that gives us some nice needle action and then providing we just mildly prepcheck this terminal. We're going to have ourselves a free needle.

Why? The only thing that can key in the actual GPM is the mass with a significance. Because an actual GPM is a mass with a significance, See. So we get the mass with the significance that's a noun, we know we haven't got an RI for an actual GPM. So if we prepcheck it we've got the thing which is keying in an actual GPM. So the goal we found on the list is thousands of miles from being an actual goal. We couldn't care less. We're not doing anything with it. See, it's some kind of a goal. Even if it's just an item on the list.

And it is probably the lock that is keeping the actual in, see. So we could probably strip these things off left and right. Now, if you're careful as you go along over such a route of clearing-if you're very careful-only to choose things which have recognizably good reads that don't come from a big protest or argument with the pc, see, this thing has got a read, so forth, there it is, see. And as long as we don't get it up that we're hotting it up to get actual honest-to-God real goals and start arguing with the pc as to whether they're actual goals or re-goals or something because-huh! They're all just items on a list. He's had this kind of a goal at some time or another, don't you see? You'll probably find he's very interested in one of those goals on the list and another one he doesn't want to have anything to do with, well, respect his wishes. Don't get in an argument about it. You have to handle it softly. You have to handle it gently. Otherwise you're liable to get your hands on something there and invalidate it and turn yourself on some somatics you'll wish you didn't have anything to do with.

So lightly, lightly. And all you're trying to do is desensitize the pc and you make yourself a Clear. And that's an R4 process, revised, from what we know now, to deliver a

destimulated Clear. I was talking about this earlier-I didn't give you an active formula many months ago, by which to produce this. But you notice I did revive the HCS certificate and have been talking about this level. Now if this terminal is what you sum up a service facsimile into this was probably what they were trying to make guilty-see, make right, make wrong, O/W, any of these things would fit in, you see, make guilty is the service facsimile cousin of O/W. See, make self right and others wrong, well, that adds up to making somebody guilty. You're probably having all of that delivered into your paws, except you're finding now what they're trying to make guilty, don't you see. So there's another possible family of processes that add up into that particular lineup. Just pointing out the service facsimile has something to do with this, not that you necessarily use it. But you aren't left high and dry with no result.

This thing won't prepcheck-well, obviously then somebody's trying to make it guilty. Gives you the other line of process which you could use at that time, see, you could use your old service facsimile processes, you know. How would you make yourself right about it and how would you make others wrong about it. But that would be a rather extreme look. I don't think you'll run into that very, very hot and heavy, but that's the only thing I can think of that you would run into.

If you've got a noun, it's neither going to be a terminal nor an oppterm because it doesn't exist in actual GPMS. So you haven't got to worry about, any of that old stuff that we were worried about at that time. So I've given you actually a very simple rundown. List a little reasonable goals list, find a goal pc is really interested in and then just list nouns of who or what would have it and then prepcheck the result, and if you don't drive the pc into a hole with a bunch of out mid ruds and choosing the wrong item and only getting goals by protest, why, you're going to wind up after you've done this a few times-why, you're going to wind up with a lot of keyed-out GPMs and you're going to wind up with a Clear. So there is the manufacture of a Clear by destimulation, the destimulated Clear. And this is-be very, very handy to use.

This doesn't particularly invalidate anything else you know in the way of processing. I'm just showing you there is a route based on materials which are more or less in your hands, with this one addition that I've finally gotten the common denominator that isn't present in actual GPMs and so won't key them in. Which is very, very handy to have. So, therefore, that's very safe to process. And with that-with that squared away-why, of course the road is open to ordinary, run-of-the-mill Book One type destimulated Clears .

You can key out actual GPMS. Actual GPMs are keyed in only by masses with significance and oddly enough there will only be one mass with a significance in any given environment that is really raising the devil with the pc. He's got thousands of them apparent, they're all associative. There's only one that's keeping it stirred in. So eventually you will move along the line till you will finally fall into that one. And you find out the reason he can never walk down a main street and that sort of thing is because of the glass in the shop windows. And he thought it was the traffic and he thought it was policemen and he thought it was city life and he thought it was most anything. He thought it was his shoes, and so on. No, it was the glass in shop windows. And you'll eventually fall into that category and find out what it is that makes it impossible for him to walk through the city streets. This is the kind of thing that you run into with this.

But now, there-there is a map and design of perfectly safe, useable processes which will take the individual from Level IV up toward Level V, so he's got enough reality and is unburdened enough so that he can understand and you can get him searching for and actually finding actual GPMs so as to run out the bank in its entirety. The thing is to fish him out of the bank so that he can then go back and finish up the bank. All right?

That's it, thank you!

