

ACC TRAINING PROCEDURE - QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

A lecture given on 18 July 1958

[Based on the clearsound version only.]

How many expect to be there at the end of today? Okay. How about it, Instructors?

Male voice: Yep.

How many people are you going to have left in the TRs at the end of this week?

Male voice: They're all out.

How many people are going to go back in, I should have said?

Male voice: Sixty or zero.

Either one, huh?

Male voice: I don't know.

All right. We're not above throwing you back into the TRs.

Male voice: That's right.

So don't feel too complacent at having gotten out of it. All you've got to do is put your spine into a corkscrew shape, confront with your right shoelace and not correct it three or four times when asked to do so and you'll have had it!

Why? Because obviously, obviously auditing or auditing positions are uncomfortable to you. It's not punishment. We're trying to groove you down.

You'd be surprised what a joy it is to somebody or some group, somebody who knows nothing about it at all, to watch a good auditor, a good pro, at work with a pre-clear. I'm always amazed at how a totally strange group of people - unless they've got some nut in their midst who is restimulated or something of the sort - will sit around

and how quiet they will be and for how long, observing a rather inconsequential session. Have you ever noticed this?

Audience: Yes.

Yeah.

Well, what they're impressed by, although they are apparently interested in the replies of the preclear - what they're really impressed by is the professional attitude of the auditor and how he goes about his work and his thoroughness and efficiency in the whole thing. That impresses the living daylights out of them. But it impresses them to such a degree they don't even look at it. No more than your preclear looks at it. He sort of takes it for granted sort of thing. And the better it is the more he takes it for granted. The more natural or real or the way it should be it seems to them, you know?

And I ran into this first, by the way, just before the first book was published. I had my first surprise about this sort of thing.

I was invited up to an apartment in New York City where there were several bigwigs of one kind or another. You know, people who are prominent, newspaper syndicate features and that sort of thing, and they were there, and in the arts. And it was just a party. And somebody got me talking about Dianetics. And somebody persuaded me to run an engram on somebody. So I picked out a likely subject and threw him down on the couch, you know, and proceeded to run an engram.

It turned out to be one of the more vicious engrams I could have selected. And although it wasn't terribly dramatic from a standpoint of agony and pain, there was quite a bit of comm lag mixed up in it, you know? The fellow was pretty anaten, pretty fogged out as he was running it. But it wasn't a prenatal or birth or something that you would consider a headline attraction, you know? It was just something stupid like a tonsillectomy or something like that, you know?

And by golly, all these people sat there in the room watching this and for about two hours and a half, why, a pin drop would have scared them half to death. This was very interesting to me and I had to take a look at this, you know? What I was doing was not very interesting from a standpoint of a performance. And what the preclear was doing - the preclear wasn't being very interesting either - compared to preclears I had audited.

If it gets too dramatic you can expect the group, perhaps, to dramatize. That will occasionally occur. It occurred one time at 42 Aberdeen Road. After we left the address, 42 Aberdeen Road, the owner of the property had moved back into it, and some auditor decided that he had better go over and tell them something about Dianetics, smooth them out somehow or other. They were upset because the property had so many people in it. It was just my home, you see? The property had had an awful lot of people in it. They hadn't wrecked it or messed it up.

So this auditor starts to show them what Dianetics was all about, and threw the husband of the family back into birth and ran it. Got about halfway through and the fellow was going into convulsions and so forth and having a perfectly wonderful time.

At which time the wife and about three or four of the friends there begged the auditor to stop and practically threw him out of the house and got down, „*Oh, my poor, dear friend!*“ you know, and all that sort of a thing to this guy that was halfway through birth.

We never heard the end of this, and we don't know what happened to the fellow after that, you know? We haven't a clue. I imagine he had colds and things for a few weeks. They usually settle out in ten days at the most.

But here was a case of a really dramatic show. Big show. Well, it was too much for that particular audience.

Now, I've put on some rather quiet shows. Like, you know, I'd just sit down and audit somebody on ARC Straightwire. And I swear people sit around by the hour watching me run ARC Straightwire. And you've had the same experience, I'm sure, running some rather mild process on somebody and having other people sit there just as attentive and just as interested in what was going on. Fascinating. Every once in a while one of them answer one of the commands to themselves.

Well, all I'm trying to point up is what their attention is really on. Their attention is on your perfection in the TRs. And the more perfect you are and the better easy-command-of-the-situation show you put on, why, the better and more intense their interest is. It's quite interesting.

So good auditing occurs when it occurs. You give good TRs with good intention, running along the line, with good interest in the preclear, running sufficiently easily so that there's no apparent strain anywhere in the environment on the thing, and boy, you've got it made as far as the preclear's concerned. And the test of it, of course, is that an audience, a number of other people in the room, will watch you with great fascination; watch what's happening.

All right. This is your period, not mine. What questions do you have? Yes, Adele?

Female voice: What do we do if we've begun running present time problems on chronic conditions? Drop them?

Present time problem on a chronic condition. Well, you have no business running a present time problem on a chronic condition for this reason: A present time problem process, of course, is what it is: „*What part of that problem could you be responsible for?*“ And you should bridge it over as rapidly as possible into one that will produce an effect. And then, watch out, because you're generally running right straight on the Rock.

I haven't taken up Rocks very much. But Rocks have tabs on them that stick out in plain sight. And one of them is a chronic condition.

Female voice: What if it's already produced an effect in somatics?

It's all right. You've got to flatten it. You understand that, „*What part of that limb (or something or other) could you be responsible for?*“ isn't a - I trust you were not saying, „*What part of that problem could you be responsible for?*“ You're undoubtedly saying, „*What part of that limb could you be responsible for?*“

Female voice: We're using „*that problem.*“

Hm?

Female voice: We're using „*that problem.*“

That problem. Well, it isn't a problem - which is putting a lie into the session the whole distance. You just better slip it right over to „*that terminal.*“

But this thing producing effects, producing somatics, and so forth, the general rule is that when a process is producing change you continue to run it. So I think that short of disastrous occurrence of some kind or another, you would have to go on and flatten that and then get off of it as rapidly as possible. And then come back to it with its proper process which is Help.

Female voice: Thank you.

Answer the question?

Female voice: Thank you.

All right. Yes?

Male voice: Ron, what's happened to the old, „*Build a future,*“ as far as goals are concerned? Does that take too long or something?

I said there's a Goals Process. Of course, that is it.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

On actual test - on actual test against profiles, the process run does not produce as much gain as the other processes you will run, and actually doesn't change the person's goals as fast as other processes. So it is merely - it's a good process, it just happens to be weaker than what you can do.

Speaking of old processes, you'll be interested to know that - first day, I think, of this last congress, why, the head of the Kansas City group fell off a roof and broke his back. And they - family hastily sent Nile and Mary a wire to please come back and do something. And Nile came up and saw me and I asked him whether or not they had anybody there that could do anything. And yes, there was somebody there that could do anything. So I just told him to have this person run some Havingness on the fellow if he could, you know. And then to go back after the congress. Well Mary went back after the congress. She just got back to town and she's got this fellow with feeling in his legs and got him on the road, got his temperature down, got him squared around. He's living. He's also taking his work - his office work - is being brought in to him so he can do it in the hospital. And then he's bound and determined now that he will get on a plane as soon as he can and come in to the HGC and get some intensives and get this broken back straightened out.

All right. Now, she ran out of and pretty well flattened a couple of processes that I gave Nile, which were fairly standard processes, you know? Some Havingness and I think it was „*Invent - invent a person with a broken back and what problem he could pose.*“ I think that was it. And she ran these pretty flat; she didn't know where to go then. She

picked up the old one: „*What could you change?*“ and „*What could you leave unchanged?*“ Well, that's way off the track and way from behind, but it's still a good, powerful process. And this one, for heaven's sakes, shook out his evident goals. See? And his goals were - he was so busy; he wanted to come back to the HGC. I'd offered him some auditing and he wanted to come back to the HGC, but he couldn't because of his family commitments and his business and all of that sort of thing, so he fell off a roof and broke his back. Isn't this - isn't this wild? That's what Mary reported on the thing, at least. But anyway, he's in much better shape.

But here's your goals. Now, there's goals shaking out of an old-time standby - still good.

Male voice: One further point on that, Ron. When you get the preclear to establish a goal, I usually find it's a good policy to establish whether it's real to the preclear that he or she can work towards this in the session.

That's all part of the chitter-chat.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

That's right. That's adding the certainty.

Male voice: Good.

You'll find - you'll find that goals become pointless if you don't check them at session end.

Male voice: Uh-huh.

So you're stuck with remembering what the preclear's goal was for that session, and whether he made it or not, checking whether or not he at least accomplished something toward it. And this puts time on the auditing time track.

Male voice: Uh-huh. Yes.

There are many ways that you can run goals, is what I was trying to say with all this dissertation about this chap. There are many ways that you could run goals. There are many ways that you could arrive at goals. And in the final analysis if a person doesn't have some goals and if you don't treat it one way or the other, he probably will just miss some large percentage of his auditing benefit. It's a catalyst rather than a process.

Male voice: Yeah. I see.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, I was one of the fortunate people who stayed back and had another two days to look at the TRs.

Oh, yeah? Good.

Female voice: And I found something very interesting: That a coach if he promoted terrific ARC with you could flunk you hardest, fastest and best. But if there wasn't any or very much ARC, you could beat him pretty near every time. I found that very interesting.

That's a very interesting observation.

What other questions are there?

Yes, Rick?

Male voice: Could you consider affinity as willingness to confront?

That could be part of infinity - affinity. „*Willingness to be*“ is a better definition.

Male voice: Thank you.

You bet. Yes?

Male voice: Would you define problem?

Problem. Postulate-counter-postulate. Terminal-counter-terminal. An unresolved and opposed set of considerations would define a problem. A problem is relatively un-computable when first viewed and it is not computable as long as it remains in perfect balance. Some other factors or considerations must be added or subtracted from a problem that is a real killer as a problem before the thing resolves.

And the way you unbalance a problem is quite interesting. It is a problem as long as postulate-counter-postulate apparently has equal and opposite postulate force, you see? So that - well, I'll give you one; I'll give you one right straight off my case. I seldom use my case. Scarce. Valuable.

It's been my consideration for a long time that individuals most failed in the research in the field of the mind when they predicated everything they were doing on their cases only and never found out whether or not there was anything else in the universe. And so I try not to do it. But this one - this one is amusing to me because I never saw such a complete this-met-that and neither one of them had any difference of weight and they were both totally opposed.

And this was the problem: If you trained somebody to use a sword, he would undoubtedly use a sword and get himself knocked off. If you trained somebody to be a scholar and a man of peace, he would undoubtedly run into somebody with a sword and get knocked off.

And we used to have a saying in France: The value of a cassock and a cross against wolves was that they marked where the body had been devoured. Wolves will not eat brass or linen.

Now, there was a hell of a problem, if you look this thing over. You made this fellow a man of peace and, of course, he never would become involved with the upsets and so on of combat and swordsmanship and valiance and chivalry and all of this sort of thing; he'd never have anything to do with that. So, therefore, apparently he would be safe, but he wouldn't be safe. But if you trained him to a sword, of course you were training him to an inevitable death. And these two things were totally counter-opposed. Whether sensibly or not, that was another thing, see? But they were totally counter-opposed.

I looked at these things and it just didn't, you know, didn't compute. The question, then, every time I'd evidently trained a boy or a son or a person, you know, this question would come up. And it was always a disappointing answer because you knew the end product of the answer. Either way you answered it, why, he was dead. And so it was in those wild times, you see? And it had evidently been going along - I'd evidently had that thing just generation after generation after generation, see, just riding along. The ethical, moral responsibility of training. That's all it - all it's conceived itself to surround.

Naturally the answer to it is terribly simple, which fell out of the hamper on the next three or four auditing questions. Just bang. The answer to it's rather obvious. But because some of you may have the problem I won't bother to answer it.

A problem is composed of factors which are apparently - underscore apparently - unreconcilable. Apparently, you see? You have two truths of comparable magnitude which contradict each other. And there is the general run of problems.

Yes?

Male voice: One more point. How would you apply this with a preclear? Would you get him to get some understanding of this?

Well, that comes under the definition of the problem. We're going to take that up some more - next lecture. Defining the problem. Every few commands you should get him to define the problem, and the next thing you know the problem falls apart. But if you don't get him to define the problem and you just keep using the word problem, why, he's liable to drift off onto other problems, or all kinds of vagaries occur.

Male voice: So, you'd...

Yes. So you'd get the problem redefined several times.

Yes?

Female voice: Ron, this thing you mentioned now - if you're running a present time problem and this gets started on a chain into the past and you hit the Rock or very near the Rock and...

Which you will.

Female voice:... which we have, yes.

Which you will.

Female voice: Yeah. All right.

No, if you overrun it, you will.

Female voice: Yes. But then what are you going to do if „*What part of that problem could you be responsible for?*“ cannot possibly handle the huge, big condition, situation half-way...

All right. I've got that taped fortunately.

Female voice: Yes. But are we going to sit and do ARC drills?

Now, wait a minute. I'm going to - I'm going to show you - I'm going to show you where this thing is taped and you will see that it is taped.

Female voice: Yeah.

Getting him to define the problem handles it. This will occur every time a little auditing error is made. Things don't become a problem to people unless they have been a problem to people, you might say, at this late stage of a case. So you always can count on the fact that if you overrun a problem or do this little thing wrong, you will always go back into the past with the problem.

And that is, you make him define his terminals of this problem. Then you make him define the problem often and the terminals some more. You got this? Now, this continues his attention on the physical universe aspect of this. And you thank him very much and acknowledge the living daylights out of him every time this reminds him of anything. And you don't let him get reminded. You might say you forcefully keep him boosted into PT.

And there are several mechanisms. First of these mechanisms is to get the terminals defined, of the problem. What are the terminals involved?

Now take the ethical, moral training problem I just gave you, see, as an actual one that I did find myself on my own case. All right. Now, don't think for a moment that this wouldn't underlie any PT problem that had to do with training. You get the idea? To some slight degree any modern training problem would be a lock on this thing. So all an auditor would have to do, would be to let me wander in a session that way, slightly into the past and get reminded of something, without acknowledging it within an inch of my life, and I would have been right straight back into the time this problem occurred, which was 1125.

Now the next thing is to get him to define the problem often as you run it. *„Now, exactly what is the problem?“* This is the cliché that an auditor uses. See? *„Exactly what is the problem now?“* And he will define it for you once more. Now if he defines it by running into the past, no - *„So what are the terminals involved with this present time problem - this present time problem?“* See? *„What are the terminals involved with it?“*

And he says, *„Well, it's my wife and the chauffeur. And that reminds me..“*

You say, *„Well now, your wife, you say, your wife. Now, what's she look like?“*

„Oh, so-and-so and so-and-so,“ see?

„And the chauffeur, how long has he been working for you? Oh, that's fine. And he's working for you right now or has he left?“ See? Zuuup, see, right up here. And don't let him slip. Don't let him slip. Because every PT problem, if it is a severe PT problem to a person, is based on a chain to which there's a basic. And the command which you're using is purposely a little bit light so that it won't tend to go into the past too far.

Female voice: Well, now, that's fine, but can I just ask something else?

Mm-hm.

Female voice: All right. Well now, number one, how about if this has already occurred and you have the junk around the Rock or something near in restim and you're trying to run this one; and if so, are we going to just try and push this to one side so that we can run a bit of ARC Straightwire drills?

You can always bring a person on up to PT. You can always bring a person up to present time. Communication as a process will bring the person to present time. „*What part of that problem could you be responsible for?*“ if it has drifted into the past, is no more than communicating. It's as-ising some of it, but it is still merely communicating, isn't it?

Female voice: Yeah, if the preclear can answer it. You see, if it is a problem, but if it's a huge messy condition and they are utterly confused.

Well, there's still a part of it he can be responsible for. He may comm lag like mad, but there's still a part of it he can be responsible for. He can still be responsible for having gotten into it in the first place or having sat down in that auditing chair as they'll sometimes tell you bitterly.

Now listen: It's a communication process and therefore cycles just like ARC Straightwire. And if you permitted it to go into the past, it'll cycle back up to the present, and the thing for you to do is grab the brass ring as the present goes by. That's right, see? The present will reoccur again if you watch it, and if you don't two-way comm on the significances of the past with him too much. If you just lay off that luxury and just ask him, you'll find that a problem will cycle just like communication. Got it?

Female voice: Yeah.

It will. You don't believe me. Female voice: Urn - well, I'm the preclear on the subject.

You're the preclear. Well, now, that's responsible for some of this. Now, as you cycle back into this, so you will cycle back out of it again on this particular process, if it is continued to run.

You can leave a person parked all over the time track at end of session, perhaps, if they are going to be run some more. But it would be a serious thing to park a preclear in the past with a communication type process and not bring him up to the present if you weren't going to run it anymore. So, „*Auditing must cease at ten o'clock*“ gets awfully modified by this rule: When do we get him into PT? We've been bringing preclears into PT here now for eight years or more. They should have been in present time. Well, a communication process does bring them back into present time and so does a responsibility process. But they can get awfully messy if they slide off a PT problem and dive for the past and hit something like the Rock. This can get awfully messy and it can get very uncomfortable. So if you're the pc in that particular case, I can understand your concern.

A better one is for the auditor to carefully pick up all these terminals as he goes. He picks up all these terminals. What kind of terminals is this pc talking about all this

time? And you can take advantage out of any auditing situation, no matter how bad. Who's your auditor, by the way?

Female voice: Mauerer. But, Ron, why don't you go straight for the Rock now? Why do we have to do this ARC? If you hit it, why do you have to push it on one side? Do you see?

Because the Rock is not always the basic on which the present time problem is sitting. The present time problem may be sitting only on some side consideration or lock. You can take somebody who has a Rock which is definitely concerned with jewelry and get his car stolen. This will only vaguely associate.

No, there isn't any reason to jump the gun as you'll find in experience that by trying to bypass a PT problem and trying to go for broke right then that you will very often miss. Thoroughly. Because it doesn't take long to clean up a PT problem. It doesn't take very long to clean it up. It either cleans up or it doesn't. And if it doesn't, why, you've got no choice but to clean it up.

Yes.

I know, „*this has got to be done all at once*“ is very, very much the point. But it can't be done all at once. The present time attention of the pc in the auditing room is one of the reasons why past locks come to the surface. The pc's attention is so small on the auditing session that when he hits the Rock with a present time problem in this situation - in restimulation, he can't handle it and he tends to go to pieces. His attention's all split up.

You audit somebody who is tired and his attention is rather poor and you hit something beefy in the case and he just goes wog! And you hit it when he isn't tired and it's, „*So what?*“ Get the idea?

Female voice: Yes.

All right. That answer it a little bit?

Female voice: Yes.

All right.

Yes?

Male voice: You're running the process, „*What part of that problem could you be responsible for?*“

Right.

Male voice: Good. Now, their idea of being responsible for a problem is solving it. I've struck people like this.

All right.

Male voice: Would the process work then or would you have to do more about clearing the command?

Well, it would be in the realm of clearing the command now.

Male voice: Yeah.

Their definition of a problem is an awfully poor definition. There's two - there's two definitions to a problem which are the rougher - the rougher things to handle. I'll give you an actual case on this if you want one. There are two definitions for problem which are the roughest definitions that a pc can have.

One, you have just enumerated. That's not the rougher one, but that's one of them. And that is: A problem is something he has to solve, see?

And the other one is: A problem is something that cannot possibly be solved. Now, if he's got either of these definitions when you're clearing the command, it is allowable to make a dodge on this „*What part of that problem could you be responsible for?*“

Well, actually there are about ten or twelve things you can clear a problem with, you know? Problems of Comparable Magnitude, Problems of Incomparable Magnitude - they are a couple of the older ones. Asking him to communicate with the terminals he's - you know - recall a time when he communicated with the terminals which are involved with this particular problem actually will bust a problem up in a rather gentle sort of way.

But there's a killer on these two definitions. There's one that goes like this: „*Invent a woman. What's her definition for a problem? Thank you.*“ This preclear is a woman, let us say, see. „*Invent a woman. What's her definition for a problem? Invent a woman. What's her definition for a problem?*“ And you'll change the definition for a problem.

Now, I should say something about this. A problem is something that can't run if it has either of these definitions. It's worth knowing. I had a case that hung fire for a year; wasn't my case, particularly - well, I guess, yes, it was. Also somebody else's case, but also my case. And this person had this definition for a problem a year ago. And so about three, four weeks ago I picked up the case again and found out the case hadn't gone anywhere in auditing. Well, if flattening a present time problem can be so violent as to keep a case from moving on an APA, then certainly the definition of problem is something that could hold the whole case up too. Right? Hm? So you get this idea of what is the person's definition for a problem as either something that has to be solved right now - and they can't change this definition - or it's: a problem is something that could never be solved, by definition; then, of course, on the first one you're just going to have him collapsing the problem on himself all the time.

Well, if these definitions don't easily shift, then they're somebody else's definition whose valence he's grabbed hold of. So you've got a terrific misownership on the definition, but a pc who is not capable of shifting ownership by responsibility. You get that?

Audience: Yeah.

All right. So the best way to handle it is to misassign or reassign the ownership of the definition by saying, „*Another person: What's their definition?*“ See? All right. „*Invent another person,*“ and „*What's their definition for a problem?*“ You see, you get this thing over there

and they all of a sudden take ownership or properly assign the ownership of this definition and it just goes poof. And you never saw anything change as fast as the definition for „*problem*“ when run in this particular wise.

Male voice: Is this one case where you do not accept their first clearing of the command to be done, is it?

Well, remember, PT problem is preparation for auditing, not auditing. You wouldn't say this is one case in auditing where you do that. You'd say this is one point in auditing where you've got to have orientation before auditing can occur.

All right. Their whole case is a composite of problems. It would not be a case unless it were a composite of problems. If the person cannot handle problems or if a person has to solve the problems, all of them, or if the person has to totally neglect all of the problems, their case, of course, will not change. So it comes under the heading - it hardly comes under the heading of clearing a command - it comes under the heading of straightening up problems.

Now, there's a nasty trick that you can use on preclears, just comparable to this. I'm glad you've brought this up. I know it makes you feel uneasy to find that there are exceptions to hidebound rules. But you must realize that a problem is a case is a problem; a case is a problem, is problems; and if there's something difficult with this definition of problems completely aside from anything else, Help will shift around to some degree. But you can also run into a case where Help is a way of insulting somebody. And then you audit him on Help for fifteen or twenty commands and you say, „*What is help?*“ and clear the command again and the person says, „*It's a way of insulting somebody.*“ (This, by the way, is a subject of a later lecture. I'll give it to you now because you are running into it on problems.)

You do this same trick. They're misowning a definition for help so wildly that they'd have to get rid of the valence in order to change the definition. Only you can't get up to a process of changing the valence until you change the definition. So there's a way to short-circuit it.

You say, „*Invent a man,*“ (we don't care what he invents - invent a broomstick. Just invent anything - we didn't ask him to mock anything up, we just asked him to invent something, you know, only he usually mocks it up; we don't care) and „*What is its definition of help? Oh, thank you. Good.*“ And „*Invent a broomstick and what is its definition of help? Oh, thank you.*“

And the next thing you know you've come close enough to a proper assignment of ownership of the thing that without having gotten rid of the valence, the definition shifts. And you'll see that doggone definition for the word shift, shift, shift, shift and all of a sudden come up to something that's resolvable at which time you can come off of the process and whip right around and go right back to clearing a PT problem or go right back to running Help or something like that.

The only thing that hangs up a case right now are the significance of these three commands: Creation for Step 6, help for the Help Processes and problem for CCH 0. And we've gotten cases down - this is a terrific thing, you see - we've gotten cases

down to a point where their resolvability depends upon their ability to define these three things. If they can define those three things somewhere and if you can change their definitions of these things when they're wrong and offbeat, why, you can solve the case. And this is about the only thing that keeps a case parked in the existing state is an unchanging definition of these three things.

And we know what makes cases cases: problems, help, creation. See, just those three things. There fortunately isn't anything else. You won't find some other exceptions to it. This is a subject of a later lecture: the cases that do not change. Got it?

You could almost say that you could produce a release simply by clearing these three words. You want to know how some people have accidentally produced a release with great suddenness: they've suddenly cleared or changed a definition on one of these three words.

Okay?

Male voice: Okay.

We're pretty close to the end of this right now. One more question.

Maida?

Female voice: While you were - of continuing discussion of problems in the last few days, the lights sort of went on for me and I'm going to check it out. It seems to me it's relevant in relation to what we've been talking about here. And that is the definition of problem and present time problem, and it really clinched it in the example you gave about this man that fell off a roof in order to come get his processing. And that is the problem - present time problem - is that which the preclear considers that make - renders him helpless. If you're helpless ...

That's very good. That's very smart, Maida. That's very, very smart. I'm impressed. That is smart. It's that which makes the preclear helpless. That's pretty good. We've got somebody among our midst who's got some - who's got some thetan.

Thank you.

Okay. That's the end of it.

Now you know a lot more about auditing than you did. It's always difficult to audit while you're being instructed in auditing. You got that? There are two or three of you, right now, who feel a little bit upset about your auditing, I'm sure, or about your cases. And that could simply be a feeling that you're invalidated on your auditing which makes you less capable of handling cases, don't you see, which could get you into more upset about your private case. You get how this could be? It's always difficult to paint a picture with somebody standing there insisting that you inform him exactly how you mix pigments, what is form - you got the idea?

If you want to ruin an Olympic games athlete for a short time, simply go out and ask him how you hold a discus, what is the stance, how many steps do you take, and bring it all into awareness.

But I'll tell you something. It is that which was not in awareness being brought into awareness which upsets you. Therefore, as it is brought into awareness, you get into the optimum situation of being able, actually, to perform even though you're totally aware. And your Olympic games athlete would become world's champion if he could throw a discus and still consciously go through every part of throwing a discus. You see that?

So the ruination is not forever, so don't despair.

Thank you.

[End of lecture.]