

EFFECTIVENESS OF PROCESSING

A lecture given on
30 April 1964

Thank you. Well, this is the what?

Audience: 30th of April.

Thirtieth of April, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

All right. We've had a little slowdown here recently on research the last six, seven days—I managed to get the show back on the road again – mostly due to the nonsense going on in Australia. The general situation with regard to that is they're not in any danger or anything like that, they're just being cross – advised and being generally upset. The government of Australia in the form of little pipsq – I mean this is ... Anyhow, they – they have this parliament and it has very, very great – well, it's all swollen up on itself because it used to be the state of Australia used to meet there, see? And they don't realize that it doesn't anymore—but it's just the parliament of Victoria, see?

Well, these little boys have an opposition there that are quite red and they all of a sudden decided under a fellow of the name of Galbatty to investigate—investigate Scientology on account of how bad it all was, you see? And—this is the message I want to get across to you, not the state of Australia. An organization starts slipping—they stop following through standard policies, they are not on the ball here and they individuate there and they goof up someplace else. And then you all of a sudden start having trouble in their vicinity and it finally swells up to something like this inquiry you see, and that sort of thing. Just everybody has to some degree or another taken his finger off of his number and goofed up. You get the idea?

In this particular case, why, they ran some jerk down there who they knew was a security risk. He couldn't pass an E-Meter test if you'd held a gun to his head. He is just a complete bum. So they go ahead and give him high-level processing. Name is Werne. And they give this fellow a bunch of high-level processing and restimulate two or three wrong goals on him one way or the other so he goes into a complete spin. And I think he'd been in psychiatric treatment and he went back under psychiatric treatment—and then he runs over and sees Galbatty to get Galbatty to pass Legislation so as to cure his GPMs and it just all went to smoke. And it had never even occurred to anybody down in Melbourne simply to handle

Werne, refund his money and straighten him up. When they did refund his money, they didn't even require him to sign a release. So they went and refunded his money; he went over to the court the same afternoon and filed a suit for a hundred and sixty thousand pounds. I mean, it takes genius, see? It just takes goof up after goof up.

Now, they've been testifying on the stand down there, nothing but Class VI material – Class V, Class VI material – yap, *yap, yap, yap, yap* – not realizing that all it is, is a fishing expedition by the—by the opposition, don't you see, to get a lot of oddities they can quote and say, “You see, Scientology is just silly.” Quote all these things out of context, you see, and then go stampede other state legislatures, you see, into passing Legislation against Scientology. Well, finally the opposition took its finger off of its number down there and they—a document passed into our hands on testimony—suggested testimony for witnesses. And it turns out to be the minutes of their second meeting of witnesses wherein they were arranging testimony which they should give at this free, open, public inquiry. If you want to look up the records, the Profumo witnesses are still in prison for having done this exact thing, you see? Well, all this is very interesting. The Profumo witnesses to the contrary, as soon as I got hold of this document—it's a case of what we would do about it.

Meantime there—this inquiry is costing the organization five hundred pounds a week. So every time you turn around there is a cable through from down there: “Send us five hundred pounds,” you see? “Send us five hundred pounds,” “Send us. . .” Two—two to three days later, “Send us five hundred pounds.” We finally gave them a guarantee from a Swiss bank that guaranteed their bank account and the bank down there—I guess it has mostly kangaroos for customers—this bank didn't understand what this Swiss bank blocked—fund guarantee was, which was that if they—if their overdraft wasn't met, the money would simply pass into the bank to meet the overdraft. They couldn't understand this—the only bank in the world that couldn't have understood it.

So they're still at this business. I've—just a little while ago one came through: “Send us two thousand dollars at once,” you see? They—they won't at any—they don't realize that this is sort of silly. While they're busy sending through these demands to get them off the hook because they can't stand up to it, the instructions going their way, you see, are just being disregarded. And the instructions were, simply: Walk into the inquiry and say we couldn't testify anymore because of collusion and fraud and produce the document and that would be that. Of course that would definitely be that. It would probably result in the Resignation of the premier who ordered the inquiry.

Well, all this is very interesting. We got this evidence, got it all rigged up. I planted the howitzer, tied the opposition across the muzzle of the howitzer, showed everybody where the lanyard was. All they had to do was jerk on it slightly and said, “All right. Pull the lanyard” and that's the end of the inquiry into the situation. Everybody promptly ran away and said their—everything under the sun, but they wouldn't go near the lanyard, see?

So the attorneys down there are busy telling the staff how this document is unimportant, that it doesn't mean anything because it was known to the fellow who was running the board of inquiry!

Audience: Oh. Ooooooh!

So they all bought this, you see, that the document is valueless. But the same attorney, the same attorney—directly, immediately, and at once—has telexed through a long letter to me, on the basis of “For God’s sakes, don’t! No, no, no!” Because it will unseat the incumbent government of Victoria just before the election. Finish them! While he’s telling the organization that it’s unimportant and means nothing. Finally I start hammering on him hard enough and he comes through with the truth. He’s protecting the government of Victoria first and Scientology second. He says, “Of course, if the opposition got in because of this terrible scandal and so forth, why, they would pass material against Scientology.” And he’s very reasonable about this sort of thing, but I just wonder why he would tell staff down there that it is so unimportant when he tells me, “Oh, no! Don’t! Please!” You know? His fingernails are chewed off clear to the third joint! You see what the situation is, see?

We have it in our power to simply give a little tug on this lanyard and that is the end of any future inquiry practically on Scientology to the end of time. Everybody would say, “Leave those people alone.” Horrible!

Now, that’s the existing thing. Now, they won’t do it. They won’t present this evidence and—I wouldn’t go along with this, but they practically—not even being practical enough to go around to the incumbent and say, “Hey, bud. Why don’t you meet the organization’s cost for this inquiry, which was normal in any case, and just pass a little bill sort of and say, ‘That’s the end of the inquiry, we didn’t have anything’ and we won’t release it.” That’s using it for blackmail. You at least got that, see? No suggestion of that has come across or anything of the sort. But these cables keep coming through: “Send us two thousand dollars so we can pay this week’s bills at the inquiry,” see?

All right. There’s a GPM “to create problems.” I just wish they would move up the track to the next GPM, which is “to destroy problems!”

Now, that’s what has interrupted research here for the last six days—trying to get through, trying to get things clarified, trying to get things squared around.

Every once in a while an organization will start to skid a little bit on execution of this, following of policy that, being on the ball here, see? And then the next thing you know, why, they’re in deep, dark, stumbling trouble of some kind or another. Then at that point—just to give you the rest of the lesson—when you try to straighten it out, you’ve got all kinds of crosscurrents going on, where everybody’s got them hypnotized into believing something else and you can’t get an execution at the point of trouble. So it just goes up in a balloon.

Now, the organization will be all right, it'll—it'll survive, simply for the excellent reason that they'll be forced to take some kind of a solution along this particular line. Of course, I always believe—I always believe that when somebody comes and attacks Scientology on a frontal attack and starts doing things one way or the other, if he at any time laid himself out on the carving table and said, "Carve," I would simply pick up the biggest knife! I mean, I haven't got any circuitous thinking on this particular subject. Somebody says, "Down with Scientology, shoot all Scientologists" and so forth, and "Here's a piece of evidence by which you can shoot me," my finger instantly, one splitsecond later, would twitch! This just is—this is terribly, I'm afraid, unsubtle. See, it's just unsubtle. But it's that situation which exists in Victoria as of this minute. All anybody would have to do, is just twitch his finger and that would be the end of inquiry and the end of really all future inquiries. And it would probably be the end of the FDA trial in Washington because rumors abound that it was Washington money which started the inquiry in Australia in the first place. This investigation would back all the way back up and probably be the end of the E—Meter trial in Washington. But there it is—there it is.

Now, we're not going to do anything more with them. They can go ahead and work their own destiny out in their own peculiar way. It will probably all come out all right somehow or another. I just hope that we don't for years and years and years fight this confounded basketful of testimony which is nonfactual and so forth, that it won't keep appearing in other state legislatures as reasons why it should pass laws to debar Scientology. I just hope that won't happen. But it's on Melbourne's head. That's it. I have spoke.

All right. Now let's talk about ... I'm just bringing you up to date, giving you, the—giving you the gen, *zip—zap*, center, rapidly. If you ever find an organization or area in Scientology—I'll give you this as a little moral lesson—which is slipping, you know, slipping one way or the other. "Well, actually, we—we don't have any classified auditors auditing anybody around here. We didn't believe in that, you see? No, the preclear, the—no, nobody keeps any logbook you know. So nobody ever keeps any auditor's reports on sessions, you see. And we—we don't believe in, you see, this, that, the other thing." Slipping. You know what you are looking at in the future. You're looking for a complete bust.

It isn't, you see, that centrally, Scientology in its control areas or international board is always right. That isn't the case. But it is at least always uniform. And these things are built out of errors which have developed in the past. And their efforts to guide a safe course through the rocks and shoals of processing and organizational activities. When those things are all abandoned, naturally, the errors which they prevent occur. And when those occur, you get a deterioration of the situation.

All right, I don't know what to talk to you about today. You don't look like you need a good talking to. You look like you are doing all right—except you, of course! You look like

you are doing all right and so on. I could give you a bit of a talk on the HGC allowed processes, but I don't happen to have a list of them sitting in front of me.

But the whole basis that I could talk to you about and will talk to you about is simply the effectiveness of processing and effective processing. That's all. Just you, the auditor, bringing about a desirable effect on the pc. It's just that, nothing more. Nothing fancier than that.

Now, *that* is quite a subject! And it's the subject that you are grappled with in studying. And sometimes you forget you are grappled with that subject and think that you are just grappled in with bulletins or tapes or something like this. But actually, all the way along the line, you are simply handling this one single subject and problem which is: How do I, the auditor, produce a desirable effect upon the pc? That is the entirety of your activity.

Now of course, you, the auditor, could go into Group Auditing—that is to say the old—style Group Auditing, where you have a lot of people in chairs and they execute the commands from somebody on a platform. You could have the same problem there: How do you, standing up before a group and group auditing it, produce an effect on the pc? And also, how do you, the Auditing Supervisor, when you are running a co—audit, get an effect produced on the pcs in the co—audit which you are conducting, you see? And also this could go into how do you, the auditor, by training alone and teaching a PE Course or something of that sort, produce an effect on the *cases—on* the cases of the people who are listening to your talks and lectures. It goes out into that ramification.

Now, it can go a little bit further. How do *you* as a Scientologist, produce an effect on somebody that you're talking to? Let's drop out the idea of an auditing action. How do you, the Scientologist, produce an effect on somebody you are talking to? You are talking to George Q. Blitz and he wots not of what you are or anything of the sort and without your giving him an ACC on the subject of Scientology—or even discussing Scientology at all—how do you produce an effect upon this gent?

Now, all of these things come under the heading of the production of an effect, don't they? Now, just production of an effect, then a production of a desirable effect, then a production of a desirable effect upon pcs or other than pcs, as subdivisions of this—so it's just the production of an effect. And if I were to teach you, just cleanly and totally, how to produce an effect on another human being, it could go into very numerous subjects.

There's the subject of armaments. You cock a gun and you pull a trigger and a bullet arrives in somebody else's skull, you produce an effect on that individual. Now, governments, lacking adroitness and so forth, really in the final last resort only produce that effect. They are producing an effect on somebody through the channels of destruction. They are trying to get compliance through threat. Now, that is a whole field and area and is exactly 50 percent of the production of an effect general subject. That's 50 percent of existence. That's the production

of an effect by threat, menace, force, duress, strength—you get the idea? And that's—I'm giving you this very, very technically. This is 50 percent, exactly of the ways of producing an effect—are in that category.

Now, if we study that 50 percent, we will find that nearly all mental healing activities, sooner or later, drift into it. Psychiatry—with its prefrontal lobotomy, electric shocks, wet packs, chemical shocks, biochemical administrations of one kind or another—has drifted over into the solid—form effect. There are two reasons for this: (1) They do not realize they are trying to influence thought. They have no definition of thought. They don't even think anything is there thinking. They are trying to influence matter. Man, to them, is matter. And they are using matter to influence man. So they're actually in the field of physics, not in the field of mental healing. And it's drifted over to that direction. Every once in a while a psychiatrist will err in the direction of producing a kindly effect. It's a stray. I am not now being sarcastic. I'm just talking right straight off the record. He strays over and he says something friendly to somebody. Any of his friendly ideas toward a patient, when he exhibits them, are in the zone and area of a pitch. He knows it's a pitch and so does the patient. The ARC, you see, isn't there at all. He tries to be friendly so as to get the patient to confess more. There's always a lot of falsity involved in this sort of thing.

So, you run a danger in operating 100 percent in that remaining 50 percent, see? You're operating *wholly* in the remaining of 50 percent. The production of a beneficial effect. And operating in *that* 50 percent of the sector, you have left the other 50 percent slightly on automatic. So therefore, you occasionally drift over into it. Once in a while you drift over into it. Once in a while as an auditor you've just had too much and you explode and you tell the pc, "To hell with you." Happens to the best of auditors. That's because he's got a 50 percent area here that he is not operating in. So occasionally it goes on automatic. You follow that?

It's almost inevitable that an auditor, sooner or later, is going to blow up at a pc. Now, let me point out to you this other fact: That an auditor, in that blowup, never has, doesn't and never will produce an improvement of case in the pc. You have to be there in the driver's seat a few times like this and watch yourself blow up under tremendous stress. Ah, this person is just too much, man—you know? Every time you turn around, why, you're—you're trying to help them out and they ARC break, see? And you try to help them out some more and they ARC break. And they ream you out and so forth. And you finally let them have it, see?

Well, what cures you of that? The best cures are at Class VI materials. No, what cures you of doing that? At Class VI there are so many examples of this—abundant examples. A pc's been ARC breaky, pc's been ARC breaky, pc's been ARC breaky—you've blown up. And then, you're red face a few sessions later to find out that you were running it all upside down and backwards, that there *was* bypassed charge there. See?

You don't get as much of an opportunity to get clean—cut examples of this at the lower levels, because those bypassed charges are mainly session bypassed charges. But you

still run into them. And after your face has been reddened with the blush of shame a few times at realizing that you actually had skipped a GPM on the pc. You know, nothing slight—you just skipped a whole GPM! You're going back over your auditor's reports, *ta—da, ta—da, da—da* one day, you know, and you're looking it over, "Let's see, what have we run on this fellow, and so forth. Well, we ran number 3, and then we ran number 4, and then we ran number 6, and then we ran number 7, and then we—what? Oh, my God! No wonder he was ARC breaky!" See? Now you know, and it never comes—emerges clearer, that you made a mistake, the pc got ARC breaky and then you blew up in his face. The reason why the pc operated that way lays there, very wide open. It's visual to the eye. And you say, "Well, I blew up for nothing?"

I had this sort of an experience—had this sort of an experience one time. Found out almost a 150 hours later that the person had been in an actual RI at a particular moment, when they had just been too insufferable for words. And I had been gnashing my teeth privately to myself about what horrible pcing this person did. Almost 200 hours later I was running down the track and the pc—and my gosh, we collided head—on with the RI that that pc had been in at that moment of that ARC break because it had been bypassed at that moment. It had been walked right on by. It hadn't been accepted on the list. But I recalled it because there had been an argument about it. After that for several sessions the pc was very ARC breaky and easily upset.

There is this whole sector over here, 50 percent, and that's wide open for an auditor to blow up in. But what does he accomplish? All he accomplishes is a mess—up. He really doesn't actually bring about any destruction. He just messes it up. Now to go on and do something is a harder task than if he hadn't moved over into that sector.

Let me give you a broad example: It's much easier to process somebody before he has had his prefrontal lobotomy than afterwards, you see? Just classify the prefrontal lobotomy over here as in *extremis* of destructive action toward the pc, you see? Well, similarly, on a much, much lighter level, it is far easier to straighten out the ARC break before you have blown up—you the auditor—in the pc's face, one way or the other. You know, "I am not going to process you anymore, you keep talking to me like that." Even if it's that mild. You'll find yourself falling across that one, falling across that one, falling across that one—wow! You finally, out of your own self—defense—not because you have done anything to the pc, because it is causing you so much trouble—you begin to say, "Why did I ever do it?" you see? It's a kickback mechanism that operates in the final analysis, to an auditor with experience, as a disciplinary factor. All he has to do is recognize this and he sees at once what the disciplinary factor is with regard to it.

So you're actually not keeping the Auditor's Code because I tell you to. You're keeping it because if you do anything else but keep the Auditor's Code, you have made far more trouble for yourself as the auditor, with that pc, than you can easily undo. And now

you're in an awful mess. It's a self—disciplinary type of activity. Now, I warn you that this big sector does exist—50 percent—a destructive sector. So that, if left at random, every other effect produced would be destructive if you just had this thing going at random. It's like you flip a coin fifty times, why, you're going to get twenty—five heads and twenty—five tails, usually, on the average. Fifty percent, the chances are.

So, if you had an unintentional, undirected, just—any—old—way type of thing—you weren't worried about interpersonal relations, you weren't worried about anything of this sort but were just delivering random communications or cause—distance—effect lines, you might say, to the pc, then 50 percent of them would be destructive and 50 percent of them would be constructive. That just—that's the random. Supposing you didn't know anything about Scientology, do you understand? This would be the random selector.

Well, you're a specialist. You're a specialist over here in the other 50 percent. Fortunately, by the laws of life, it's this remaining 50 percent sector—the good sector, you see—is the only one which has any lasting benefit or there is any direction up or anything else. The odd part of it is, it isn't—it isn't a proposition in black and white. It isn't a proposition of putting something there or wiping something out. It isn't that fifty—fifty. It's by the definitions of “create” and “construct” which you get out of *Fundamentals of Thought*. You don't ever really destroy anything, see? It's not “take something away.” You're dealing in a sector over here, then, whereby you can do something constructive by actually deleting something. But the other sector is just messing up what is already wrong. Eradication has to be 100 percent before it is effective.

If you want to know the truth of it, if you wanted a purity of destruction, you would get a not—thereness. But destruction does not go in that direction. When you rehabilitate the individual, it isn't enough to knock down the prison walls and leave them in rubble with him buried under them, see? That would be a destructive way of going about freeing an individual. “Well, we want to get Joe out of the dungeon. Good. Blow up the castle. Boom! Where is Joe?” So the action of destruction, as it's normally, commonly understood, is not an action which produces a result on a case. All it produces is mess—up.

Now, an as—ising of a situation is not looked on by you or me or anybody else, really, as destruction. It's looked on as a constructive action. Now, Joe's in the prison and we say, “*Wheoow—no castle!*” There stands Joe. No rubble. Simple, clean. We look upon that as beneficial. Actually, that's an ultimate in this other 50 percent. If you had an ultimate destruction, you wouldn't even have the rubble. But you'd still have Joe.

Now, if the way to handle Joe, as an individual, is to set him free—and it is—then the destructive action that you're engaged on would not be messing up what he is caught in—but it would consist of the as—ising, rather smoothly, of what he is caught in. Take a good workman to take down his jail, see? Now, the only thing Joe objects to is having it all rubblified in his vicinity. Having it so messily knocked apart that he can't find his way

through it. Now he hasn't got a castle and he is not free but he's got an awful lot of shambles. And that's what he objects to. He doesn't object to being free. He doesn't object to the disappearance of his dungeon. He objects to it being done in such a way that he is battered about and surrounded by rubble.

So the effect that you're trying to produce on the pc is an infinitely simple one. You are simply trying to set the individual free by as—ising what the individual is caught in. And without destroying the individual and without leaving a lot of rubble around. And that's really all you are trying to do in the effect you are producing on the pc.

You're—frankly, it can be done in the mind. It's a relatively easy magician's trick with the mind. You go—he's surrounded by this bird cage called mother—in—law, see? And he's worried all the time about the mother—in—law, worried all about the mother—in—law, worried about the time about the mother—in—law, he can't think about his job or anything else because of his mother—in—law, *aww, aww, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry!*

All right, your magic trick, as an auditor, is as—ising this cage called mother—in—law so as not to leave a lot of rubble around. Now, the way you would leave rubble around is this sort of an approach—counseling, you see: “Put your mind on something else. Assert yourself in the home.” These are various types of advice, don't you see? “Assert yourself in the home. Do not permit yourself to be dominated by women.” How much rubble do you think is going to start gathering along about this point, huh? In the first place, you've launched a simply other—determined and not pan—determined action. So therefore you've set up conflict between two other terminals. You've made trouble in life for somebody else. So you are going to start adding to the debris and trouble of life with such advice as, “Assert yourself around home,” you see, or something like that. “Turn your attention in the other direction. Don't think about it. Learn to sit still and look at your navel and not think.” These are all advices of the past that I am giving you. They're not just cracks. “Assume the Ib position.” That's one of the plays Shakespeare wrote: Ib. Ibid. I'm kidding. In other words—do something that doesn't do anything about the problem at all. I was struck by it last night. I was looking up a thesaurus, that's why it came up at this particular point. And it seems like the only play he ever wrote!

So anyway, life, then, could be handled in a way of setting it into more violent counter—motion against itself. You could handle life by setting it into more violent counter—motions. War, for instance, is one of the chronic errors that man falls into. Let us solve the problems of the Balkans by going to war. See, this is to set terminals at other terminals. And have you ever noticed the amount of debris which accumulates when this occurs? The amount of breakage is fabulous. You can still, even this late, go up around London and you can still see bits of debris which came out of that last big “solution.” See, it's still there and it's still knocked about. And that's solving things by setting terminals at terminals or making somebody's attention go off of the subject or so forth.

Now, those are the mechanisms by which life handles its problems. *Those* are the mechanisms. And you as an auditor actually are being asked to decry, throw aside, and so forth, the standard dramatizing solutions that life is prone to. See, you're asked—you're asked as an auditor to assume a better discipline, which is a more workable discipline. In other words, let's find out what the problem is, what considerations they have had about the problem and what they have done to solve it. Because these, we find, are the building blocks of the cage. Those are the building blocks of the prison. The problem itself, what they have said the problem was or what has caused it, and solutions they have had to what they thought it was. Those are the building blocks. And after they have got through building all these things up, they have got a pretty big dungeon. They have got a big dungeon called "mother—in—law" or a big dungeon called "government." Or they've—they've got something, you see? And this thing is built up. But that is what—all the cage is built out of—not built out of another blessed thing.

Somebody had to *conceive* that there was a problem there, then had to conceive the problem was something different—we had to get an alter—is of the original problem, by the way—had to conceive the problem was different and then conceive that there were other problems. And each time they had a concept of what the problem is, they would have to solve that in numerous ways before they really have a first—class dungeon. That's how one is built.

You have to say—you have to say, "Well, I have a problem at home. I'm—I'm not happy with my home." In other words, here he is versus the home, see? He has to say, "I have this problem." Oddly enough, there doesn't have to be any prior art—nothing has to have existed before that point. He had to have had—needed no reason, because a thetan is always capable of postulation. And then he had to find a justification of some kind or another for this problem to exist, so he altered the problem a little bit. He said, "It's because of my mother—in—law. She is the problem." Well now, of course, she can't be the problem because she is not two terminals up to this point, see, she is just one. So now he has to then say it was the mother—in—law and then he has to assume that he is against her and that she is causing the difficulty. And then he has to go ahead and solve this. Now, of course, he already solved home as a problem by saying it was caused by his mother—in—law and she was the problem. That's the first solution, is the announcement of the first problem.

All right, now he has got to solve this situation one way or the other. He's got to work at it one way or the other. He's—he buys her some croquet mallets so she will take up croquet, you see, and go off and so forth or he does something or another. He makes extraordinary actions in life. Well, after a while, you can count on the fact that although his home is not happy, the problem he has set up, mother—in—law, has been solved into submergence. It's disappeared from view. He no longer can annunciate what the problem is but he can annunciate the last solutions that he had to it. And he will now find what's wrong with his life is the last solution he had to his mother—in—law. That is now the problem, see?

His last solution, that he would never go home. See, it's now a problem, because he can never seem to go home. He is now forcing himself to go home but he can't go home, you see? This is now the problem—his inability to go home. He's even forgotten why he started not to go home.

So now he starts solving this problem. He tries to make home more attractive. He tries to get himself in trouble outside of home so that he will go home. And eventually—eventually, he gets himself messed up with a—what is commonly called an affair, see? The reason he got himself mixed up in this affair is the girl always said, “You ought to go home now.” See? And this—so this is now—this is now the problem. It was a solution, you see. But now it's a problem again. So he is starting to solve this sort of thing. And he goes off in a long concatenation of solutions.

Now, this fellow is walking around in circles in life by this time. He doesn't know whether he is there or went. He knows that he is unhappy. It is not just an item, “unhappiness,” that causes him to be unhappy. He can actually, off his own bat, be unhappy. Everything seems to sort of dim down. He seems to sort of have his mind on something all the time, all the time. He seems a little abstracted. He can't concentrate or he does something or another.

Now, that is the prison. And he has built it up himself out of some basic and fundamental problem. Now, your art as the auditor is as—ising, not destroying. You're as—ising these bits and pieces that made up this cage. And you will find that as you as—is them they disappear. You are not, then, adding to this enormous structure which he's already got by giving him new solutions.

All right, now let me give you an example here now. Supposing your pc was totally uneducated—a very untutored, unlearned pc. And you're really trying to fish him out of the soup; and to the best of your ability and so forth. And you were running “What problem have you had?” in order to get the pc to as—is the problems they have had. I know you don't run this particular process, but let's just say you were, see? You still can do it. You could still get away with it; you won't get much tone arm. And your pc was inventing new problems to have. And you were unaware of this as an auditor and thought the pc was giving you problems the pc had had. And in actual fact, the pc was giving you new problems that he had never had. He is running a process called “Invent a new problem” and you're run—trying to run a process called “As—is your old problem.” Do you see that?

Now, supposing your understanding was deficient to that degree—that you were trying to get him to as—is—as—is bank—and you didn't realize that he could very easily be making new bank. And supposing you didn't add this up. Well, your pc wouldn't improve. That would be the exact penalty right at that point. The pc might even be happy with you. The pc might even be still talking to you, pc this, pc that.

But sooner or later you are going to decide that you are off on the wrong tack, somehow or another, because this pc doesn't seem to be able to get rid of these phobias and nonsenses. What process am I talking about? I am just talking about R1C, and then we add an M to it, it gives you the meter. Follow the blowdown after you have finished the cycle of action.

You after a while would decide you had better go off on a new tack. So you go off on a new tack and you'd run something else, "Touch that wall" or something like this, see. Pc isn't going to improve now. Very minor improvement. Yeah, you decide, "Well, I had better do something else." So you do something else and you do something else. And the pc doesn't improve. Sooner or later you are going to get mad at the pc and start moving over into the destruction cycle. There is nothing calculated to make an auditor more mad with the pc than the pc not improving. Some pcs understand this very clearly and tell you with great propitiation that they are greatly improved when they are not. Do you—do you recognize that as a little deficiency of understanding of what you are supposed to do? Supposing the auditor was deficient in that little piece of understanding. The auditor isn't trying to knock out anything. The auditor happily sits there and lets new things be added to the case. Well, the only reason he'd do something else other than watch these little bits get knocked out—the only reason that he would do something else, is because he didn't understand he was supposed to knock out these little bits.

Now, another deficiency in delivering processing to the pc comes under the heading of not realizing that it is went. This probably is the most mystifying thing to the new auditor and he is always hounding a pc about the problem that has just gone. He becomes completely baffled because he sees no debris. Well, his magic consists of as—ising without debris. He has as—ised this thing. The auditor who doesn't know his business doesn't recognize that he is *blowing* things, he's as—ising things by the simple process of inspection and communication on the part of the pc. Order from the auditor. The pc inspects it. Pc looks at it. Says something to the auditor about it and it goes!

So, this fellow is something like trying to make a steak dinner out of a sliver of bacon, see? This auditor, see, he gets this little tiny sliver of bacon on the plate. And that's all he can see he is ever going to have on his plate. He gets the pc to admit that he has trouble in the office with some of the other people in the office, see. So he's got that now on the plate. That's his sliver of bacon. He starts treating it like a steak dinner, see? He is going to process this. He has got his timetable all figured out and further, "Well, I'm all set now! Got the next 75, 125 hours of processing all fixed up. I'll straighten this fellow up with regard to the office." See, all set, see? So he says, "All right now."

The fellow says—the pc is sort of "All right, what?" "Now, about your difficulties at the office. . ."

And the pc looks a little bit blank for a minute. “Oh, yes.” He gets it back again, you see? He kind of mocks it up once more.

“Now, about your difficulties at the office, who do you detest most at the office?”

“Detest most at the office? I don’t detest anybody at the office. I just always had a sort of a withhold. I just didn’t like to be there, you know?”

“Well, yes, very good.” Let’s make this bacon out of the—beginning to look a little bit shriveled here. There’s something wrong going on. “Well now, how do we approach this problem,” the auditor is saying, you see, “How—how do we attack this problem?” Well, he’s in the same position of the fellow fencing air. The dimensions of the problem were one—thousandth of a—of a nothing by one—thousandth of a nothing to begin with, don’t you see? And it went *phfffft!* And that was the end of that.

Now, you could train an auditor if a pc uniformly always cognited. But on these little things there isn’t enough horsepower in them to generate a good cognition, see? So he—the pc would say, “Oh, I just realized I didn’t like the boss! Gee, I feel much better now!”

The auditor would say, “Oh well, we don’t have to have that steak dinner here. We are all set.” See, unfortunately, all auditing is made out of these little slivers of bacon, see? And the auditor that really has a tough time is trying to get a piece of steak on the plate every time he has just got this bit of grease. Because it’s always blowing, see? It’s always blowing. It’s insubstantial. The pc is sitting there and he gives him all this long song and dance about something or other and the auditor takes it all down and figures it all out and then says, “We now have the design of the situation and we know now what we are going to attack on the case.” And it’s blown!

The new auditor probably has a tremendous embarrassment of never really realizing what auditing is for. Why all these TRs and these drills and why this adherence to a comm cycle? Why all this sort of thing. He never adds that in to any of this other. Of course, they’re there to bring about the as—is.

You ask a question, you’re really saying, “Here’s something, we’ll see if you can as—is it.”

The pc says, “*Ya, ooh, oh, yeap—whamf—whamf—whamf—whamf* All right.”

And the auditor is saying, “All right, it’s as—ised,” see?

Now, that’s actually what this auditing comm cycle is all about. But people don’t easily add that up to the other situation. They don’t recognize what auditing is all about because it looks very, very—must be very complicated—it has made this fellow terribly sick for years. It has made him sick, unhappy, miserable, made him a complete dope, a social pariah for all these years. And at the end of thirty—five minutes or something like that—obviously something like this should take a long time, you see? At the end of

thirty—five minutes it might have—be—it might just have blown up. But if the auditor had estimated that it was a long, serious problem, the auditor can keep chipping away at it for the next twenty hours. Of course, he is making no progress at all on the case because he is making the pc pull back things that have went. He doesn't recognize the ease with which this basic auditing comm cycle can actually blow something. So you're always having him ask about things that have blown. Quite common.

Now, an auditor gets so fixated (this is the other side of the coin) on having them all blow easily that once in a while he runs into a brick wall of: it didn't. And it's just like stepping for the step, you see? You know, you're at the bottom of the stairs and you try to go down one more step. And it is with a terrible shock that you hit the landing with your foot, you see? A misestimation, you know? "Oh, we figured this all out and we got it all out and we ran all this thing all out and *uhhheei!* Still worried about it."

What happened? Well, what happened there is that you happened—you see, all these little symptoms of existence can fall into two categories: Those that are floating loose and fancy free and those that have got roots. So the pc's upsets and phobias are not always rooted.

Unlike Freudian assumptions, you do not have to assume that the reason he is fond of eating with his spoon rather than his fork—you do not have to assume that this grows roots clear to the center of the earth. You don't have to assume that at all. Those roots might go no deeper, you see, than a slight personal preference based on an idiosyncrasy he made up his mind with in the army. See, that's just nothing, see. Doesn't have any depth. There's no depth there. It's like trying to jump into a one—inch—deep swimming pool, see? And you try to go any deeper than that and you are in for an awful thud, because there is nothing deeper, see? So, you might say that it isn't any precise percentage, but a large percentage of these things that worry people have no roots. They aren't deeply rooted in the ub—conscious re—conscious, you understand? They're—just don't go down to the center of the earth.

And then there are a few subjects and items, the display of which in this lifetime is just a little flag. It's just a little flag. And boy, you pick up this little flag. You think, well, it is just—just like everything else and you all of a sudden pick up this little flag, you know. You thought you were catching minnows, you know? And boy, you got a whale on the other end of it and he's anchored right to the bottom of the ocean. You move that flag and it is you that moved, not the flag. It is a little telltale. This thing goes clear to China, see? We don't know what happened here. Every once in a while an auditor will hit one of these things which is simply a symptom of some very, very fundamental, deep—lying mass and significance in the case. And of course, it just doesn't shake.

This is about the only thing that ever gets in the road of clearing. You go along the line pocketa—pocketa—pocketa. Everything's fine! *Tra—da, ta—da, ta—da, tra—da, tra—da, tra—da, tra—da, tra—da!* All of a sudden, why, you're going to get rid of his lumbosis too,

see? And I'll show you exactly where you make the mistake. You take something which has no needle reaction or TA blowdown, but which is obvious and visible—but which doesn't respond on the meter—and all these little flags bear that characteristic. "Now, your lumbosis, now. . ." And that is just one smooth, uninterrupted rise. "Your lumbosis now. Has that gotten worse or better in the last few weeks?" Just one long, uninterrupted rise. There is not the least quiver on that needle on the subject of lumbosis and there is not the least blowdown on the part of that tone arm. And all the pc tells you—he has lumbosis and he knows he has lumbosis and he could discuss lumbosis for quite some time. Your TA just sits there and does absolutely nothing and your needle does not respond in any way, shape or form. It's an obvious manifestation. The guy *does* have lumbosis, see? This is obvious. And it does not respond on the meter. Therefore, it goes all the way to China.

And the more you talk about it, the more trouble you are going to get into. Because if you force the pc into a recognition of the reality of that condition—you pin him, instantly and at once, to his most fundamental bank. Just like that. It's very, very interesting. You could take somebody who has no manifestation about it. He is not—his wife is going to leave him tomorrow. You can't get him interested in the subject.

You see, the auditor in each one of these cases where the auditor picks up this flag that goes all the way to China—it's going to be the *auditor* who recognizes it. It's going to be the auditor who puts in time on it. It's going to be the *auditor* who tries to force forward the reality of the situation on the pc. It's the *auditor* who is doing it, it's the auditor who is perceiving it, the auditor who is doing it and it is not cooperated with by the pc except to the extent that the pc will answer the auditor's questions.

In other words, you've got an unreal subject. Fellow walks in—fellow walks in and he's got a papier-mâché head, you know? You don't say, "How are you Mr. Jones? How are you feeling today.? What's on your mind? What you worried about today?" or something. You would have to make this kind of a goof. "Hey, we're going to audit this papier-mâché head," see? Now, if that papier-mâché head had no rise or fall, no speeded rise, no speeded fall, no RRs, no drops, no TA blowdowns—nothing with relationship to it. Yes, that's wrong with him but it goes all the way to China. You are dealing with something there which is below any ability this pc has to perceive. You can see it. He can't. He probably looks in the mi—in the mirror every morning and sees a regular head. You have to evaluate the importance of the thing for the pc. You have to force the thing into existence. And by the time you have done that, you can actually push a case all around and mess it all up and you can bog the case down so that it won't get tone arm action. You're not giving him anything he can as—is, so he isn't going to have any victories. You are giving him something that is totally unreal to him. Why is it totally unreal? Well, it's just too deep, too fundamental, too far gone. It's—he's not about to have any recognition of it.

The main danger there is the auditor deciding what is wrong with the pc and then auditing it. That is the main sin. Now, if you—if the auditor decides what is wrong with the pc and then audits it, it very well may be what is wrong with the pc. It may sometimes be that the auditor can change this with the pc. That can happen too, see, once in a blue moon. But the pc will never find out about it and will be rather resentful and you won't have as—ised any cage. The only cage the pc can as—is is the one he's aware of. He can't as—is any other cage. And you're dependent upon the ability of the pc to as—is. Now, if you're dependent on the pc's ability to as—is, then you had better depend on auditing what the pc can as—is. Elementary.

Now, you can force the pc into all sorts of wild, oddball, physical manifestations this way. I can just see lines of people walking into the psychoanalytic laboratories without limps, and walking out on crutches. I can just see lines of them doing it. Because they specialize in this. They arrive at this through testing. This is why we don't put very much pressure on testing. It's why—we could learn a lot from testing, but we don't really bother to, you understand?

This is where testing dead—ends. You can read deeper into the psyche than the pc can as—is. That's something to remember when you come up against tests. So therefore, little, light, shallow tests are far better than deep, deep, fundamental tests.

There might even be something to a Rorschach. See, there might even be something to it, rather than the old—it actually started as a kid's game, you know, it's the kid's inkblot game. You spill some ink on a piece of paper and fold it together and display it out and ask the other kid what it is, you see? It's a kindergarten game. And everybody got very fundamental. And they found out that you could read various deep and connotations—and you found out—they found out that various psychologically disoriented psycho—drams would occur in these things, see? And they coordinated it up empirically against a tremendous number of neurotic and insane persons. And they found out there's some coordinations in this. Then they could lay out one of these Rorschachs in front of people and get the person's reaction to it and then they could evaluate the test. And they could say, "This is what is wrong with you."

Now, look how that operates with the one I am just talking about. The guy very often sits there and says, "That's what is wrong with me." It is beyond his ability to as—is. What you have done is restimulate him without any hope of destimulating it. You—in other words, you could force him to assume the characteristics and dimensions of this neurosis or psychosis. That operation could be put under the heading, "This is how to be nuts, taught cheap," see?

A meter has only this value—that it is at the level of reality of the pc. If it reads on the meter, it has the potential of being real to the preclear. If it does not read on the meter, either it is totally suppressed or it's unreal to the pc. That's the end and short of it. Therefore, this

meter is rather beautiful to that regard, in that it can sort out things that the pc can find are real to him.

We take—we take a meter. Let's take an assessment level operation at Level IV. We say on this meter, we say, "Grandma, mother, wife, aunt," and so forth. Flinck—a little tick there and so forth. Now, if we want to be real Swami Gambola, you see, with the complete turban and the Woolworth ruby, all we would have to do is say, "We find that the realest person in your family was your aunt."

He'd say, "Oh, true, true, true." See? That coordinates instantly and at once, you see?

"You had—You had certain interpersonal relations with your aunt."

"Oh, yes, yes, she used to talk to me all the time and so forth."

You understand, that's assessment for reality. See, you just name off his family members. One of them falls, you just say, "That's the realest person to you." Doesn't matter whether they're the maddest at him, see, or *what* the interpersonal relationship is between him and this person. We know his mind is on that person and we know that he can have a reality on that person. Therefore we know what he can as—is about his family. He can as—is sections relating to that person. And by the time he has got unpinned off of that, we could say the whole family over to him again and this time it would be Grandmama. And suddenly and mysteriously we would have a lot of things of reality about Grandmama. And he all of a sudden can as—is those. And we say all over to him again all the family names. And now we have Papa. Ah, great, because he now can as—is something about Papa, who he dramatizes all the time.

But supposing we had gone about it this way, much more intricately: "Now, you fill out this paper of your characteristics of the ideal person, the ideal villain, the—what—what novels you read most, what type of tobacco you have. Now, here is another piece of paper. What are the types of tobacco and the reading habits of each family member," and so forth. And you say, "Well, you're—you're actually dramatizing your father."

He'd say, "This is a disaster—horrible!" And he would go off all beaten down, see, and develop all of Papa's ills.

See, it's just on this little simple trick of what can you do with a pc? Well, you can do with a pc what is real to the pc. You can as—is in a pc what the pc has a reality on. And having as—ised it, you have a little more cage taken apart so he can see a little bit further so you can find something new for him to have a reality on. And you can as—is that. And it's just a progressive line of taking down the cage. But you try to take down the moat while he is still in the deepest dungeon, he could very easily drown without even coming near the moat, don't you see? "I am suffering asphyxiation and I don't know why." Well, you are taking down the moat!

“Well, go on. You know all about the moat. Yes, yes. The moat’s green, scummy water and so forth. Now get the idea of being—drowning in green, scummy water.” And don’t blame me if you find your pc sitting there stone—dead in the chair and the diagnosis is that he drowned!

This is what is known as running somebody—we have a lot of little, careless phrases that go by, describes this—running somebody above their level of reality. These are usually very glib. But they have a tremendous fundamental truth back of all these things.

Therefore, the auditor who sits there and audits a pc in some other frame of reference than the pc—being able to recognize where the pc is and audit him on things the pc can have a reality on—the auditor who audits that way wins. The auditor who doesn’t audit that way loses. That’s the magic of auditing. That’s the magical trick. Now, you could do almost anything with a pc—almost anything—if you know these little things, you see? I don’t care what process you are running. Processes are important, because they tell you how to get to these points of reality.

Now everybody, unless he is stone—dead and long gone, everybody has some reality on some level of A, some level of R, some level of C. So we find processes which are based on A, R, and C interpret with the wildest variability with the pc, but yet hit some level of recognizability in the pc.

You say, “Who do you like?”

“Oh, I—I like Joe.” Now, what does he mean when he said he liked Joe? The semantics of the situation are, is he is fond of Joe. But he isn’t answering that way at all. A little bit later he is telling you he is really apathetic about Joe. He keeps reinterpreting what his emotional reactions are on the A line. Quite interesting.

“What is real in this room?” is probably one of the most nebulous questions ever asked. The auditor doesn’t recognize it as a nebulous question. The pc walks over—all the performances—the question seems direct, all the performances seem very direct—the pc walks over and he picks up that wire over there, that white wire, and he says, “That is very, very, very real.” I don’t know what he means. But it means that he can recognize a white wire. I don’t know what he means. I *don’t* even know what he means when he says he can recognize it. But it means that—to me, for the benefit of just the process itself—that he can see it, recognize it and direct his attention to it. Great. That is all I am asking. I don’t care what else he means. It is nothing to me.

See, “Look around here and find something that is really real to you.” Oh, it’s an interesting question. What goes on in the pc’s head when he answers that question? Wow.

Now, beware of the pc when you are running processes like that, who just glibly ticks off everything (and you know he is in a bad state) but he can just tick off everything: “What is

really real to me? Well, the carpet is really real to me, the roof is really real to me and the beams are really real to me and the walls are really real to me and the windows are really real to me and everything is really real to me, wha rrrr—rrra—mm—mmm—mmm everything's all really real to me and everything's all. . .”

I'd conclude about that time that I was several stratospheres above where I ought to be running. Because one of two things will happen: Either his havingness will increase and he'll be getting tone arm action—he'll be getting quite a bit of tone arm action, if he—if he's that good on reality. Why, just the fact that he is shifting his eyeballs and looking around and getting havingness and so forth is going to shift his tone arm around, you see? This guy must be a whiz—bang. See, he is going to get tone arm action, he is going to get needle reaction. Yes, it's real, see? Needle action, a bit of tone arm action, tells him, yes, that's true: The carpet is really real to him, the beams are really real to him, the walls are really ... It's reacting here on the tone arm, see, on the needle, see? That's true.

But the case that always got the auditor in trouble was the person who had 8—C completely flat. Run it off a mile a minute and never from the time they started it on would they ever get a twitch or a flick on that unless it was caused by a body motion. They suddenly jump up in the chair and sit down again and you see the needle move. See? But the action of running these things off, you know, talking about this or that one, produced no reaction on the meter and produced no tone arm reaction. No wonder they could be so glib. They're going through some kind of a circuitry response. They're not there. They have been educated into naming of objects in areas or something and they don't have anything to do with it. And they can just, you know—has nothing to do with them—too—doo, *too—doo*, *too—too—doo!* Not even in the universe—ta—da—ta—da—ta—da—ta—da! “Nothing worries me! I'm perfectly free as a bird, sitting down in the middle of this rock.”

And they haven't any recognition of location or position or anything else. They're disoriented. And you'll find out a great many insane people—not describing—this case I just described to you is not even an insane person, not even neurotic. You'll find a lot of people are in that condition, though. They're pretty bad—pretty bad off. You find out they have a lot of psychosomatic ills which they don't know they have. They have a headache all the time. As you're auditing the case you suddenly (quote) “turn on a somatic.” Hell, you never turned on the somatic. You turned on the awareness of the existing somatic. The person is now aware that their head aches. If they thought of it a little while, their headache really ached yesterday and the day before and it's been aching for a long time. But they are up to an awareness of the fact they had a headache.

All kinds of awareness shifts take place here and you get reactions, very often, which are not the same as they are advertised. You pull a mass in on a pc one way or the other and he gets a headache, see? All right, the auditing brought in a headache and the auditing will move the headache on out again, eventually, unless it's some upside—down process like, “What

problem could you solve? Thank you. What problem could you solve? Thank you.” You know, that’s one of the most remarkable processes. That led us into RIC. It’s many years old. And if you ask a pc that—if you ask a pc that question, “What problem could you solve? What problem could you solve? What problem could you solve? What problem could you solve?” You can very often see a mass moving in on him. “What problem could you solve?” and this is closer. “What problem could you solve?” see, and he answers and again—and it’s closer.

This is very amusing, because you can turn this thing around and head it out the other direction. You just say, “Think of a problem. Think of a problem. Think of a problem. Think of a problem. Think of a problem.” And it has gone over the hill and far ... Now you could turn around and say, “What problem could you solve?” and it turns right back. It’s quite an amusing exercise in masses. If a pc can perceive masses, he can watch this happen.

So, when you are looking at a pc and processing a pc, see the pc in regard to what the pc can see, not what you can see. But learn to look at a pc from the point of view of what the pc can see. Don’t, then, bother to limit your own vision, see? But recognize that there may be a difference here. PC can see something and you can see something else. Actually it would be perfectly factual, because you’re in two different locations and space is a viewpoint of dimension—you would of course see different things.

But the point is, is the pc can as—is what is real to the pc or what he can see, what he can know, what he can perceive, what he can cotton on to. And actually, he can’t do any more than that. Now, after he has perceived something, unless it is one of these deep—rooted things, the chances are it’s gone. And the auditor is very stupid indeed if he thinks he has got to go on auditing it after it went. Because the pc will get very upset because you are now auditing nothing. And a pc will get very upset about this after a while. “What about dogs? What about dogs? What about dogs? What about dogs?”

And finally the pc said, “Yep, yep, dogs, yeah, dogs, dogs. Been terrified of dogs,” see, something like that.

He told you, you know, he is afraid of dogs. “Well, what about dogs? What about dogs? What about dogs? What about dogs? What about dogs?” I don’t care. It’s just a process see—off the bat, see? “What about dogs? What about dogs? What about dogs?” See?

All right, and he eventually looks at you and sort of—“Yeah,” he said, “well, that’s the point. What about dogs?”

Now, unless the auditor can perceive that he has now changed the pc’s point of view with relationship to dogs by the process of as—ising the pc’s fears and solutions to dogs—as—ised the pc’s reaction to dogs—unless the auditor can also perceive that the pc has changed, in other words—then the auditor will go on trying to audit out what he has audited out. And he can park a case.

The auditor's ability to estimate, then, what he has as—ised, is part and parcel to the creation of an effect on a pc. You have got to know what you have taken care of and therefore you have to know how it is taken care of. It is taken care of by being perceived and as—ised and that is the only way it is taken care of—perceived and as—ised.

You ask the pc to look at something you know he can look at, he looks at it and he as—ises it. And that's the end product of auditing. I don't care whether you're doing Class VI or Class I—the action is the same. And that is how auditing works and that is the effect which the auditor creates on the pc. And that's how he creates the effect on the pc. That's the only way he does.

An auditor that doesn't know how auditing works and doesn't know why auditing works will commit several other sins. Amongst them is to address subjects that are not real to the pc. Another one is to run what has been run out. Another one is to—not to flatten what he has begun to as—is. These are the various crimes that the auditor can omit—can commit with his comm cycle.

So in the final analysis, an auditor who knows how auditing works and why auditing works never really gets in much of a bind. He never gets into much of an upset. I myself have had some gorgeous crashes on this particular line, as one would have with magnitude in research work. You work it—because in this case you are always evaluating what is wrong with the case from the viewpoint of research so that you can add up the principles involved. Don't you see? So you're always looking for this sort of thing. So, you're always wishing off on cases something that is wrong with them, in order to find out if it is. And I learned this the hard way very, very early.

But I never—I never would—would—I am perfectly willing to give up a theory. A theory to me is not very valuable. I can invent lots of theories, see. In most fields of science a theory is so precious that it has to be set in jewels and gems. And all one's work is involved—is in setting up a theory. And having set up this theory, all the rest of the work is put in on asserting that it is right. See, there isn't any further action taken with the theory than those things. That is quite common in the field of science and research. Always gone on the basis there's always lots of theories. If this one doesn't work, there's always another one.

Nevertheless, every once in a while you still will get a favorite theory. You'll get something that is very favored. You see, and you go down the line and you say, "There are this number of potentials with regard to this case," and so forth and you say, "Isn't that a nice one?" you know? "Isn't that particular one—number 3 there—isn't that nice?" you say. "That would be real, real cute you see, if that is the right one," you know. So you start processing the pc and you favor number 3. You see, you weight number 3 heavily. The pc just sits there looking blankly at you, you know, his eyes sort of cloudy and so forth.

You feel like saying to him, “Hey, isn’t this a wonderful theory? I mean, you know—what—what’s—what—what’s added up there about—about what I’ve cognited for you on—on your difficulty with spinach.” You see? And—and—and so forth, and then, “Hey, hey, you know. Isn’t that we—wonderful.”

Sits there, his eyes cloudier. And all of a sudden, he says, “You know, that second one that you mentioned there,” he says, “that—that makes some sense—with a little change, that makes some sense.”

The second one? Hell, you didn’t care anything about the second one, see? He goes on and embroiders number 2 and then all of a sudden you arrive at number 4, which is the correct one, don’t you see, that he can as—is and has got a good reality on. “Oh yeah, that’s it.” You know, and it always leaves a bad taste in your mouth, see. He got well on the wrong process! Awful upsetting. So I know what you’re up against.

You always—you always will have these interesting theories. For heaven’s sakes, don’t stop having them. “I know what’s wrong with that guy,” and so on. Remember, it isn’t your brightness that is held in question. It’s the pc’s perceptive abilities. And the pc—it isn’t real to the pc; something else is real to the pc about this sort of a thing. Well, don’t try, then, to get the pc to as—is your concept of it because that isn’t there to be as—ised. What is there to be as—ised is his concept of it. And he also may have a much shallower concept and sometimes surprise you by having a much deeper concept of reality than is being granted by the auditor.

So it’s within these variabilities that you can bring a case out of the soup and so forth. The odd part of it is, the world is artificially and the universe is artificially divided into the constructive and the destructive. When you get way up topside, there is only the free. And you’ve actually escaped these two things. You can see that it—with an individual, the most constructive action that you can take with the individual would be to bring the individual into an ability, himself, to create and handle his own problems and situations, see. That is an ultimate.

Now that, of course, takes care of the other factor, because what would be the ultimate in destruction? Would be the disappearance of the traps and pitfalls that lay in his path. So you’re actually not, when you come right down to it, doing a one—sided job. It only appears you are. You go off into this other destructive action toward a pc only when he appears not to as—is properly to suit you. See? And that swings you down from your Olympian height of being able to cover all sides of action, you see? The ultimate in destruction, of course, is *the—whew!* Gone! You see? And the ultimate in construction, when you are dealing with a human being and when you are dealing with a person or a spirit and so forth, is to bring it about so you say, “*Phew*” and the individual himself can create. Those are very Olympian actions, I assure you.

And when you lose on those things, through your lack of understanding or bad luck or any other reason, why, you tend to drop down into the artificial segmentation of life into a constructive sphere and the 50 percent destructive sphere. And you start slapping back at the pc and you start creating men out of clay and you start doing all kinds of wild things. And just recognize that when you are reacting reactively to the pc, that you have dropped down from an ideal auditing action and have stepped into a nice, fat dramatization on your own part. Just get yourself by the scruff of the neck and say, “Hey, I must have slipped, because I am dramatizing,” and you will bring yourself right back up scale again.

Auditing, in its most fundamental approach, is basically simple, because it evades, by undermining, all the complexities of life. You are not now trying to dream up a solution comparable to the problems this bloke has got. That’s true about life, but it’s not true about auditing. You are pulling the rug out from underneath his problems because you’ve got the answer to why they become problems in the first place.

You know how he got into the cage. Like you take a—you take an old smoothie on Sec Checking. And he can go back down the line, pocketa—pocketa—pocketa, find the original overt, take that thing apart and the whole chain just goes *brrrrrzzzzzzz!* And the most complicated set of problems that you ever heard of just blow right off on that particular subject. He just fishes out and so forth. Sometimes the reverse will be found. He imagined he had a problem which he didn’t have or imagined he had an overt which he didn’t have or something. That can be uncovered, too.

But you’re pulling the string which unties the sugar sack and that’s rather interesting. Otherwise it would be so complex that nobody could ever have anything to do with it. You could never do anything with it.

Auditing would have to be as complicated as life if auditing were a solution to life. And fortunately, it isn’t a solution to life. It’s an as—isness of the less desirable parts of existence.

Now, all you have to do is know this one approach of what you are trying to deliver to the pc and you will be able to pull it off every time, rather simply.

Thank you.