

LOWER LEVELS OF AUDITING

A lecture given on
17 March 1964

What's the date?

Audience: March the 17th.

Seventeenth. Seventeen Mar., 14. Is that it? All right.

Well, going to talk to you today about some more lower levels of auditing. First I'd like to tell you something about the existing world situation.

I've had a gamble on time going that began in January of 1963. And it was just a time gamble, no more—no less: Could I complete the job before the roof fell in? See, that was the time gamble. I took the calc—I knew I could complete the job. But could I do it before the roof fell in, you see?

There were many factors involved in this and it begins much earlier, actually, wondering whether or not there's going to be another war—sabre rattling and atom-bomb sizzling going on and so forth. But the time schedule was mainly dependent on Scientology organizations and Scientologists—how long they could hold out? You know?

I took a calculated risk and neglected organizations and Scientologists during the period from January of 63, on through till, actually, last month or something like this. I started doing something about it in November, really, but not with enthusiasm. I started really crowding it home along about January, a year later. And that was simply to conserve administrative time and put all the time on research, making about an eighteen-hour research day, you see? I cancelled out all social activities, all foot-on-the-mantel sort of activities, cut down my breathing and devoted every tiny scrap of time I possibly could to the research line, trying to complete a job which, of course, could not ordinarily have been completed in years and years and years—the amount of work which still had to be done.

And Mary Sue caught the brunt of that. For long periods of time there, she didn't have enough sleep to bother about. But we—we got ourselves straightened out. And August—August marked the point of „could be done.“ „Could be done.“ Here—here are the materials—we have our hands on them and so forth. September, those materials were understood, but not labeled or communicated. And the period from then, September of 63, on through till January were pretty well devoted to codification. The relay and communication, that is the labeling of the material, the defining and looking exactly at what you had, putting it together in a way that could be communicated, you see, and forwarding it through to a conclusion.

This was, of course, all on the level of OT. Now, when we say OT, why, your imagination can just run riot. I mean, wh—what do we mean, OT? Well, I don't know. Think of something terrific—that's OT, see? What exactly is the zenith? Well, of course, there is none. It's—it's an infinity of up. And you can't really put a label on it and say, „Well, it stops here.“ Because the truth of the matter, it doesn't stop.

But exactly what did one have to do, one, to make an OT? Exactly what did one have to do to get the materials in a communicable form, labelled and so forth? And then, what did one have to do to communicate the materials so they could be understood and used? These were the immediate problems which were faced. And I think you'll agree that was a hat full of problems.

Now, at the same time, it was necessary to form a bridge from the individual, you might say, on the street on through to reaching distance to these materials. And that had to be solved, too. And, oddly enough, that is the more difficult problem.

That problem is now proving more difficult than the upper-level problem. Because, of course, with one's attention very closely devoted to the idea of exactly what it is and exactly where you can go and exactly what you have to do to come along and tell somebody how to get rid of his sciatica or something, at a level of auditing he can comprehend, so that he can get a reality, so he will move forward toward it is quite a stretch of wits.

Because you know what his sciatica is, you see? He's got a GPM or item that's out of place like crazy, see? He's going along in life giving himself a wrong goal all the time, you know, something like this. He's doing something goofy with Class VI materials. That's for sure. But of course, he's out of communication on the subject and you can't talk to him on this subject. It doesn't make any sense to him.

Edgar, I think, came as close to packaging that up as anybody. Had some fellow saying, instead of, „Is it your own goal?“ you see, „Well, is it something you did?“ And instead of „an implant GPM,“ saying, „something was done to you,“ you know? He was dividing these things up. And I think he cured somebody's long-standing TB or something. He cured TB with this. Just—not—not using „implant“ or „actual GPM“ or anything like that, but just saying, „Well, was it something you did?“ and „Is it something that was done to you?“ Rather terrific job he did. I think about thirty-five minutes of auditing on this sort of thing.

But exactly how does one get somebody up to reaching distance? You see, it's a—it's—it's a steep mountain, when you get there. It's—it's a steep, very exacting Mont Blanc. But as you have often noticed, walking in foothills, every time you come up to a hill and you say, „I have now climbed the hill,“ at the moment you reach the crest, you see a bigger hill, you see? Well, in this particular case, when you get to the last hill, you see Mont Blanc, you see? Now, we've got to scale *that*, you know?

But these little foothills become progressively bigger as an individual walks along. And unless he's walked securely up the hill to the crest of the hill, he's so discouraged when he sees the next hill that he quits. So, it's a progress of wins, in other words. And you have to have materials which cause the individual to walk forward with wins. Well, what is a win? Well, if you—he accomplishes something that he wants to accomplish. That in essence is a win. And a lose is, he fails to accomplish something that he wanted to accomplish.

And it all comes back to this basic thing, what does he want to accomplish? So we're actually back on Class VI materials, aren't we? Rather—rather fabulous. If you want to turn on a feeling of sadness and apathy on a pc—I won't give you the process because for once in my life I haven't got my notes, but it's in Mary Sue's notes—an exact process that does this. But it just takes up his little goals in life and straightwires those that have been blunted, see. The idea of what's he tried to do that he failed to do, don't you see, and that type of process. I'm just giving it to you as a process type, not as the exact process. But the exact process does exist. In fact there are two of them.

And this is quite remarkable, because this repairs his ability to win. A brand-new thought to you, isn't it? I mean, to repair a man's ability to win. You don't realize that that pc that you get in off the street, who just came along for the curiosity, you know—because Annabelle had some processing and it made her feel better—may be unable to win at anything. And you're trying to give him a win, and he can't win at anything! See, he might be able to inherit a million bucks and he still wouldn't have a win, because he can't win.

So you get fooled, because you estimate that if this man had a million bucks, you see, then he would have a win. Well, then you could cut it down further and say, „Well, it's because he can't have a million bucks.“ No. It's because he can't have a win. He can't win.

So no matter what you did for him, get rid of his sciatica, arthritis, or anything else—no matter what you did for him—you would find this individual in a state that he couldn't win. So therefore, although he's gotten rid of his arthritis... He can have „no—arthritis,“ you see? He can have the item „no—arthritis,“ you know, in life, but he can't have the win of „no—arthritis.“ See. So therefore, he cannot go on with you, as the auditor, in any very good frame of mind. Don't you see? That's how beaten to his knees you'd find the bulk of the population.

So therefore, when we talk about mounting these little foothills one by one and finding another foothill a little bit bigger until we get to the mountain, we are actually dealing with a progress or gradient of wins. And it actually is a much more difficult job to get somebody from Level 0 to Level V than it is to get him from Level V all the way through.

I think that you would have a horrible idea of trying to walk up the easiest slope with some girl, let us say, who has French spike heels and they're made out of abrasive-type material, you see. I mean the type of material that just rips to pieces, you know. If you get a spot of water on it, it goes, you know. And she can't walk very well anyway, you see, and she's wearing one of these French skirts that permits a stride of a sixteenth of an inch, you see. And she's held together with glue and sticky plaster, you know, the makeup is on. And if the slightest drift of Wind came by, it would mess up her hair. And trying to get this girl over a little bit of rough terrain—see, now that's about your first—look at your first step.

Now, when you're taking this person from V up through VI, you're dealing with an experienced mountaineer in spiked boots who's perfectly decent with a rope, you see, and an alpenstock and so forth. And you'll find, actually, that it's much safer to climb Mont Blanc with him than it was to walk up this gentle slope with this girl.

So those are the problems—those are the problems of the progress of Scientology. But the political problem which we were faced with is, we're facing a world which is more and more intolerant, and which is more and more bent on giving people no wins.

Literature is getting more and more apathetic. And the—a hero is something nobody could even imagine in these times, you see? And it's all pretty horrible and it's all pretty grim and man is born to trouble and dies in more trouble. You know? That's the motto. Win has almost dropped out of popular literature. You find—you find in even some of the more adventurous tales today, that the treasure is in the cave but somehow or other at the end of the story, they don't ever get it out.

And that is merely the acceptance level of win. That is all that is. And the acceptance level of win dwindles away to practically nothing. It can get to this point: „Nothing horrible happened to me today.“ And that is a level of win, see.

You've sometimes seen a pc set a goal like that, you know? Session goal: To get through it somehow. But that's actually a pretty high level of win, compared to how low it can get on a social level.

Well, to get back to what I was telling you earlier, the calculated risk was, could I do it in time? Could I do it in time? And I did it in time. And we arrived. And this is about the first time it's ever happened in Scientology. But sitting down in Scientology Library and Research files and available to the thirty students who are on that course right now, is practically every scrap of material that could be assembled on the subject of VI. That's a fabulous thing. You say, „Well, naturally, get a piece of stuff like this, we could research for a long time, get an awful lot of data together, and there's a lot more things to know, and all that sort of thing.“ That is not true at Level VI right now.

I can tell you—tell you little things like, well, this is an actual goals pattern from beginning to end. Find a little thing like this. I just found that the—a create-type goal is never an odd-numbered goal. It is always an evennumbered goal. That create, therefore, in life itself, is twisted

into a junior status compared to destroy. Destroy is considered superior to create, believe it or not. That's in the levels of Class VI, see?

Well, that's an interesting philosophic observation; all it does is make it a little easier for the auditor to plot the goals on the pc. Gives him a better start, so that—it gives him a little tiny clue, if the—if the pc is trying to plot a create-type goal, you know—no matter what the wording of the goal is—why, he would be foolish to try to plot it in the odd—numbered slots. But if he's trying to plot a destructive-type goal and so forth, he would be foolish to try to plot it in the even—numbered slots.

You see, that's just making life just a little easier. But that's about the level of advance that we are at there, a little odd bit that doesn't amount to a great deal, but is interesting to an auditor who is trying to get a goals plot together.

The one thing we don't know is, is we don't know how many goals patterns there are. But at a guess, there is a very finite number of actual goals patterns. That is, they're—they aren't random forever, which I consider is quite interesting. I mean, there are probably very few—very few. And so we can look forward to some time in the future when we say, „He's pattern A,“ you know? „He's pattern B.“ If he's pattern B well, then his goals are *brr brr brr brr brr brrp*. We have to find them all and put them all in Place, but it's just *pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow*, requiring very little of the pc.

All of which gives a great certainty, because the diff—most difficult point in any of this is finding and plotting goals. You get one of those goals out of line, you'll wrap a pc around a telegraph pole the like of which you've never heard of, man. But it's interesting news that there are probably just a few of those. But you get what the level of advance is. We have all the technology, find them all and put them together, there's an infinite number of patterns, you see? These are little bonuses.

Well, anyway, after—here we are thirteen months, fourteen months—about fourteen months after the kickoff on this and the job is all done and wrapped up. And I've been involved for the last month or so, particularly strenuously, trying to put together and—organizational difficulties in auditor organizations and relationships and classification materials and consulting people about how they wanted classification to go and doing various things of this particular kind. That's been the more recent activity.

And with governments leaning all over Scientology and looking down our throats—for instance, the probability—Mary Sue was always curious. She always said, „The government wants something out of Scientology.“ She's always saying this. „The government wants something. There's some reason for this.“ And we finally found it. They want the E-Meter for front-line combat troops. I thought that was very interesting. Yeah, it's pretty crazy, isn't it? Typical.

You see, they get so much infiltration—this is serious—they get so much infiltration in modern warfare of the type that is being fought, that they can't tell friend from foe. So they're going to equip front-line combat troops with portable lie detectors. And, of course, there's only one portable lie detector in the world—the E-Meter. I knowed something was getting those chil-luns, you see?

But apparently they have some kind of an interest in it. And you would—a thief or a criminal never can ask you for something. They've got to steal it. And I wasn't saying all the governments are thieves or criminals. *Don't* get me wrong. I think there's one or two that aren't.

I know this is about the wildest curve you ever heard of and it's completely unbelievable. You can see a soldier walking around carrying an E-Meter. Before he shoots the guy, you see, he puts the electrodes in his hands, you know? Bunch of psychotics. I know, it doesn't sound right. But it sounds—it sounds just exactly what a government would do.

Now, in view of the fact that nobody's going to help them run these things and nobody's going to tell them how they operate and so forth, I don't imagine their program will be very suc-

cessful. But I don't think they're trying to be successful because I think their acceptance of win is a total crash. They know they've won because they're lying there with bits of meat splattered around the landscape, see. That's a government level of win.

Now, the situation can become very acute in the next year or so in Scientology, because, of course, we've got to win back any lost ground and put things all together and so forth. But we've made it at this end. But remember, only we here at Saint Hill have any reality on the fact that it's made, see. Only we have an—ar—a reality on that.

Earlier, Saint Hill training did a great deal for organizations and auditing all over the world. Levels and standards of auditing have just come up enormously in the last couple of years. So that I read, now, criteria from organizations and auditors around and—as to what's gone wrong with a case or what's gone wrong with a situation. It's very smart. It's very intelligent. They know what they're doing on that sort of thing.

So we've put their basic auditing into good condition. Now I've got to move some of the old processes, like Prepchecking and R2H, ARC break stuff and that sort of thing back into their hands. And we've got to put together this little gradient of wins and match that up and we will have this thing made. Because there isn't much doubt of turning out OTs at Saint Hill. As a matter of fact, my estimate to OT now, is in terms of hundreds of hours.

And it's very interesting, had a new—new datum. Recounted the number of actual GPMs on the track. Got rid of a few and was able to buck up to the tiger and count him by the nose, and there are only about ten series of goals, not fifteen thousand. Ten series, making only about four hundred and twenty GPMs. Not many. That's not many at all. And in view of the fact that you have a pattern, you could knock those off—a slow auditor could knock them off at about one every hour and a half in the early stages of the case, which quickly cuts down to every hour, which quickly cuts down to about every half-hour, see? So there's your case estimate. It's the number of time—long-length of time it takes to get a goal plot together plus what? And length of time to run that; you can count it up and you can't get more than five hundred hours no matter how hard you try, see, for a total case.

And we cracked this thing down the middle, crosswise and upside down. And it's been a long, hard haul. And it's been very hard on people in the field and it's been very hard with shifting patterns of processes being carried along the research line, changing organizational staffs and upsets and trying to get people trained and trying to get through, and hanging on somehow and so forth. It's been rough—been rough.

But roughness makes very seasoned people. It is not all loss, see? When you recognize that an individual, moving forward with certainty, will go through a fantastic amount of ramifications and upsets and that sort of thing—if he's moving on a certainty—you don't have to worry too much about how smooth it is. It's just how certain it is.

The hardest part of the problem, though, and what I'm talking to you about in this lecture—the hardest part of the problem—is getting the individual over these little gradients of wins. Gradient scale of wins. Well, this is complicated by the fact that an individual can get into a certain number of ARC breaks and stop auditing. He can—he can stop. He might not stop forever, but he'll stop.

Now, you recognize... Let me—let me make a few technical points. Let me—suffice to say, we started in January of last year to pour the coal on, we're in March of this year and we have won. And as soon as people find it out, why, everything will start going smooth again. And everything is working forward at a mad rate of speed.

Saturday Evening Post articles or Victorian Parliaments or something of that sort. For instance, Victorian Parliament thought they could completely break the back of Scientology by just shaking it down for counsel's fees all the time,' continuing their hearing on and on and on and on and on. Well, I just cracked the back of that, I just wired Peter and told him I'd underwrite his

counsel's expenses from here on out, see? Of course, poor Victorian Parliament. Because they'll be sued for every penny of it when we get through.

But the point—the point here is, we've achieved Mont Blanc, and Mont Blanc is surrounded by foothills. And how do we get the people from the paved street, over the foothills at least to the base of Mont Blanc? We haven't got any worries at all once we get them in sight of Mont Blanc. As soon as they've got a reality on where they're going, what they're doing and so forth, they'll go through hell and high water in order to move the rest of the way.

But those early wins—those early wins—they're the problem. There's your mother, or your father, or your relative, or somebody and there they're sitting there and they don't know. You know, they say it so well. Or they're completely open-minded about it. What occurs at this particular point? Well, you recognize that there's no win available and so you give up. Ninety percent of the time, you give up. And all I'm putting into your hands here is a little piece of technology. What you probably recognize is that a win isn't available, so you stop trying. Or doggedly, you keep on in a frame of mind of realizing no win is available, so therefore, don't create one. Do you see that?

Audience member: Mm—hm.

Now, dissemination totally hangs up on this one problem—the win available. And it hangs up from the auditor's viewpoint; it hangs up from the Scientologist's viewpoint. That's where it hangs up. Doesn't really hang up from the pc's viewpoint. It's our recognition of no win available.

Look how long I kept trying with the US—ha!—the government. I used to write them a letter every now and then. I used to try to do this and that and so forth. I was eventually writing them in a very, very hopeless frame of mind. I mean my—rather antagonistically defensive, hopeless, „To hell with you, if you did reach out your hand I'd probably step on it,“ you know. That's this—that kind of a frame of mind.

And you just write them off, see? Just write them off. That's your recognition of how much win is available. Which, by the way, is monitored, and not only by the way—but is monitored directly by your acceptance level of a win.

Now, the scale of win—old Chart of Attitudes—the scale of win is a gradient scale and is not expressed in the early Chart of Attitudes. So I'm giving you a brand-new scale here. This scale is vitally important to anybody working in a Central Organization or working as a private auditor or any Scientologist trying to get anywhere with Scientology. This is the one that knocks his head off or lets him go over.

Now, there's two sides to this scale—two sides to this scale: an outward win of assistance and an inward win of being assisted. Now, it's a win for anybody if he assists. And it's a lose for somebody if he doesn't assist. This is all on the basis of failed intention—and we'll reduce it down to that in a moment.

You intend to help Aunt Hattie with her lumbosis and you give her some auditing and maybe she gets over it, but she doesn't think she has. She doesn't think it did her any good. What happened? Now what does that demand of the auditor? It demands that he has more confidence in his own observation than in the pc's estimate of the situation. It requires a certainty of observation, without reassurance from the pc.

Now, that's an old datum, but it's terribly interesting to get involved with because it means that you are so certain that you have accomplished something with the pc that you do not need the pc's statement that it has happened in order to be sure of what you have done. Now, frankly, that's an almost impossible level. But if you fall short of that level, you then go into agreement with the pc's acceptance of wins.

What's his acceptability of a win? And if you're expecting that pc to tell you that you have won—and that pc, being down scale, has a very low acceptance index of wins—you then will be made to feel that you have loses.

I doubt that there's an auditor here that's done any auditing at all that hasn't at one time or another run into this one. We get rid of Aunt Hattie's lumbosis for her or we got this person so they no longer have screaming nightmares or something and they tell you, „Well, that didn't help much.“

They have various ways of saying it. „It was probably the Bromo Seltzer,“ you know. „I'm no longer taking the Bromo Seltzer.“

And you say, „What the hell are you talking about?“ you know? „Here I sweat my skull to the bone and—over you as a case, and there you are.“ and so on.

Well now, comfort, a relaxed frame of mind, any such acceptable level of serenity, you might say, being at ease and relaxed about things, requires that you know the exact situation and know that it is the exact situation. The whole component part or all the component parts of this thing called peace of mind or serenity or poise or self-confidence or anything else depends on the individual's... I mean—I mean true self-confidence, not walled—in, maniacal idiocy, see. The house is burning and you say, „Well, I'm perfectly happy.“

This is the type—this is what this finally got to in India, you know. You—your Indian guru came down scale pretty fast over a period of time. And his idea is that you should be able to look any disaster in the teeth, you see, and be completely serene. Well, that's insanity, man! That doesn't apply, you know. In other words, he had it redefined into the ability to endure or the ability to suffer. It was no longer—no longer what it started out to be. And that is, you must be able to conceive the truth of any situation.

That is the true and complete answer to self-confidence, serenity, any one of these other desirable things which all adds up to simply peace of mind. Peace of mind doesn't even mean an inactive frame of mind, you know. It just means, well, you're calm about it, you know?

Now, that—knowing the truth of the existing situation—is really the only thing which supports self-confidence.

Now, it may be virtuous to be truthful and it may not be. We're not speaking of virtue; we're simply speaking of the—of the aspects of truth. But most departures from the truth have to do with an attainment of a point of safety. An individual departs from the truth in order to obtain a self-security or something of that sort. Either for the other fellow or himself, you see. Those are departures from the truth. That's a fear of what might happen to him.

Man is terribly complicated in his civilization by having these points very out—very, very, very out. For instance, civilization, at every point, can force upon the individual, lies. In other words, they can make the individual lie.

The—it begins with the social lie and then there's the police lie and then there's this and that. All the uncomfortable things that can happen to you if you were to tell the truth.

If you were just to tell the truth consistently and continually in the existing civilization, according to the standards of the existing civilization, you probably couldn't live twenty-four hours. See, in the first place, overfrankness would get you in trouble and cost you probably lots of your friends. These are the various arguments which have been offered by past philosophers and so forth. If you said nothing but the truth for twenty-four hours, why, you would lose everybody you knew, and you would probably wind up a suicide or something.

But it's built—even that philosophy is built to discourage an individual from an announcement of truth. Well, when one fails to announce truth, one is then, to that degree, protecting a lie. And thus, one begins to surround himself with lies in his social atmosphere. This is very esoteric. This is rarefied air of philosophy I'm giving you here, but it's nevertheless very germane. It's something that—something that you should look at.

The society, then, by various tricks and mechanisms, brings an individual into a state of tolerating lies or aiding and abetting lies and so forth and adds some virtue to this. And then „recognition of the truth“ gets converted into „enduring the truth.“ You see. See, the „I'll just stand here and recognize the house is on fire and then I will be all right,“ you see? Well, this is getting pretty wild. It's taking very upscale characteristics and moving them down very low scale.

If you stand in the middle of a burning house, the recognition of your self-confidence, the recognition of the truth of the situation and so forth, is not going to keep you from being burned. As long as you're in a body and wearing flammable clothes, that I can guarantee. You're going to be roast long pig in no time.

So, what's—what's this thing? What's this thing we're talking about? Recognition of the truth in any existing situation alone has the power to as-is that situation. And very often one is confronted, without a gradient scale, with so much truth that one cannot assimilate it or as-is it. And then one gets swamped with it.

Well, this—this fellow's always had an unhappy marriage—let's look at this one—he's always had—always had an unhappy marriage and he's often wondered why. And actually, only the finding of the truth about the marriage—only the finding of the truth about the marriage—could bring a calm marriage about. Right? Or bring a calm frame of mind.

Well, that's an easy thing to state and so forth. But now let's take this fellow and he's got all of his normal aberrations and upsets and frailties and weaknesses and so forth and we suddenly unload on him the reason why the marriage has been such a failure. You know, he get—he gets it, he finds it out all in one and one-half seconds, see? He is immediately and instantly overwhumped.

See, that's more truth than he can as-is. Maybe he finds out that his wife has been unfaithful to him for ten years, you see? Something like this. Only it all unloads on him like that. Well, he cracks up. So this, actually, discourages a person from the recognition of truth.

So what is it, really, that brings an individual away from recognizing truth and makes him less clear-sighted? What is it? It's a lack of gradient. That's all. It's just a lack of gradient. It isn't done on a gradient scale. It isn't done one little step at a time.

Time, then, enters into this thing. We take a person who is completely in the middle of the Dark Ages, living utterly under an intolerant church and a ferocious political system and we take this individual, there he is. See, he's in Stygian God—help—us, you see. And we face him up with the situation that man would be better off if he were permitted to be educated and if he had some degree of political freedom.

Well, those are certainly banal truths to us here in the twentieth century. They're certainly banal truths. But believe me, when they hit the French population in the late 1700s, they weren't taken banally. Everybody went nuts! They went mad! France moved out—tried to move out of the Dark Ages into a higher level of truth in two minutes, with no breathing stops, see?

And truth, in that particular instant, taken on such a fast no-gradient, see, too quick, too fast. Man, there were aristocrats hanging from every lamp post, and sans-culottes in every gutter starving to death and on this pile of upset and shock... What actually were they advertising? It was a greater degree of political freedom, you see? That people ought to be educated.

I mean, you get back down to what were they trying to put across in the French Revolution. Well, they actually weren't even trying to put across that they should get rid of the king. They weren't trying to put across many of the factors which have drifted down to us through what is laughingly called a history book. What they were trying to put across is a bunch of fellows had gotten the idea that the Dark Ages had been over for some time, but nobody had been given the benefit of this. And so people ought to be a little bit better informed of things, and the political freedom ought to be a little bit better established. And they, frankly, in the early stages of it would have settled for almost anything. But nobody would give them any degree of truth.

The king was very stupid. He could have issued a decree a year or two before he did, you see, that would have given them a certain number of these things and all would have been calm. But no, they were all faced with these situations.

And what turned against them? They got caught right into the middle of „There must be no truth.“ And the forces of no-truth loomed up over the heads of the French people and they went mad, you see. They had recognized what the truth of an existing situation should be, you see. But it was too great, too fast, no gradients of any kind. Murder, rape, slaughter in all directions and then finally, Napoleon, see? I mean, almost anything happened to them.

So, the situation—the situation is they came back to a very debased state. They were more debased after the revolution than they were before it. Don't forget it.

France, actually, has never been a political entity of any great stability, on a wide plain which is very easy for horsemen or tanks to operate on. And is very susceptible to invasion, at no point really protected by anything. And has therefore been an unstable political entity for a very, very long period of time. But she frankly has never since really ever held up her head amongst the nations of the world—never really since. She isn't right now. I mean, this fellow, Joan of Arc—pardon me—General de Gaulle looks awfully tall for Joan of Arc I... Do you suppose somebody has given him a wrong pitch on a past life? You know, he thinks of himself as Joan of Arc. It's puzzled me for some time. I just wondered if somebody over there hadn't made a miscalculation, you know. Got a broken meter. Something.

But the point—the point is, that this country has actually never risen to—to any great status amongst nations. And that sounds a very peculiar state, very peculiar to say that, until you realize that the diplomatic language of the world before the French Revolution was French. And no educated man ever spoke in courts of the world in anything but French. Interesting datum, isn't it? French succeeded Latin as the diplomatic language of the world. Here was a great power. They had an empire of a very great size and so forth. And they started going downhill.

Well, they hit too much truth, too little—too little ability to use that truth, to recognize it, no gradient scale of approach to it. No evolution, in other words, from the darkness in which they existed into the light. Somebody just suddenly turned the klieg lights right straight in their eyes, you see? And they went mad and they actually have never lifted their heads since.

All right. How do you protect an individual, confronting truth and knowledge, from this exact occurrence? Let me call to your attention that we very often don't protect the individual from that. They get ahold of some early work because this work was designed as a—as a research into life and the reason it succeeded is because there were no holds barred. And there was nothing held back. It existed as a study into what was there. Somebody gets hold of a book about exteriorization or something like this, they recognize the truth of the situation, see, like that, and they go right off their hinges.

Then they go around and you can't ever get them to talk to anybody, you see, about communication or you should run a little 8-C on the pc or you should do this or do that. No, this guy, „All you can do is tell him not to be three feet back of their heads,“ you see. „You got to bang everybody out of their heads,“ you know and so forth and „I was Joan of Arc,“ and „Everybody's had a past life,“ you see and so on. They go rattling on at this mad rate. Well it's all true, see? It's all true. But they reached there with no gradient and they have no interim reality and actually get no reality on the truth.

So there's another factor which is involved in truth. I know it sounds strange that something else should be involved in truth. There's another factor called reality, which we could define as this philosophical oddity: The ability to assimilate truth. See, reality is the ability to assimilate truth.

And therefore when we talk about assimilation, we must come around to another point: Assimilation is dependent upon cause—distance—effect, or communication.

And then there's such a thing as an even balance of mind, while one is assimilating. And we call that affinity. You have, actually, your factors of affinity, reality and communication bound up in this thing called truth. So, truth is truth. But truth which has no ARC hooked up to it, is denied the individual and can wrong him and harm him.

Truth must go hand in glove with understanding. All the truth in the world can sit in the middle of a park for everybody to gaze at and if there is no potential of understanding of any kind whatsoever, it will not be truth to anyone. It will simply be truth. It's just truth; but not truth to anyone.

So there are two different degrees of truth. And it sounds funny, splitting it up. We'll get into Kant's untenable bailiwick, first thing we know: how things are knowable and unknowable. No, we'll never go that mad. There are things which could never possibly be known by anybody, anyplace and so forth. This—you don't realize it, but you know, that's standard philosophic opinion circa 1964. Nobody's ever bettered it—for idiocy.

Transcendentalism. Do you realize there are things that transcend your ability to understand, that you will never understand, that nobody will ever understand, that they transcend you forever and will always be unknown and so forth? The ego that would write that would be too big to fit in the normal hat. Because how could he recognize it? He's in effect saying, „I am in this benign position, where I understand all this, but you...“ Wonderful way to make a slave, isn't it? Debar him forever.

Well, fortunately, there are no such things—no such things as unattainable truths. All truths are attainable. We can just reverse transcendentalism. All truths are attainable.

But the work of Lao-tze, the work of many philosophers in many ages, the work of the adepts, the common activities of a guru in India at this present moment, is totally concerned with the route to truth. How does one approach truth? They say the truth exists. How does one approach it?

That's an interesting point, when you don't know what the truth is. It's saying, „How do you get to Memphis?“ without knowing that there is any town called Memphis or even that there are any towns.

Studying only the route to truth, then, with nobody around who has a final concept of what the truth is, is an idiotic activity best relegated to dog kennels.

„Let's all sit down and study how to get to *Rupf*.“ And then nobody ever asks, „What's *Rupf*?“

„What do you mean how to get there?“ Not even ask this: „Is it a road across space, measured by time? Is it a space—time journey that we are making? What kind of a journey is this to *Rupf*?“

„Well no, let's just discuss how to get to *Rupf*.“

And of course, we get a total bog-down of every philosophic activity, at once. Kant „solved“ it. He says you could never know what *Rupf* is. That was a good solution. That kept a lot of speculation from occurring. The slave master's speculation. I mean—a slave master's operation to prevent anybody from ever reaching anything.

But now we happen to be in an optimum position with regard to this thing. We happen to be in an optimum position. By certain clinical demonstrations which are not necessarily therapeutic in any degree, we can demonstrate such things as exteriorization. We can demonstrate such things, then, as a disconnection, with total reality, between the individual and his body. All right, we can demonstrate, then, that the individual is not a body. We can demonstrate many points of this particular character. So we know where we're going“ we're going toward freedom and we're going toward a free individual.

Now, we know additionally that what is, is the creation of such an individual. I don't care if he's the Big Thetan or an average thetan, it's still a creation of such an individual.

We've gone further than this. There's no difference of order of magnitude of life between a man and a vegetable. You wondered why on earth I was playing around with plants. I was trying to see if there were different orders of life that responded on different wavelengths, and so forth. In my own crude way, that was about as close as I could come to testing it out.

Very recently, one of the great universities with one of the great budgets with one of the—well, we won't go on, on that particular course—have finally discovered that you can train one Generation of monocells and have them respond—have the next Generation respond to the stimuli that the first generation was trained with. In other words, they're getting something there which they say the memory in the monocell transfers complete into the next Generation.

That's better stated than their experiment, because I did those experiments in 1938 and they have not even come up to really interpreting them. Theirs is something like „Life eternal is about to take place via the monocell.“ They've come to the conclusion that all life is cellular activities and so forth and that cells are made out of mud or something. I don't know what they're—what they think or are up against. But they're about where I was in 38, see.

And they will branch off of that because they will very rapidly run into things which are not digestible as truth, you see, and they won't get their next budget. That's how truth never gets discovered, you see. It's unreal to the people who are giving them the money.

So anyway, we know, then, that certain phenomena exist. And a great many of these phenomena are demonstrable on a research auditing level which we seldom employ today since all that work has been done. So we know what truth we are trying to attain. Now everybody has, to a greater or lesser degree, some sympathetic harmonic with that truth, see. They know these things are true at some level, even the level of feel, do you see?

Now, what's their reaction to that truth? It all depends on how much truth they can assimilate, or how much reality they have on the approach to this truth. So what is life? What is life? Well, we know that it's not a city in the sky nor a spot on a road map. We know that it lives right where the pc's sitting. We know we're continuously in contact with it, so it's not really a journey across time and space. But it's a journey of undoing the lies by which the individual has road marked himself in.

The lies, the nonvolitional actions, the conditioned responses—if you want to use an archaic term belonging to the nineteenth century. Various things have marked this fellow's road. And he has traveled downward. He's traveled downward. There's a lot of experimental data which exist on the fact that he has traveled downward. The size of the GPM in the third series is unconfrontably larger than the size of the GPM in the current series. In other words, you just go three serieses back from the present series, you see, and my goodness! This fellow's—you're staring at stuff that must have been made by a much more powerful being, you see? He made it himself. And so you can recognize that he is going downhill; that he is on a downhill road.

Now, we have to find out what mile-marked the downhill road. What put him down to the next curve every time, see? And all we have to do to recover the individual, fortunately—all we have to do to recover him and his ability, by our rationale, is undo these mile-posted turns for the worse. See, what was he doing, repeatedly and continually, that was putting him on downhill?

So we are traveling a road that has been traveled, but traveling it backwards. So we know what this road is. The Way, the Tao, whatever you wanted to call this thing, you see? We know what that road is. It is the road that the individual has followed from a degree of perfection and beingness and selfness—not selfishness, but just being himself—on down to a disintegration, forgettingness, bluntingness, until he's in the state you find him in the pc's chair.

Now, he has traveled that road and all the auditor has to do is walk him back that road. It's already—it's already there. It's all mile-marked, you see? And just get him to the point where he started to make that road downward in order to recover the individual which we know existed to begin with. The potential the individual has sitting right in the chair.

So the road to truth then, adds up to us as the individual potential. The situations in which that individual potential can be lessened—that's all part of the truth. And what has happened actually to this individual—that's all part of the truth. How this individual is related to the remainder of the universe—which is all part of the truth. And what we can do to restore the potential of that individual—and that's all part of the truth.

So, what's truth?

Now, seen from the viewpoint of an auditor—seen from the viewpoint of an auditor—it's what actually happened or the situation which actually exists at any given moment in the state of beingness of an individual. That's truth. Don't say, „Truth is the ultimate that we are seeking to attain.“ Truth is that which exists!

I know I contradict myself. I once gave a lecture on „The Road to Truth“. Well, I might—might better have said, „The Road to Perfection,“ or „The Road to an Ultimate Truth.“ You see?

But we're just taking apart this thing as an anatomy. And by doing so we see, although this is a very esoteric discussion indeed—probably been more philosophy, factual and backed up, on the subject of truth stated here in the last few minutes than has ever been stated before on this planet—easily, see? Because it's usually all hedged-up, you see, in so many pitches and so many directions that people want you to go, so many curves on the line, that you can't separate the wheat from the chaff.

We find ourselves in this then interesting position of knowing where we're going and knowing how to get there and knowing what the road is and knowing the processes that we have to go through and the disciplines which we have to master and execute in order to arrive at that point. All these things we have.

But amongst these things, this is one that we have not mastered: an estimation of the individual's ability to conceive of truth.

Here sits this greengrocer and you tell him something about Scientology. Well now, you might say—be using the word Scientology, but you are talking to him about the road to perfection. You are talking to him about the road to ultimate truth. You are talking to him about the composition of himself. You are talking to him on the subject of who are you? What do you consist of? What potentials could you have? What potentials have you been robbed of or have robbed yourself of? Where are you going? What is life? What is your relationship to your fellows? What is your relationship on any dynamic? You may be using the word Scientology, but these are the things which you have embarked upon to discuss.

And the unanswered question is, what can he recognize?

Yes, you could throw all the truth down his throat and he might suddenly in a starey-eyed startlement, you see, go about half off his hinges. „What do you know?“ You know?

There are several things you can do that perform an overwhump of this particular kind, minor and greater. And there's no reason why you shouldn't do it. I'm not saying there are certain things which you mustn't do. But if you were to say to him, „Try not to be three feet back of your head,“ and he banged three feet back of his head, my God, he's standing there looking at this „Hwph!! There's an awful lot of truth! I'm me, and it's it!“

A lot of you have had—the old timers around here have had that experience, you know. „I'm me and it's it. Now I know... You know? Huhh—wuhh. Uhh—uuh! Yes!“ See?

And you've also had this experience, two hours later: „What exteriorization? I wasn't exteriorized. Well, possibly something happened, but I don't know.“

Now, you've shot the individual momentarily into the rarefied air of: he could see it, but he couldn't have it. So you can show people things they can't have. And there's how you generate an unreality. You show people truth which they are then unable to achieve, attain or accept.

For instance, if we didn't have a gradient scale now of getting from the man in the street to Class V, we would very soon, within a year or so, find ourselves in a very involved situation of

nothing we knew to be true would be true to them. It would only be true to a few of us. It would become very unreal to these people.

Now, if you'll notice there's a common denominator to everything I've been telling you: Hit with too much truth, the individual thereafter degrades. That's a common denominator to all of this. Common denominator to France, common denominator to you getting off the airplane, any of this sort of thing.

You hit this individual, he exteriorizes, bang! He said, „I'm me. I'm a spirit. I don't have mass. The body is a body. I'm different than it.“ Two hours later, he's harder to process. Now, what's going on here? Well, it means the individual's acceptance of win, the ability to win, has been excited and has lost in the process. He can't have it. He cannot attain it. This one he can't win. It's too much.

And when I think of saints of olden times, and I'm very sure some of those boys were capable of throwing around the partridges and making the birds all sing in C—minor simultaneously, or something around this, you know. And piling up loaves of bread or driving swine off the Empire State Building. I'm sure there's been this kind of action, you see, in the past because it's potential. Notice that it's the common denominator of the type of action which excites man and which drives him afterwards into a degrade.

Quite interesting: Christians killed more Christians, in one year in Alexandria, than the Roman Empire in its entire persecution of Christianity ever executed. This is the action of a degraded people. Why were these people degraded? Well, they were hit in the teeth with too much miracle. Nobody could ever repeat the miracle. And you show me one method, one method in Christianity—I'm not against Christianity—but you show me one—one method, by which an individual living in a certain way can in actual fact achieve any of the abilities of sainthood.

Why, this is very, very interesting if you look this over. You go around repenting ye, repenting ye, and you go around debasing ye, debasing ye, and all you're going to do is key in a few actual GPMs. You go around turning the other cheek all the time, you're going to introvert.

I knew we had it made when a *Saturday Evening Post* article began to paint us as a „dangerous people.“ There's just a thread going through that of the Scientologist is a sort of a violent fellow. There's this—just this hint coming up. That's very healthy. That's very, very healthy. Because every time a group or movement has been recognized as totally peaceful, everybody has shot them right down like dogs.

I gave you an example of that in one lecture, one day. Jewish people. Poor people. No more peaceful people on Earth. And look what's happened to them. So it's not unhealthy to be thought of that way. But it was interesting that this fellow, without any evidence, could come to these conclusions and so forth. We're not dangerous people. Nobody's just trying to paint it this, but to paint the individual Scientologist as a dangerous or violent person in any way, shape or form is about as far as you can get from truth.

But for the public to tend to believe that or for an individual to start to believe that or a Scientologist start to be fought in some particular line is not an unhealthy sign. That's a very good sign. It means that you're not that introverted.

But our materials—our materials are very prone to lay a great deal of truth out in front of people. Well, it puts you on a withhold not to do so, so there is no slightest reason under the sun to do so. Lay out the truth, but provide the road.

And that road is provided by having levels of acceptable truths or realities that an individual can attain—attainable realities.

In view of the fact that you can't start running him in the next ten minutes up the side of Mont Blanc like a mountain goat, it requires that you establish and rehabilitate his ability to win in some fashion and then increase it in some fashion to eventually achieve the point where he can have truth. And that way you won't just throw everybody around you into a complete, frothing,

ecstatic, worshipping apathy. I can't think of anything worse, myself. You may have—you may have different opinions about it. You—when you get them run out, you let me know.

But that is—that is where any philosophy errs. This has been solved in the past: When anybody got ahold of a piece of truth they then built up a hierarchy of secrecy. They then built up a class secrecy level. Well, that will operate in any event because you can't expect somebody who knows nothing about TR 0 and has never audited a pc—to be able to sit in an auditing chair and audit a pc, much less on anything very touchy. So, a certain amount of training and skill—a lot of it—has to exist before that level is attained. This is a self-denying mechanism. This is a mechanism of automatic denial, due to a mere fact that it intervenes some training, you see? And it intervenes some understanding. It takes a while to assimilate the materials involved and so forth.

But outright pitch for secrecy is intolerable. „Well, you can't know that because you are only a Class III.“ We can hear it now around the Central Organization. The Class IV Auditors have a secret meeting because they're covering materials which shouldn't be known at Level I, you see. I can just see some haggard-looking girl, standing sadly out in the hall and so forth, she's just been ejected because they have found out that she flunked her Class III examinations and she was present in a meeting that—that was now going to take up Technique Zed, you see. And she's not supposed to know that because... If any—if there's any similarity between what I'm talking about and certain orders which exist on the planet, it's purely intentional.

No, the route—the route only demands this. It only demands this of you. It does not matter what you tell people, it does not matter what you show people, it does not matter to what degree you momentarily or temporarily overwhelm a public. That is not the final point. The final point is whether or not you provide for them a gradient scale of acceptable wins and acceptable realities, by which they can progress to a higher state and a better understanding.

And if you can do that, you succeed. And if you can merely shock them out of their boots, you'll inevitably fail.

You see, actually, it doesn't matter what percentage of them does take that route. That doesn't happen to matter. You don't have to have a full, 100 percent sweep, you see.

But that route must exist. And it must exist wide open, not back of narrow, locked, closed doors. Otherwise, you never make any progress toward any ultimate freedom or betterment of affairs, anywhere.

Okay?

Audience: Mm—hm.

Thank you.