FUTURE TECHNOLOGY

A lecture given on
14 June 1962

Well, you will have to tell me the date.

Audience: 14th June.

Fourteenth! What planet? I've got so many calls to make these days, you know! 14 June, AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

You know, there was a great many students came in the first part of the year and that has sort of peaked the attendance here for awhile. When they arrived, they didn't know whether they'd be classified or not and when they leave, they sometimes are and they sometimes aren't. I'm going to talk to you about training a little bit more in this lecture.

Now, you think you are traveling fast now. *Heh-heh-heh! You* will think you were traveling so slow that your footprints are in front of you! Because this is the kind of a schedule that has to be met. can I give you a short rundown on same, what this is all about?

Training, as you noticed, changed recently into three sections. Now, the three sections of training were Theory, Practical and the Auditing Section.

Definition of the three sections are simply, in Theory, they have to be able to duplicate the information in bulletins and tapes, texts.

In Practical – have to do, the doingness angle of the thing

Now, Practical actually used to be the Auditing Section. You know, used to fog around in it and that sort of thing But the Practical now is the supervision of doingness, just as doingness.

The Auditing Section is the *fait accompli.* When you get into the Auditing Section you're not supposed to be practicing, you're supposed to be auditing Because frankly, the only thing that is looked at in the Auditing Section will be the results that you obtain. In Practical it's how you do it and in the Auditing Section, the results.

But of course, results are now dependent on the textbook solution, which is rather unique. It's unique in any science, for any result to be obtained by the textbook solution. They teach nuclear physics today and they still tickle the tiger's tail, see. They give you formulas – endless formulas – you know. And you're supposed to be able to figure it all out – and, they

do – they figure it all out, but it doesn't have anything to do with nuclear physics. They still get in there and shove bars of plutonium in and out of this and that, see. It's quite remarkable. They even run their submarines this way. The chief engineer of an atomic submarine has to know all of the Theory in the world, see. He has to be in mathematics galore, and so on. When he wants the submarine to go faster, he goes down and shoves on a rod and adjusts it to a point where the water boils quicker. Crazy, you see. There's no textbook solution there at all.

In medicine the textbook solution is more often violated than otherwise and if you use psychiatric textbook solutions everybody'd be dead. As far as psychology is concerned, it hasn't ever pretended to have a solution for human beings – it only has solutions for animals. Oh, I didn't – I didn't mean that as a dirty crack, because, frankly, we are burying them and their future. I invite you in the next decade to the funeral of both of those activities. Of psychiatry and psychology. It'll be a very sad funeral.

But, they haven't got any textbook solutions. And right now we've moved up into the level of textbook solution.

All right, last night you saw a couple of auditing demonstrations. These were simply goal checkouts. I wanted you to see how you checked out a goal. That was the only reason I gave them. I didn't even particularly pick up goals that I wanted to check out or didn't want to check out. I thought I might learn something about it myself. How about a partly worded goal? How did it check out?

The first case that you saw had four hundred listed on each list of that particular goal. Now, if I'd tested it, you probably would have found the transfer of the goal reaction to one of the levels. Had I read the four lists off on the thing – you probably would have seen one of those lists ticking If one of those list lines had been ticking, then of course it tended to prove out the goal. Time was going on, I didn't want to upset anything and I particularly didn't have any pat solution to it. Didn't want to say anything much more about it, because I wanted you to concentrate on just this other idea of how did you prepcheck a pc so as to prove up a goal.

Now, there was a tick on the second pc's line reads. I don't know if you saw it or not. one of the lines ticked. Well there's a high probability – is, that that goal could now be continued to be listed with profit. See, you could continue to list the goal with profit. Before I did anything more about this goal, I would read the lines off to it again and I would ascertain what was cooking here and test whether or not we could go onto a new goal, because I've already said I could always consider this goal a bit of a late one, that might list longly. And so you might profitably transfer over to another goal. But that would only be if one of those lines wasn't ticking too hard, you see.

In other words, the read that you get on a goal – I'm indebted for this term, to Charles, here. He said it very well. He said the read "transfers." That's exactly correct. That well describes it. The read transfers from the goal to one of the lines that you're listing. You see,

"Who or what would not oppose going to war?" you see – *clank!* All right, well the goal, "to go to war" wouldn't read, but the line would read, if it's partially listed. Do you see that? There's more to be learned about this, there's more to be observed about this. But, there were some partially listed goals and I was simply checking them out. Giving you a Prepcheck example.

Now, if you notice, on the second pc we had a lousy dirty needle. Now, you probably wondered why I didn't finish up my fish and fumble. I'd better tell you something about that, because, there were two things that happened in that session that you might have missed. One of them is I didn't finish the fish and fumble. Every time the pc said "goal" I got a dirty needle. So I found out I was fishing and fumbling for the goal. So I got out of there. I backed the fire engine right back into the stall. And we parked it right there and went on about our business. And I thought you might possibly have missed that.

It'd been on, already. And when I started to run it down to find out if we had a missed withhold or something of the sort, why, the pc discussing it, every time he came near the subject of goal, we had a missed withhold. We were prepchecking – we were prepchecking the goal, so it was no time to fish and fumble for it because we were about to run into the line very shortly as, "On goals, is there anything you failed to reveal?" you see. And sure enough, we had it. And I finally had to ask him a slightly altered question, "Who didn't find out about the goal?" You see?

Now, the auditor had already picked up one person that had not found out about this goal – and maybe some mention of the other people – I don't know if there was mention of the other people, too. But we got a bit of a change the second that we ran through that. But on the subject of listing we got a considerable reaction. Remember?

Now, on neither of these sessions would you have seen any reason to have called this a Prepcheck. There was no Who – there was no When, All, Appear or Who. So where was the Prepcheck? Well, I didn't run into anything that needed to be prepchecked. You see? Everything cleared up on a couple of questions, see? So we're talking about a terribly short track, see. We're talking about the short track of auditing or at best this life's listing. So if we're talking about such a short track and you can just knock it out, why cheers! See? We'll do so. And the reason we call it Prepchecking is because we're always prepared to prepcheck – form up the What question, go on sailing back on the line and do a stylized job on it. But on neither case did I run into any necessity to do so. See?

These middle rudiments prepchecked out gave us an interesting reaction on the part of the first pc. The first pc was very defensive. Been talking to the pc earlier – was actually very dismayed. We invited her – we invited her, by the way, to stay over, to see the demonstration tonight. And then as a complete beast, you see, why, I suddenly realized I'd like a look at that goal and I'd like a look at the pc and see how the pc was operating Because the pc was a bit

defensive about things, you see. So I put the pc in-session. It really took her by a storm. And, when she started into that session she was really boggled. The rudiments were all out and crisscrossed, you know. But, that was all right. Got a telex from her this morning She felt wonderful, surprised her half to death, you see. she felt wonderful and she was sawing into all the goals in the shop and had gotten another Saint Hill graduate all straightened out on his goal. So she'd instantly put it all to use at a high degree of velocity.

But before she was getting that Prepcheck, she was pretty queasy about the whole thing And she went away feeling fine.

All right. What you saw in the Prepcheck was all textbook solution. Did you notice that? There's no variation from the textbook. There was one blunder, I don't know if you noticed it. It was the second session, it was getting late and I had not been crossing my list off and I didn't know what I'd gotten the reaction on. I have a guilty conscious every time I make a pc expose something discreditable on a TV demonstration. I don't particularly like to do that to somebody, you know? *Bang! You* know? Catch them and drive them into a corner, and so on. He came up with a discreditable one on "careful of," you know? And he exploded with it and I looked down at my check sheet to ask the second question and I had neglected to mark it up to that point. So I had to take the safe route out. I checked the ones I knew bridged into the ones that I had gotten a reaction. See, that was pure and simple a blunder. See, I didn't remember that it was "careful of" at the moment I asked it, see.

He suddenly came up with this revelation – *bang, you* see. Well, was it on "Invalidate?" "Fail to reveal?" or "Careful of?" Which? And there I sat, see. I don't know if you might not have noticed that.

But notice that – you might not have noticed it because it was a fairly smooth recovery. I just went simply back over to the last one I knew I had covered, took the next one, checked it – checked it and finally of course had it and it was "Careful of." Meantime the pc was sitting there almost exploding with the final – with the next answer. But you notice, it didn't disturb the pc.

Now, those demonstrations you're seeing are textbook solutions. That is to say that's textbook auditing There isn't any departure from that. The only envisaged – and I should mention this to particularly those leaving – the only envisaged change in Model Session, is to pull, "In this session . . . " to the head of all end rudiments. You precede them with "In this session." You've already had the change of the withhold question in beginning rudiments and end rudiments.

But there is an additional change in Model Session and I can't tell you its absolute final form, but it runs something like this – because it's ragged. There's a raggedness to saying to somebody, "Do you have a present time problem?" He says, "Yes." Well, where are you at? See? It's an understood question. So, you could consider your rudiments question, this is the –

this is the solution that I am researching right now. Consider your rudiments question this way: That the needle acknowledges for the pc so therefore you acknowledge for the pc. you an – pardon me – you answer for the pc.

Now, you see that that's going on all the time, with this anti-Q and A anyhow. You answer for the pc. you say, "Do you have a present time problem?" *Clank!* Well, you notice that you never wait to have the pc says he does or doesn't. You notice that you say he does or doesn't, see? You say, "All right, yes, what's that? That read." you see?

After a fellow's been audited for a very short period of time he begins to expect this to happen, you see – and it is not disturbing at all. So that you've got a second question, on all rudiments questions, which is simply, "What is it?"

It's just your – your second question. That's to keep the thing from hanging in the air. And that's what I'm testing out at this particular time. So you say, "Do you have a present time problem? That read. What is it?"

And the pc says, belatedly, "Oh, well, *uh – oohh – hmmm . . .* " And you say, "Well, I'll repeat the question. What is it?"

Now, you might run into a snag that way, but that is – that is, after a considerable amount of study, the only way I can see out of this particular dilemma that is smooth. It's just recover with a "What is it?" Don't use it every time, perhaps. But certainly, if your pc does not come up with the information instantly, after you've answered for the pc. See, you've already said yes – you say, "It read." And the pc – so on. you just say, "What is it?" Don't leave the pc sitting there in a long comm lag Got the idea? Now, there will be some more data on that, but that's the only envisaged change.

Now training has worked out this way: The auditor who comes here usually has had lots of loses. He's had loses. Let's admit it, see. First place he's been auditing up against a not totally refined technology and he's been doing this and that and he's also been doing things that were way off-line and he's lost. He's had some loses. Furthermore, he didn't have the technology which cleared everybody who walked up the walk, you see. So naturally he had some loses.

All right, then the faster we get a student into the Auditing Section to get some wins, the better off we are. Simple. We already have the solution that gives him wins. Get the rudiments in and do Havingness in the body of a session. Now, that will give him some wins – if they could read a meter, if they get the rudiments in, if they run the Havingness Process for the pc.

So this calculation has moved up to this degree: If a student has not finished his Theory, Practical and has not audited his rudiments and Havingness and all of his Prepcheck and finished up all that auditing and all of the Theory and Practical for that auditing – that's

three classes, see – by the end of his sixth week, his chance of leaving here Clear is greatly diminished.

Now, I was just working this out. Based on a sixteen-week course, if he has not finished up all of that work in that auditing – finished by the end of the sixth week – why his chances of leaving here – so Clear that you rap him on the rim and he rings for hours – these are badly diminished, you see – the chances of doing that. you follow this reasoning?

Well, actually, it means for faster wins, if you look at it this way, because he's up against something that should win and if he doesn't get a win hell be checked up on it in a hurry. So we look at the body of the course up to that point, as a *fait accompli,* and then we go on at the beginning of the seventh week to find a goal, and so forth. We might take that seventh week, on a dual capacity. We let him start finding the goal – because already he can prepcheck, see – during that week while he studies the Theory and practice of what he is doing in a Goals Assessment, like mad.

Now, we go on out to the far end of the course – the remaining many weeks of the course, up to sixteen weeks – and we polish up this auditor. In other words, we polish him up. Now, that doesn't mean that you who have not finished this by the end of the sixth week necessarily are out in the rain. But I would say, unless streams of sweat like Niagara Falls started falling from your brow, and if you have gone as much as three months now and are not yet on a Goals Assessment on anybody or on yourself and so on, your chances of leaving here Clear are quite poor. If you're only up to two months, well we might make it rather easily, still, you understand. If you're here three weeks and are still stumbling around with Model Session you ought to have your head examined. See, you should have finished that at the end of the first week. see what I mean?

Grooming up the auditor would most easily take place, of course – making the auditor an absolute finished product – would more easily take place after he'd had wins. you see? So anyway, we had a bit of a conference this afternoon and that's what we were talking about and we're going to run it from that particular quarter.

Now, this has some influence on training outside. The Saint Hill graduate, going out of here, at this stage of the game, is – right at this moment – is the only one that knows anything about this three – three-section training system.

And I have gotten back some questionnaires, answers from Ds of T that show they're terribly adrift. One of them wanted to know . . . Many of them were very good, but some of them, *hm-mm.* One of them wanted to know what you did with the incoming students after all the old students had gotten up into higher classes, if you were using the class system. That's still got me boggled. I don't what he doesn't know, you see. That's rather marvelous – you get to asking that as a question. I don't know what he's talking about!

And, a few questions of this character demonstrate that, the workability and how the system goes together, and so forth, is very much, a question in the minds of people out in Academies and that sort of thing so any assistance that any of you can give an Academy in straightening this out would be appreciated. Any way you can give them a reality on it, would be appreciated. But all training is going onto this pattern. I think you'll agree with me that it's a rather successful pattern of training

Audience: Mm-mm, yes.

We should actually only be teaching here Class III. That's what we all actually ought to be teaching Training is slowed down by the fact that we have to groom up the earlier classes. That's what holds one back. But naturally if we didn't have the technology, how could anybody learn it? If we didn't have it grooved and so on.

But, I've been working like mad along this particular line and I've finally got it grooved out and, your mistakes have served. Don't think that your mistakes have gone unacknowledged. The – most of what we call a textbook solution today is in there to get around the mistakes you have made or to steer you through those chasms and back alleys that you might otherwise have gone into and so forth.

For instance we used to have as a maxim, "The auditor must get an answer to every command he gives." Remember that? Yeah, but how few auditors knew this! We'd get a new auditor coming up the line and all of a sudden he'd be saying, "Do cats spit?" you know, "Do cats spit? Do cats spit?" And the pc about every third time he asked it, you know, would say, "I think 90." And he thought this was all right, see?

And of course you had your end rudiments set up and the pc is way out of session and you'd be surprised how often this is the case. So much so that you know, you could take – you could take an old-time auditor and ask him in the first session in which he had failed to answer an auditing command and you'd find out you'd get a little bit of a case surge. Quite interesting. Just ask him, "What was the first time you failed to answer an auditing question or command?" you know. And it'll rip up the line like a – like a mad buzz saw. I remember Herbie one time when he first heard it, he just suddenly – on an ACC – and he just suddenly had remembered the first time, you know? Made an awful difference to him. He walked out of there – he was glowing.

But, so what do you have now? You have an end rudiment, something that constantly reminds the auditor of this. Constant. It's always in front of his eyes. Every time he goes down the Model Session line, he hits all the basic errors that have been constant and continuous in auditing of course, it so happens that these things are the *sins* of auditing and when – they're only the sins of auditing when they're out of order, auditing doesn't take place, so of course they do belong in as rudiments. But you see how the thing is packaged up? Instead of an

isolated unimportant maxim that nobody has ever read, the thing sits there and is done every session.

Well, it works this way: The auditor going by this particular point is reminded every session, because he occasionally finds the thing out, you see. And he's reminded every session, you see, that he should get his auditing commands answered. You get the idea? And he's reminded about these other little points. He's reminded about the pc's overts during the session under the heading of "damage" you see? All kinds of points are interwoven into this thing. Actually it'd make an interesting crossword crazy quilt, if you figured out all the things that have finally been lined up into the textbook solution.

Actually, they're minimal. They're the minimal number. You could get far, far more expansive about this thing. But I'm certain now, that you'd be running off into relatively unimportant data. yet – oh, you could – you could trim it up, see. you could put more in it, but you'd be running off into unimportances. You'd be running off into things that processes or listing or something like that would normally care for. We've got the minimal number – well, we've got the minimum and maximum. Beyond what we have as the textbook solution, you can be pretty confident that it can be safely ignored. See, if it isn't in the textbook solution, it can be ignored – not with – not – without vast consequences, don't you see? But those points which are the textbook solution if ignored will scuttle the lot. The ship will go down in a trail of bubbles.

Now, there's only one thing that I myself have felt questioning about, in all this. I've seen a pc get – and myself in one session got – sufficiently ARC broke that nothing in the rudiments or anything in any part of it would do anything about. That was very interesting There was nothing would have done anything about any part of it. Why? Well, I finally worked it out and you'll be interested in this little piece of technology here, which was based on a subjective reality. Why did nothing in the whole ruddy lot affect this particular ARC break line. And you 11 find out, then, that an ARC break can exist outside of this particular area. The healing of same is a bit too heroic to attempt. In other words it's too big to straighten out in a rudiments proposition.

And that is this: When a pc takes responsibility for withholding – it took me many weeks to finally curve down to what the answer of that was. And don't think about it too long, you'll get a headache! If a pc has taken responsibility – we're still on the subject of Model Session, see. If pc has taken responsibility for withholding from this auditor or from there on out, he has dove-tailed straight into the mechanics of Routine 3GA. There is the bridge. There is the button that makes 3GA what it is. Because 3GA of course is based on the mechanics of taking full responsibility in a limited way, for one purpose.

The individual dedicates himself to never eating cats, you see, or some such goal, you see. He dedicates himself, basically, newly, primordially and before anything occurs, you know, prime postulate. He takes full responsibility for this prime postulate and here he goes.

Now, because he's taken full responsibility for the prime postulate, he of course, has set up a thing where all other things are otherness. See, so everything else is an otherness. So this is a marvelous pat, single look and a departure from all pan-determinism. And he's had it. Oh, he's had it for more reasons than that. Any other action than never eating cats... See, funny part of it is, it just doesn't even have to do with cats, you know. It doesn't even have to do with eating. Just an other action. You know, like gazing at cherry trees – is an alter-isness of the basic purpose. So, he mustn't do anything but it, because he's taken full responsibility for it. This is what he stands for – to never eat cats. Therefore doing anything else under the sun, moon and stars is a breakdown of his own determinism – which of course is very isolated determinism. And this is the way he backs out of the universe, see. And thereby runs square into it with a thud.

You see how single-minded all this gets? So therefore other occurrences are not as-ised, they are alter-ised, mass gathers around these things and that sort of thing.

Now, if a pc were to – you understand that it's a withhold in a – it's a withhold *missed* that louses up a session. Have you got a reality on that these days? Yeah, well! All right.

It's the withhold missed that louses up the session, see. Now, what if a pc took responsibility for never getting any off? If you could push a pc into a point where he would make a postulate that he would never get off his withholds, you'll get an ARC break that no rudiments could undo. And I don't even know if a process would undo it, because, of course, it ties right straight into the GPM – just like that. Nothing would go straighter to the heart of anything. It'd just key in all those basic purposes, you see? Not that they're responsibility for withholding But they are certainly responsibility for an action of one kind or another. So when he takes responsibility for the highest button in the bank – withholding – why of course, wow! Do you see why?

Now, if you were to try to run a pc on this, "What withholdingness have you taken responsibility for?" I guarantee that you would get more somatics per square unit of pc than he ever thought existed. Because you're trying to run the GPM out from the topside down.

Now, I'm still talking about Model Session, so the final question of Model Session is under – on withholds, is under test at this time. I'm trying to find out, before we finalize any versions, whether or not you could ask anything that would undo the possibility that the pc had postulated that he wasn't going to tell you anything or talk to you in that session. It would be "Have you taken responsibility for any withholds?" Well, that doesn't do it of course. "Have you taken responsibility for not talking to me?" That might. And so forth.

Well, I've got to thrash through the woods and the saurian forests and the deep bituminous zinc pits and get this one properly nailed down and so forth. That's why you don't have a final version of Model Session, complete.

But I have found a button which is in excess of all other buttons. There couldn't be any button senior to it. 3GA is clearing people, you see. We're sitting there. The only indicated theory that explains this phenomena, locks up with this particular question. We already got a reality on what happens when these things do get collided one with another and it is quite cataclysmic. It is undone with the greatest of ease by 3GA. Maybe the rudiment process in the end rudiments for the final responsibility for the withhold question, whatever that works out, of course is: Do 3GA, you know?

I've got to work on this a little bit farther and find out if there is anything there that can be done which would wipe out any possibility of the pc doing such an idiotic thing as to deciding never to talk to the auditor again or something like that during the session. Because that would be the only thing that could keep him in a permanent ARC break. And I swear to you there'd be no process under the sun, moon or stars could budge it. Because it locks right straight down against the GPM. It's absolutely bang, bang! It is.

The reason why you get occluded childhood, probably, is the number of times you decided you weren't going to communicate. And took full responsibility for not doing so. "I'm never going to talk to you again! I hate you! You're a beast!" Yeah. That kind of thing That locks right straight in on the GPM, bang.

All right, enough for that. I'm just forecasting technology there. There's nothing extraordinary about that; it's just another mechanism of the alter-is of the bank – responsibility for. All this alter-is exists on the total responsibility the pc has taken for a basic postulate. And if he's entered such a basic postulate into the session, as would actually make a goal, you could hang the session up, see, on top of the GPM. So that this particular session is now part of the GPM. He's run a GPM session.

Now, the possibilities of this happening if you use the textbook solution are quite, quite remote. But, it could happen.

All right, let's look a little further now. Existing technology, changes in: *Nyet.* I've just been waiting around and shifting around and working like a beaver trying to get a clearing process that applied to all cases. Everybody run with any degree of expertness, high technical accuracy, yes.

But, anyone who has been run with expertness on 3GA and some that have been run remotely from here with no more than bulletin data, have gone Clear. 3GA is not laying any eggs that are not very easily explained or straightened out by just straightening out the technology.

So you heard so often that we're there and all of that sort of thing But I think you have also heard that, yeah, we're clearing people, but the percentage is damn lousy. I think you've heard that. Well, the reason why I wasn't concentrating in this particular line, during the past year, concentrating on old clearing techniques – one of the reasons you were getting chained all the time – is I was trying to move over into the category of all cases Clear, see. Clearing is no good to you or anybody else unless it – you can make a full sweep, you see.

It can't be that Joan and Bill and Isabel can be cleared, but, Mr. Snodgrass and so forth, hell never make it. you just get consistent randomity of various characters.

Well, 3GA apparently – and this is without any real reservation – I – everywhere it is – I just put "apparently" in because it's fashionable – 3GA has been taking every case apart that it was intelligently addressed to. Where the textbook solution of technology was applied to the case and the technique was 3GA, we got coming out the other end of the line some results. Now, of course, we had to know a little bit more about this and about that. But one learns that from what can an auditor do wrong And what are they doing wrong at this particular time with this particular technology. And you keep that corrected up rather than shifting the basic technology.

Now, I gave you a talk just last Tuesday on how you do a Goals Assessment and so on. Now, that talk pointed up and summarized it. That's the first actual release of 3GA, the first bulletin on 3GA is sitting on my desk half-written at this moment – as formal release, see. The only things I was curious about and more or less were those things which were standing in people's road. I mean I was still working on these points, trying to ask these questions and get intelligent answers.

How many should a goals list consist of, you know? Do – can you completely discharge a goals list? Is there such a thing as a complete goals list? Yes, there is and about how long would it be? Well, I can't tell you how long it would be, but I can tell you how short it must not be. It must not be shorter than 850, see. Might be *longer* than that. And probably the proper question on it is – you said today – is, "Is this goals list complete?" not "Are there any more goals?" And this sort of thing, however, is . . . It's obvious that if you haven't got a goal that you can get a goal. We've never failed to find a goal on somebody. But what's the easy way of finding the goal? That's been the main question.

Soon as this got broadly workable, I could understand more about the GPM and see a new method of tearing the GPM to pieces. And then I found out where the GPM went, so that's that. The GPM will go *poof!* And that's that. There is no GPM after you finish off this type of activity.

Now, how many – how many goals do you have to list out? Well, I haven't demanded anything more than 3G – of 3GA at this particular stage of the game, than that it did bring the pc, by listing, down to a free needle. Because I know by experience that if you can bring a pc

down to a free needle, you could find another goal and bring him down to a free needle. We've done this lots of times, see.

And you can keep doing this and I also know now if the GPM entirely disappeared, how to get it back again. I can always get a GPM back. I know about – oh, I know lots of ways. I know lots of ways. Let a psychologist question the fellow, I mean. So his needle is clear. So his needle is gorgeously clear and so on. It's free and floating and he's only had one goal listed. How are you going to find some more GPMs to list, see? *Uhh!* Well, it's gone, you know? You can't get any tick on a goals list or something like that. Aw, I could fix that pretty easy, long as there's any GPM there, why – and so on.

I'll give you a method of doing so. This shows you how corny this could be and so forth. "Did you ever want to do anything you couldn't? Thank you, that's it." All right, just write that down as a goal and insist on auditing it for a few seconds and the GPM will be in. And then prepcheck it and run out the suddenness of it. But you'll have a GPM to audit.

Obviously, if the fellow can still give you a spot purpose that he couldn't do, you still have a piece of lock on the GPM, you see. So you could just pull that in so that you could do enough with it so the fellow would take off and you get a registry on the meter again. That's horseplay – what I'm talking to you about – because I don't think you'll run into this particular problem. But even if you did run into it, you could solve it.

Now, on the problems of listing, these are very simple problems. The only real dangers and the only thing that a graduate of Saint Hill should be very careful about, is just kick the living teeth in of any untrained, unschooled auditor who is trying to use 3GA. Just bat their brains in mercilessly. Just tear off their thetan and send it in for a box of shredded wheat, see. Because let me tell you, that could get a pc into more trouble than you can easily dig him out of.

Now, 3GA solves 3GA. That's how you know you're there, see. you run a 3GA wrong, why, you do more 3GA to run it right. Now, it's a peculiarity of problems in this universe and the mind and a lot of other things, that a prime solution runs out errors to itself. See, that is the test of a prime solution. You make an error with this solution and then it corrects the error. So therefore it isn't a cure. That tells you it is not a cure. So 3GA is the first thing we have that isn't a cure. 3GA is not a cure. A cure does something about a prior problem. 3GA doesn't do anything about a prior problem. 3GA operates on the prime – the prime postulate. There can't be anything ahead of a prime postulate. It wouldn't even register as a goal if it weren't a prime postulate in some section of track. So it isn't solving anything. Oddly enough it solves nothing But it puts the person into a situation where he doesn't have to be solved.   This is very tricky. But you'd find out if you were discussing this with a Catholic priest or a mathematician or something of that nature, but they would tell you that the Prime Mover Unmoved is the only thing that can resolve the Prime Mover Unmoved. That's right, you see, it's perfectly true. It's

a mathematical fact, you see. The only thing that divides seven is seven, you know, that kind of thing. And you've got one of those things in 3GA.

But somebody using – it isn't so dangerous that you as an auditor cannot undo the damage done, providing the person's still alive, see. you could undo it. But you can really wind somebody up in a ball, you know? Some other – some corny auditing and auditing over the top of missed withholds and messing it up and finding the wrong goal – as they inevitably would – listing the thing.

The reason I say this is because I've never seen right goals found broadly. The number of wrong goals I've seen found in the field is terrific. That's too many. I know some of you blame yourselves occasionally for having found wrong goals or maybe something of this sort.

Well, you'll find wrong goals until you go at it in a – in a perfect textbook method and with a total Prepcheck and there's too many things can make a goal apparently stay in, don't you see? And you get a supercharged list that you haven't exhausted any of the charge out of it is, you've got a goals list of fifteen. Well, the charge is liable to go around and round on this fifteen, you see – and things are liable to shift one way or the other. You can get a goal that reacted all right, but it's much more likely just reacting because the whole subject of goals is charged than because it's the goal.

Now, you list that thing and it's going to beef up the bank. It'll beef up the bank worse than any creative process we have ever had. It is pure agony. You run – of course you start running an alter-is, you see, and what are you going to get? You're going to get alter-is. Well, mass is alter-is. So, of course, the longer you run it, the more mass in the mind you're going to get. So, some character is going to be very insouciant and he's going to – he's going to know how to audit there. He got an E-Meter – he had it built – he got a couple of pipe wrenches and hooked them up somehow. And – he's really going to go to town. And he can – he can find somebody's goal all right because he knows what the pc's goal is already. As a matter of fact, he tells him, in fact. And what do you know! You know that goal will react after that? Marvelous. But it'll go right on reacting.

And you, if you didn't know Prepchecking could actually touch that goal and you'd find out it was in. "To be an old witch," you see, or something like this. It doesn't even have to be an insulting goal. "Oh, well, I see here you've got 'old' appearing on your goals list a lot of times, and so forth. And you often talk about witches, so therefore I can see here plainly that your goal is to be an old witch. All right, to be an old witch." Tick. "To be an old witch." Tick. "To be an old witch." Tick, you see?

A fellow who didn't know his business could actually come along afterwards and say, "What's – " to the pc, "What's your goal?" and he said, "To be an old witch." And it would go tick-tick-tick-tick. Marvelous! Look just like a goal. you prepcheck the thing, it goes *ppfff.*

See? Because it's been suggested to the pc and the misowningness of it has made it seize up into the GPM, you see? Wrong ownership causes it to read. you can always make a goal read.

Now, if you take that goal and you list it, the mass in the bank is going to increase and increase and increase and the pc's going to feel worse and worse and worse and be more and more unhappy and unhappy and unhappy. That's why you must only handle a valid goal and why you mustn't let people who are not qualified monkey with this stuff.

Now, furthermore, a person who is briefly trained and so forth, may be able to put forth a fair technical show and so forth. Well, let's say he's had a PE Course and been on a co-audit, you know and – something like that – and he's going to find himself a goal. Well man, he can do it. you see, he can find himself a goal. He can find himself almost any kind of a goal he wants. And he can list it. The next thing you know the pc's eyes are sticking out about an inch and a half from underneath his lids, or sunk back an inch and a half into the skull or something like this, see. He's getting nauseated and he's dizzy and so forth. And then somebody – this fellow reads in a book and well, "The process that turned it on will turn it off." So he goes on listing it.

So, you're dealing – you're dealing in a sphere where you have exceeded old Class I processes, of which this is totally true. you could louse somebody up with this done wrong You can find the goal, prove it out, he'd list it, you see, and the pc caves in. Well, why is that? Must be Scientology doesn't work.

So anyhow, there is your – there is your limit of use. The people who are not adequately trained to do this sort of thing shouldn't be using it, that's all. Some Academy might try to teach this to new HPAs or something like that, you see. Nah. NQ They haven't been in the saddle long enough. That's about what it amounts to, they don't appreciate anything that goes on, they wouldn't be enough on the ball. They couldn't catch it that quick. They'd still be fumbling with the sensitivity knob which they never got checked out, you know?

So anyway, actually, we are at a position now where all we've got to do is kick up the general grade of auditing. And you speak of training – should a Saint Hill graduate train? Yes, by all means. Don't however run a four, five, six, eight-week course someplace and call it a Class II Course and have some people on it and that sort of thing. Don't do that kind of training.

Rather, get some people – I don't care if they pay you or don't pay you. Say, "Yeah, I'll bring you up to scruff. Yeah, I'll make something out of you." And run them through checksheets and classes or anything you care to over a period of time, until they can audit, don't you see? I'm talking about oldtime auditors, bringing them up the stuff and so on. That's what I mean when I say a Saint Hill graduate should train.

As far as somebody going on a full-time course is concerned it takes today a considerable staff and a lot of administrative organization to handle this thing and you would wind up the loser if you tried to handle something like that. Oh, yeah, by all means say, "All right, I'm running a bit of a center here. you want to be an apprentice to this activity, all right. I'll require – when you are finally fully trained – I will require a thousand hours of auditing of you – of pcs of my selection and collection." I don't care what you do. But, oh, yeah, by all means train them up – apprentices – train them up, any way you want to. See, your training to a large degree would be lost if you didn't do such a thing.

As far as putting in a formal Class II type of course is concerned, saying "You come here for five weeks," and that sort – nah. *Aber nicht.* Bum show. You haven't the equipment or anything else to do so. You'll get a lot of people upset with you and so on.

Way to do it, say, "Well, if you want to hang around for the next two years and contribute a thousand pounds to the center, why, we'll make you an auditor at the other end of the line." I don't care what you tell them. But it must be on the basis of, "You've got to stick around long enough till you can do it and you abide by whether I tell you, you can do it or not. you understand?" That would be the end of that.

Now, in an Academy – would run a retread course on a grind-grind daytime basis – remember that it is not qualified to issue a classification. It can say it's a Class II Course, but it doesn't make a Class II Auditor.

This is the regulations along the line. Yes, by all means, train some people. I used to train auditors on this basis myself. I'd go downstairs to eat breakfast and so on . . . We're actually back in the old swing of 42 Aberdeen Road, practically, now. Want to say goodnight to the children, I'd have to go – I go outside where they're sitting talking to an auditor – you know, call them in – tell them good night. They – this is – this is usual and ordinary.

You shouldn't, however, mess yourself up to this extent: of let them audit pcs for you before – they don't know what they're doing Because you will very quickly learn this lesson yourself. Actually there's no reason for my telling you this at this particular stage of the game. You'd find it out for yourself. You'd learn fast. People will be on the phone two and three o'clock in the morning, the police would be coming up from the morgue, to find out – to identify . . . Be a cheerful scene.

Some of you may have seen the code of ethics of the National Academy of American Psychology cooked up by us. you might have seen that, you know. "Must be willing to accept the treatment they dish out." you know, and – did you ever see those?

Audience: Mm-mm. Yes.

Well, we're thinking of calling this a convention. A convention of ethics. The convention of ethics of international healing, you see, so that we have the World Mental

Health Organization. Now, this is the only – the only horrible plot, this, in the very near future. We incorporate this thing in Switzerland, see. And it's the World Mental Health Organization. And its literature cannot be told from the World Health Organization, you see. And we have – we have credentials which we issue to people who subscribe to the convention of international healing ethics, you see. And we give them a certificate they can hang on the wall.

Well, it has various things like not curing people they can't help, you know, all these various embarrassing points. Returning people's money if they don't help them. you know, the very things that these clucks out there would never dream of approaching, you know? Guy can't give a prefrontal lobotomy by it, unless he's had one, you know? So anyway, this is – this is this sort of thing.

Now, this doesn't go out on a common line at all; what we do is . . . This is just a mock-up. This might not come to view, you see, but we're going to try to push it in that direction. And that is we appoint people around the world – inspectors for the World Mental Health Organization. And they have a card that identifies them perfectly, you see – a perfectly fine card – and they have a questionnaire. They have several types of questionnaire, one is for a doctor's office, one is for a psychiatric office, one is for a psychology department of a university. One is for a mental hospital, one is for a regular hospital. And sometime when you want a lot of laughs, you see, why you take your card down and you see – you see Doctor Cutsbin. And you simply walk in, you hand him this and it announces that you're an inspector for the World Mental Health Organization.

Now, that's a perfectly valid organization, don't you see? And we actually are the only world mental health organization there is, so this – you want to fill out this form. you want to know about his results. And you want to know about his technology and his facilities and his credentials. And you just fill out a form representing those various things. And it's in triplicate and you send one to the minister of health, of the government of the country you're in, as *"failed."* "Failed and forwarded to the International Headquarters in Switzerland." And the other thing – you simply send it to his superiors, whoever they are, board of trustees of the hospital, don't you see. And the other one of course you send to Switzerland. It's very interesting Saturday morning's work when you're walking around someplace.

Think of going into a mental hospital and presenting a card to inspect their results and their facilities and their technology, you know, and their ethics and credentials. Think of this, man. You'll be surprised. It's not just a gag, because I think the right to inspect gives the right to command. And it's your first gradient scale step over taking control. All you do is inspect. But you tell the – you're very pleasant, you see, while you're in such an interview. Very pleasant about the whole thing He protests, "Oh, you people. I've heard about you people. You're a bunch of quacks and.... "

"Yes that's fine. 'Opinion of World Mental Health Organization – bunch of quacks and bums', that's fine."

Yeah, you can have a lot of fun with that. Anyway, you'd be surprised. They'd actually get all whipped up about this sort of thing. Inspect the Department of Psychology of Natal University. Of course, obviously they haven't anybody there who is qualified to teach anything about the human mind. Nobody's graduated from the Academy of Scientology in Johannesburg – they haven't got one in the place. You put it down as a serious omission. Numerous false credentials in the area. It would be a lot of fun.

Well, actually you don't have to do it at all. But very often you have PE Courses and you have people coming in asking you what they can do. So you appoint them as inspectors. Yeah, I think – I think there'd be a lot of red faces, wouldn't there?

But I think the right to inspect is something that you can simply create by assumption. And I think it's a gradient step on the right to command. You're actually going to get people worried about this. See, they'll be worried about you.

Now, it might work out that one copy goes to the newspaper, you see – one copy goes to the minister of health of the country and the other copy goes here. We'll work out these little details later. But I can – I can hear the scream now, from the Sunday-Monday line clear around to the Sunday-Monday line, you see. Campaigns on the floor of the United Nations that we have abrogated their authority, so forth. It's all good publicity. Nobody can do anything to you at all for inspecting.

Newspapers could become very worried that they had a hospital in the place that was not qualified, that was not staffed by qualified practitioners and that killed patients. And had been condemned by the World Mental Health Organization. "Spinbin Lawn Hospital condemned by World Mental Health Organization." "Doctor Cutsbin declared to have inadequate training and credentials." "Quack Doctor commands hospital."

Maybe we'll have a rightist press that will be as enthusiastic someday as the leftist press. Not that we're right or left.

Actually, you know – you know politically where we stand. We're so far to the left that we sometimes look right.

If a communist ever asks you where you stand politically, the way to worry him – the way to worry him, is to come down on him with all four feet – by wanting a government. And he'll look at you and he'll know exactly what speech to give you. He'll pull it right out of the file. It's "how you deal with an anarchist." And he'll say, "The valuable parts of governments, governments serve a useful purpose." See, and he'll try to argue you into – not revolution, but how you have to have a government, so forth. And I don't think very many of us would buy

that. But we're actually so far to the left we sometimes look to the right. We actually are not on the spectrum at all.

But where it comes to reasonableness, you can't be sensible on this planet at this particular time and belong anyplace on the spectrum of government politics.

Okay, well, having given you a few words of cheer and forecast, why we declare it closed.

Thank you.

Audience: Thank you.