

# MODERN SECURITY CHECKING

A lecture given on  
4 October 1962

Well, this is the what?

*Audience: The 4th. October 4th.*

Four Oct.?

*Audience: Yes.*

You fall into my bad habits. Four Oct. AD 12, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, lecture number one.

A footnote. No, I'll talk to you about it more than a footnote.

For a long, long time we've had dissensions and upsets and casualties and so forth over the past twelve years.

Dianetics and Scientology looked like a battlefield, you know. It's coming out of it. Things are much more even. Things are much more easily handled. Things are smoother, but we still have occasional upsets here and there.

I gave you an HCO Bulletin the other day that had to do with new Security Checks. I'd better talk to you about the use of that bulletin.

The bulletin, of course, is valuable in two directions. One, it points the way to a resolved case and that's the most valuable. And on the other fork of the road, points the way to peace and quiet while we get the cases cleared. And these two directions are highly desirable, but one complements the other.

Now, for a very long time we have tried to find out, very often in vain, what obsessed or ailed somebody or something – what was making them nervous and why they'd suddenly revolt and do things and cut their own throats and that sort of thing. And there are quite a few dead men on the backtrack, quite a few dead men on the backtrack – there really are.

And how'd they get that way? What had happened? Was there any international group that was closely and devotedly opposed to the advance of Dianetics or Scientology? And the answer is no. There are a few psychotic activities around on the planet that would be as antipathetic to the grocer's goodwill as to ours. There would be as many people affected

adversely across the planet as ourselves if some of these happy philosophies were put into terrific use; political philosophies.

There's another one which says anything you have should be – if you are working hard – anything you have should be shared with somebody who won't help you. That's socialism. That's a nutty philosophy. If you work real hard, then somebody else won't have to work. And of course, this is represented as “everybody will have leisure.” Except those, of course, who are keeping the society going and keeping the leisure possible.

Well, this of course is dead in the teeth of even Pavlov. It's the nonreward philosophy, you see. If you work, you are fined and if you loaf, you are rewarded. Well, what will that turn mankind into but a bunch of loafers? You see? I mean if you – if you know Pavlov's philosophy of the reward theories and so forth – how to make the dog slaver at the right times – if man is an animal and if that works, why, this would be death in the teeth of it.

There are political philosophies about, of course, which are the extreme of this. And that is to say that one man should own everything and everybody else should be in total poverty. Now, that philosophy is highly antipathetic to the greater good of the people too.

A capitalistic system where you have a group of fifteen or twenty people in a country... Well, Mexico: They're very rich in Mexico; they're extremely rich. But South American countries just love this philosophy – there's the ricos and the pobres – and boy, the ricos are really rico, and the pobres are mmmmmm – really pobre. And the gap is so tremendous. There's no middle class; there's no anything. And you're either a slave or a king with no gradient scale between them and of course that's a highly false philosophy too.

And there are others. There's a philosophy of democracy, so that the mean opinion is valid. Oh, I don't know, you take a whole bunch of uninformed people and take the mean of their opinion and then say that that mean is valid and therefore disregard it and then do things and tell them it's their fault. That's democracy in actual practice, see.

It's the perfect mechanism to prevent revolt. No better one has ever been invented. It's a self-perpetuating machine that is pure idiocy – an American president – they put up two goons which you wouldn't let clean out your chicken coop – and you're told you're free because you can vote for one or the other of them. And then if everything goes wrong it's your fault. See? It's a great philosophy.

Well frankly, all government, of course, is merely a substitute for the disability of a people. Government is a substitute for the disability of the individuals in the population.

In the absence of an understanding of the human mind, government becomes inevitable. If you don't understand what makes man tick, you inevitably have government. And you have as much government as there is crime, till the whole government is crime.

You see the logical arguments? They say, “Well, well, you need a government. Should have a police force. Should have this, should have that, should have the other things.”

“What are you going to need a police force for?”

“Well, you need a police force because you got crooks.”

“What you got crooks for?”

It’s inevitable that if you have a police force you’ll have crooks. That’s been proved out time and time again.

A little town down in Texas proved this not too long ago. They had a jail and they had a deputy sheriff or two and they had crime. A little two-bit town-spit across the city limits from one to the other. By George, economics got so bad in that community or politics got so rampant or the town was so small, it was so unimportant, that they removed the police force. Well, they removed it on a gradient scale. I think they took off one cop and left one and they had half as much crime. Then they removed the other cop and they had no crime. There hasn’t been any crime down there since.

This is an interesting look – because the game of cops and robbers...

Well, look what they do. They arrest a fellow, put him in with – association with a bunch of criminals that really teach him how in prison, and then after a few years release him, and on to the public again, you see. Now he’s educated. See? Now he’s got a motivator. Now he’s really a good criminal. This is the way it goes.

And this is a – I’m not just being bitter about it – it’s true. Police forces have nothing in common with public safety. Now, if you’re going to have crime, you will eventually get some people together and they will say, “We will hire somebody to protect us against this crime.”

And then you say, “Well, there’s some enemies on the border.” So a bunch of people will get together and say, “Well, let’s have an army.” Now they’ve got a police force; now they’ve got an army.

And somebody’s house burns down and they say, “Well, let’s have a fire department.” And they go on like this very interestingly.

Funny part of it is, that police forces, armies, fire departments and so forth have – all of them at one time or another run on a completely private basis. There’s nothing the government does that has not been done privately at one time or another.

Well of course, the more government you get, the less liberty you’re going to have, inevitably, because it – they’re not producing. The government is a nonproducer and you get more and more government, you’re going to get less and less liberty, because the laws they

pass against crime apply to you, who in theory – honest-hired them, you see. The next thing you know, you haven't even got yourself anymore and you've gone the whole cycle of idiocy.

But there is no international group that faces Dianetics or Scientology except to the degree that aberration faces sanity. And you get an auditor in there and he's doing a mediumly good job of auditing. He'll still have a bit of trouble with a psycho; he'll still get clawed up.

Now, he will eventually, also, come out on top even if he's just mediumly good. An excellent auditor of course never does get clawed up. And of course, as a group we are moving forward now toward a higher and higher level of excellence in technical application. We know more and more about it; we know more and more about the application of these things. You would be amazed how the principles of auditing work when used in life and so forth – if you yourself haven't had a recognition of that already.

Well, what's all this leading to? No, the only enemy of man is the aberration of man. There's no international group which faces Dianetics and Scientology and means to plow us under any more than any other international group would tend to rave at the auditor. It's like a psycho pc. Probably one of their biggest objections is the fact that we aren't auditing them, something like that. Normally, by the way, you figure that with a pc and it'll be right.

Some fellow at a dinner party and he's clawing you up because you're one of them Scientologists and he had a psychiatrist once who he dearly loved or something. And therefore, you're a dog and so forth. Oh, the only thing this person is asking for is auditing. I always assume – well, he wants to be audited, you know. Chews me up one way or the other – well, he wants auditing. All right, wants auditing. *Voila*. I'll give him auditing. Yeah, they always quiet right down, too.

The only thing they want is relief from their own misery and agony. Now, once you've embarked upon a course of doingness sort of thing, you're for it unless you do it. And in times past when we have not executed our commitments, we have been in trouble.

Now, there's somebody right in this room right now that was awful mad at us a very short time ago before some auditing was given. But the reason of the anger is the auditing wasn't given, although this was never stated by the person.

You see that? I mean, the person was upset really – they had a whole lot of representations – but was upset really because you didn't understand the person and weren't auditing the person; weren't relieving them from this misery and agony. Because they're miserable! There is no getting around that. They're in misery, man!

Oh, you've been there, sometime in the middle of a session you felt like you were stark staring mad. How would you like to feel like that all of the time – twenty-four hours a day? And not be able to sleep much on top of it? Well, anybody that could take you out of

that, you would have kissed on both cheeks. But you would have shot, maimed and stamped on somebody who could have, but didn't. See, that is the thing that is never forgiven.

So once you're committed along the line of a service, you must execute it. It doesn't do any good to tell some pc who is clamoring around, trying to get some auditing that you haven't got time, that you don't want to. It doesn't do any good at all. You'll have to go ahead and make some kind of an arrangement whereby it gets done, not necessarily that you do it. See, you have to make some kind of a solution where auditing can occur.

And in handling any of these situations and any condition which I speak of tonight in this lecture are governed by that principle. If you do that – if you do that, you'll come out all right. You've got to make some kind of arrangements whereby auditing can occur.

It's very funny, but you would be amazed what a pc... Well, let's take it right close to home; very, very close to home – right in where you're operating right now.

You're aware of the fact that the pc is screaming. Oh my God, you're the worst person that ever lived. And you're the auditor, you see, and this pc is just screaming, throwing down the cans and now that's it – they're finished. You know?

Now, your automatic technical response is you got to pick up their missed withholds and that is very, very true! Don't think I'm saying it's not true. Yes, you got to pick up their missed withholds.

But, here is something that you may not have noticed: that if you just start auditing them well, the ARC break evaporates. Now, have you noticed that?

What they're protesting against is no auditing. Now, if you sit there playing it safe as an auditor and decide that you're going to prepcheck – even a case as advanced and as rather stable as having found his goal – if you sit there as an auditor and go into some long, involved Prepcheck that does no listing and you insist on this sort of thing and the goal is ticking – pc feels all right; everything's fine – but you insist on going through this long Prepcheck, which is going to take the next twenty-five hours... Oh man, I don't know how you're going to keep that pc in the chair. I don't know how you would do it, man. I don't know!

You might get away from it – away with it for two hours, you might get away with it for three, might get away with it for a session and a half Then the pc's going to start nattering. Then the pc's going to start to get restive. And the needle is going to start to act up even though the pc is keeping himself well in trim, things are starting to go wrong. Along about the third session, ARC breaks are awfully easy to come by – very, very easy to come by. All you have to do is put your pencil down gently on the pad, you see, and the pc will scream like mad because you have slammed your pencil down on the bare table, see. This pcs going to make an ARC break or die trying. The next thing you know, you got the thrown-down cans,

the rage', the yap and so forth and if still nothing happens, you are going to get just a silent pc.

But you don't recognize that at any time all you had to do was start auditing the pc because, of course, you were doing no auditing. You were doing an unnecessary, unneeded action. See, it's a no-auditing situation. If you want to know what makes ARC breaks, it's no auditing. It isn't bad auditing. It's no auditing. You see, auditing can be conducted in such a way as to be no auditing – as to amount to no auditing of any kind.

It'll give you an idea. The pc's got his item. See, you can do this in a Dynamic Assess – but I don't advise you to do this – but I can show you how to get into trouble, fast. PA got his item, knows that you're going to go ahead and get his goal, tells you inadvertently that he has a pain in his hip. And you start running, 'From where could you communicate to a hip?' See what I'm talking about? Pc would get pretty upset.

Now, look. Supposing you did that for three sessions? Oh, man, there'd just be no living with this pc. Don't you see?

And that will happen inevitably. You must recognize, whatever other factors seem to present themselves, whatever happens to be present, that there is something even more powerful than the missed withhold. See, you can put a pc back into session with the missed withhold. You can pull the missed withholds and it's a necessary action, and so forth, but there's something more powerful than that. And that is making auditing occur or making auditing possible. See, that is more powerful. That is a stronger action than pulling missed withholds. I'm not downgrading pulling missed withholds; I'm trying to show you how powerful this action is.

Oh, I've had a pc just say, "*Awrr, awrr, awrr, rum, ruung, rarwr, uruawr*, and that goes down and it's just terrible and so on *ouwr-ouwr-ouwr* and you pompous ass. What the hell are you doing sitting there?" and so forth.

And just say to the pc, "All right, now, if you calm down now, we're going to go ahead now and we're going to run this process here and let's get the direction of your goal."

Not another word out of the pc and nothing showing on the E-meter.

I just want to show you you have in your hands pure magic. Audit. See, it is pure magic.

You also have something in your hands which is pure poison, which is a pretense of auditing, without auditing. Its actually quite dangerous to be almost an auditor. It would be better to be out there sweeping the streets any day. You'd live a much happier life.

The person who is almost an auditor, but who isn't and really doesn't audit, goes through the motions of auditing, see. Asks questions that sound like auditing, see. Get a meter

in front of them and do things with it just as though they're auditing. Now, if – the pc will just go mad. Remember this.

Funny part of it is, the pc will put up with a relatively poor auditor who is auditing, but won't put up with an auditor who is going through the motions of auditing without auditing. So anything I'm saying is real auditing a person – real auditing.

You would be amazed what a pc will sit through. I've skipped all rudiments on a pc that obviously had to have them run and gone straight into a Dynamic Assessment quite recently. Just – zip, bap, zoom. Smooth needle, pc answering up, everything fine – boom. You see. Auditing probably across the top of missed withholds, present time problems – see, everything.

The liability was, if I weren't me, see, if my auditing in that particular case hadn't been right straight down the groove and hadn't been completely effective, I would have come a cropper. See, the absence of the rudiments would have tripped me up. If I for a moment had looked like I wasn't auditing, these things would have all flown back in my face, see. Funny part of it is, is as long as an auditor is trying, a pc will put up with it – just trying.

But supposing you did something like this: you made a pretense of trying.

And the pc has gone wog, wog, row, row, row, and there's been a bad ARC break, the pc's havingness is way down, pc feels completely in apathy and this "pretended auditor" (the auditor who's pretending to audit but not auditing) says to the pc, "Ah, look around here and find something you can have." And the pc does. "And look around here and find something you can have." And the pc does. You notice the pc's doing the command. And then, "Look around here and find something you can have," and then walk out of the room.

My God, you see, it's like taking a man in the middle of the desert, you see – waterless wastes in all directions – and offer him a sip of water and he takes a sip of water and then you just pour the rest of it out on the sand. See?

Hell hath no fury like a pc not audited. You practically could dish a human being that way. See, if you're going to audit, you audit.

Now, all of these things, then, that I'm talking about and frankly all of the things you think you're having trouble with, are all resolvable by the delivery of auditing. Whether these things are political, no matter what dynamic they're on – doesn't matter – they're resolvable by auditing.

If there is a great Supreme Being sitting someplace, I imagine he'd be awful happy if you came up some day and put the cans in his hands. Just think of what he's been going along with.

Now, therefore you mustn't fall short of being an auditor. Of course, the more technically perfect you are, the less mistakes you make, why, the better off you are.

You saw a pc last night – really got thrown a curve. I was really thrown a curve. I stepped on the edge of the E-Meter and the E-Meter was springing like it was about to leap off the stand and it was shaking on the screen. Did you see the E-Meter shake at the early part? It wasn't secured. It was secured so as to be sprung, you see. Well, now maybe you weren't aware of it, but it was the pc who made it that way. He'd set up an auditing room that couldn't be audited in. Don't you see?

Now stop and think about that for a minute. Think of what this was.

Here was the pc who had done it, had fussed up the auditor till the auditor gummed up the front of the session, see and starts asking for goals before he starts the session because this was quite surprising to have an E-Meter suddenly start jumping at you, see.

But look, the pc had an overt. Now, there was the liability in the session, not what happened to me, you see. See, the liability was the pc was starting the session with an overt. Well, did you see me clean that up straightaway before we did anything else? And it cleaned up, didn't it?

Well, what's the difference there? The difference is simply this: that pc has confidence in the auditor and also the auditor straightened it up. Don't you see? So there is actually no great liability to a technical flub if the fundamental underlying all of this is correct, which is: The auditor means to audit and is auditing. Do you see this?

I don't know. I think there are two or three here that if they'd been caught in that exact position with a bouncing E-Meter – the pc had placed it there; the pc now had an overt on the session – I think they would have wound up at the end of session with that needle still rough, rock slamming – everything gone to hell, unable to get in any of the end rudiments or anything else. Don't you see how that was, see?

But no, auditing demanded that it be straightened up before we did anything else, and of course, that was what occurred. I was rather, by the way, afterwards, glad it happened. You'll do the same thing some day. Just remember, though, don't... So you got flustered, so things went to hell, so you no more than sat down in the auditing room and the plate-glass window of the room shattered itself in the windstorm and seven flying pieces hit the pc, you see. This isn't a good enough reason to have a bum auditing session, see.

The auditing comes above all that and beyond all that and no matter what happens you straighten it out and continue. And it all comes out all right, so long as you're auditing – so long as you really mean to audit.

That intention, by the way, is something that apparently can't be counterfeited. A pc can read it wrong sometimes. You'll sometimes see in some institution or another, some poor devil cowering back against the edge of the padded cell screaming, screaming, you know, saying, "Don't come near me! Don't touch me. You're a leper!" And that sort of thing.



And you say, “Good God, what do I do now?” Well, maybe, perhaps these words will come back to you: You audit. That’s all that’s wrong with him.

You don’t say, “No, I am not a leper.”

Hell, the fellow’s got some reality, even if it’s a corny one. Don’t Q-and-A with the no-auditing situation he’s setting up. Put in your R-factor and your H-factor. Put them in. You know?

I’m here to try to get you out of this and I think I can do so if you give me a little hand here and help me out. Now, touch the wall.” He’s already touching the wall. “Thank you. Touch the floor.” He’s already touching the floor. “Thank you. Touch the wall. Thank you. Touch the floor. Thank you. Touch the wall.”

All of a sudden he says, “What the hell, I’m touching the wall. Hey, I’m touching the floor! Where am I?” He’ll come out of it a little bit and look at you and say, “Who are you?”

You just tell him you’re his auditor. Simple. Don’t go into any vast explanation about it.

If you don’t ever intend to see him again, don’t tell him so. But if you intend to see him again, why say, “PC be around sometime tomorrow. We’ll do the same thing. We’ll get you out of this if we can.”

And the attendants of the place would be treated to some fantastic scene, such as: Nobody’s ever been able to come near this person or talk to this person or do anything with this person – nobody ever has. Picks up the stool and tries to brain him. And next time you go, why, you’re liable to see something like he opens the door a little bit wider and dusts the stool off for you. Never offers you the tiniest bit of violence. That’s as long as auditing occurs. See, that’s the magic. That’s the magic that underlies all other magic.

Now, what interrupts this magic? And what basically causes the apparent revolt against Dianetics, Scientology, auditing and auditors? What does it? What mechanism of the mind is it? Is it missed withhold? Yes, but it’s the biggest missed withhold of all. And it has to be a very special kind of missed withhold called a dynamic or an item or a goal. That’s the missed withhold.

Now, the funny part of it is, that it doesn’t matter what the person’s goal is or his item or his dynamic. It doesn’t matter what it is – remember that person is a thetan. And down underneath all of this, never lose sight of the fact. You can say that, well, “Ron’s wrong. People are not basically good. Because look at that guy, see. Just look at him, see.”

No, remember that word “basically” and an appeal to that person, directly, past all this wreckage that he’s got strewn about, reaches and gets that thetan’s cooperation. And when you can get that thetan’s cooperation to his own salvation, you’re in. But you can only

get it so long as you sincerely are going to proceed along and actually audit that person. That's a necessary part of it.

Therefore, it really doesn't matter what a person's goal is or the person's item or the person's dynamic. You have there an individual. And the heartbreaking thing about all the crime, wars and upsets of the world is that they were not caused by that individual. They were caused by the misapprehensions of that individual.

And the most misapprehension of all misapprehensions is his considerations of the dynamic and item as a result of his carelessly postulated goal and that is the most there is.

Now, were dealing here with human behavior. I could lecture to you for weeks and actually say it no better than: "If an individual exists and can be reached, then anything he is doing wrong or does wrong thereafter is the result of his not being reached." And not being audited, in other words.

It doesn't matter what his goal is. It doesn't matter what his item is. It doesn't matter what his dynamic is and so forth. This person will cooperate. This person will cooperate.

But the thing which makes it tough to reach him is, of course, his goal and the item which has grown up as his pet antipathy and then the dynamic in which he's included all the badness of existence. He's fighting against shadows. But these shadows are quite real to him.

So you're going to get into trouble, occasionally, with somebody, basically through a no-auditing situation, because of his goal. He has a goal which is antipathetic to Dianetics and Scientology, in his opinion. And the great oddity is, is you might sit around for some time and look at this goal that he considered – that committed us to being oppterm and try to figure out how in the name of common sense it could include us.

You could see at once how Scientology would not make it impossible for him to attain this goal. You can see this at once. But he has never been able to. Through the various aberrations and difficulties and situations he has been in, in existence, it is borne home to him that you match up to his oppterm.

His goal is maybe to audit people. So you're standing in his road. See?

Now, some other fellow has a goal to damn all practitioners and he doesn't consider us oppterm. So it's actually on the pc's interpretation and his experience on the track which has determined the oppterm more even than the goal. So you cannot predict, from having found the goal, whether or not you are an oppterm or not. See, that's not predictable, given a known goal.

All right, let's take this goal: "To be happy." This person can't be audited.

Apparently you practically have to sit on their chest and feed the cans into their hands and tape them down because they're just all ARC breaky and nattery and the meter doesn't operate well and that sort of thing, any time auditing falls short of very effective auditing.

One day you come into session and you're a little bit tired and you're a little bit cranky yourself. You've been sent a lot of telexes or cables from a lot of madmen. Why, you flub, you know. You don't feel like going in today and doing too much along this line. You just don't feel like it, so you say, "Well, we'll take it easy today. And I think that – I think we'd better run a little Prepcheck on the goal, make sure that it's right, and so on." You feel this would be pretty easy to do.

My God, you got this pc at your throat! See, it's just that much of a letdown of no auditing and the pc's at your throat, see.

You may even have done something that you couldn't even interpret as an action, but it was – if you'll go back and look at it – it was something that didn't add up to auditing – not in the pc's estimation – in your estimation, too. Now, you did something that wasn't auditing or that wasn't effective auditing. You did something wrong. You weren't – it wasn't that you made a technical flub, it's that you weren't trying in some direction or another.

You want to see a pc really get upset with you, get halfway through to finding their goal, consider it's too hard and sort of knock it off. Sort of try to patch the pc up so you can turn him loose.

Oh my God, don't let that ever happen to you! You'd be surprised. There was somebody here on staff finding some of the staff's goals. He actually made some progress. He was doing all right. What he did wrong was take on too many pcs. He should have taken one and carried through. Don't you see? And he dropped people with only a dynamic found or a detested person found or something like that and he ended off their auditing. And they all got mad at him. He actually wasn't very smart doing this, but there's what happened, see, and they were all kind of cross with this fellow.

No, a rock slamming case is one who would get a rock slam. This is a piece of slanguage that we have been using lately: rock slammers. What's a rock slammer? Well, a rock slammer isn't somebody you can get a rock slam on. It would be wrong if you assumed that. This piece of slanguage means that somebody who gets a rock slam when you ask them, "Consider overts against Scientology." And that broadens out, of course, against Ron, against the organization or against an auditor. And you ask those four things: Ron, Scientology organization, Scientology, an auditor and you get a rock slam.

Doesn't mean the person's unauditible. You'd be amazed. And yet they – such a person would consider you part of their most mortal enemies. You are an enemy. And their meter behaves weirdly when you try to audit them; you get a suppressed meter; you get a slamming meter. You'll probably misinterpret this, because you think that because you can

turn slams on to everybody this makes every case one of these cases. It does not. This case would actually directly have to rock slam when you ask them one of those four items.

You just pick them up – I’ll show you how you do it – you just pick them up, put them on the meter, turn your meter up and you don’t open session or anything. You just say, “Consider committing overtacts against Scientology. Consider committing overtacts against Ron. Consider committing overtacts against the HASI. Consider committing overtacts against an auditor.” Then on any one of those four, if this pc develops and picks up a rock slam, you got a security risk. It is that phenomenon which has made things unpeaceful for the last twelve years.

It was not any vast international organization. It wasn’t even the poor old suck-chiatrist or the psycho-anal-ist or the psychologists. Wasn’t any one of these boys – none of these boys – wasn’t any government. Nobody was after you. It’s just this phenomenon amongst our midst that has given us a bad time, because this other phenomenon matches up with it. This – these people, by the way – I don’t know, I can’t give you a percentage figure, but certainly is never any more than 20 – usually in an organization would be around 10 or around 5 percent. It’s some tiny figure. It’s a very small figure.

And you’ll be running a group someday; you’ll want a “clearing co-audit.” All right, let me show you how this works out. Clearing co-audit. You get everybody; everybody goes out and they find you people to be part of your clearing co-audit and you’re enrolling people. You’re going to teach them to co-audit and you’re going to find all their goals and terminals. Everything’s fine, you know, you’re auditing and everything’s going along dandy, but in a clearing co-audit there’s ample opportunity for no-auditing to occur – ample. Because you yourself are not auditing the cases all the time. So therefore, it sets up a little bit of nerviness on the part of the members of that co-audit. You’re not doing 100 percent auditing on them personally.

We’ve just had a Central Organization go this way. I wondered what the trouble was in that area. All auditing was being reserved for a few members on staff and wasn’t being given to the public.

Well, the place was caving in, man. The second I tried to salvage it, in the last twenty-four hours, to keep it from going bankrupt – and I do mean to keep it from going bankrupt – the most piercing screams you ever wanted to listen to and the darnedest lot of lies and balderdash you ever heard of blew off.

And do you know all it breaks down to? You’re stopping our auditing schedule! Got that? That’s all. They had it all stacked up.

You see, you get people figuring it out this way. They can figure it out so logically. They could say, “Let’s see, there’s only a couple of people here who can find goals, so

therefore, the smart thing to do is to have a totally cleared Central Organization and then we can be an example to the whole public.”

And the poor, lesser staff member, he isn't getting any of this. The doors are closed, see, on any of it coming into the HGC, see. Technology is going to pieces left and right.

I'm afraid society has to survive. I've had people in the past put up to me, this: “Well, why don't you, Ron, take one person and clear that person and teach him how to do so. And then have that person clear another person and teach him how to do so,” and so forth. Inevitably that person has been a rock slammer. That surprised you, didn't it?

I've unwittingly used this principle many times in the past – unwittingly.

I would occasionally put out a projected action and if certain people that I knew to be hostile to us immediately embraced the idea, I didn't do it. But if they fought the idea, I put it into effect at once.

It was a beautiful method of screening promotional and release ideas.

There were about a dozen of them in England and there are about a dozen of them in the US. And if you heard from those people that your action was bad, then you heard from all twelve. See? Then you knew you'd done right. I didn't know why this was.

Well, now get a little further on this. The American Psychological Association is only furious with us for one reason. I found this out. I found it out from a government-employed psychologist in Washington, DC, two or three or four years ago.

You realize we wont release our materials? Do you realize that they would hold on to them, too, if they had all our answers? That's the kind of remarks that were being made to me. Auditing would have solved the situation.

Now, we have several staunch enemies. By the way, what is auditing?

Well, in this case it was just some information. All the information was available, but they evidently couldn't pick up pieces of paper; they were too heavy or something.

All they wanted me to do, actually, was publish some of our ease histories in their national magazine in America. That's all we really had to do. I didn't care to make peace.

So in actual fact, it was I who kept the game going just by being so disgusted with them in the past. They would have taken these things. Maybe they would have written snapping, snarping comments about them. Who cares?

But they would have taken them and published them with the full graphs and everything else in their periodicals. They just looked idiotic to me and I was busy. But that was auditing.

Now, those people would undoubtedly rock slam on you or us, because those people are violently antipathetic to the principles in Scientology. Do you know what's basically wrong with them? Well, you get somebody out here trying to pass a bulletin and you've got them on the meter – you've been doing that – a lot of that lately. If you cared to follow back what their basic disagreement on this line of approach was, you would discover it was something terribly fundamental.

And you very often do this. And they pull up something fundamental – some basic disagreement they have with this line of reasoning – and the moment that that is pulled up, why, *zzipp!* And all of a sudden they can learn the bulletin and it's all all right. Have you seen this? All right.

Now, let's take this on a broader level. The psychologist has agreed 100 percent that man is an animal. That's inherent in the practice of psychology. That's Professor Wundt, 1879, Leipzig, Germany. It's not one of my gags.

Man is an animal. There is nothing – there's not even a nothing – nothing in his head, see. He's a collection of gray matter. And the gray matter squiggles this way and it makes him see and it squaggles that way and he hears, see. He's a meat-robot and there's nothing else present.

This is very interesting because there's an earlier fundamental, earlier than this, which makes a liar out of them. It's psyche-ology: study of the human psyche. And all of their textbooks start out by having to tell you they don't know anything about this and don't have anything to do with their definition of their own word.

You read their textbooks? “We have nothing to do with the psyche. And nobody knows anything about it anyhow and so we take off – man is an animal!” – quick – like, you know? And get in there.

You got an earlier agreement that makes Scientology acceptable to them. Argue with them about the derivation of the word “psychology.” Don't ever argue with them about whether or not man is an animal.

You'll blow off their disagreement with us. They'll say, “Man is an animal. He is not a spirit.” When they say man is an animal, they mean a man has no spirit, so they have an awful time trying to study what we're doing.

But that would be acceptable to them because it would be auditing. It would be clearing up something which was definitely antipathetic and antisurvival to themselves.

The individual existed before the goal; just as the word “psychology” existed before “man is an animal.” See, the goal is later than the individual. The goal is less fundamental than the individual.

Now, it is only the antipathetic goal and maybe you won't be able to see why, but the person will have interpreted it this way, which gives you trouble in – organizationally and in groups.

As I started to tell you a moment ago, there you'll be in this co-audit. Everything's going along fine. Everything is very smooth. You've got everybody auditing and all of a sudden there's a complete mutiny. Everything goes *bzzt-aaugh*. And people are going to quit and they're chopping each other up over in the corner and you can't... Where the hell did this come from?

And you say, "Well, it's that Grace and Agnes over there. They're having a... And Mabel, Becky and so forth. I'll just have to get ahold of them and pull their missed withholds."

Well, look, you can pull their missed withholds until you're black in the face, because the biggest missed withhold is the goal. And one of the mad things you do is pull that person's goal first, because that rewards the rebel. And you mustn't reward the rebel.

The thing you do is put them on a meter. And when you start enrolling a co-audit, you put those people on the meter. And you ask those magic four questions.

And if you get somebody who slams on any one of those four questions, don't enroll them in the co-audit. I don't care how scarce you are in numbers. Don't enroll them and also don't throw them away. Now, you could convene a sub-co-audit if you wanted to. Supposing you collected four such people out of a unit of fifty. Well, you've got a sub-co-audit. In other words, hang the rock slam around their necks and they're not going to cause any trouble because you've as-ised it.

It isn't even that they won't stay with you. As a matter of fact they're much more likely to stay with you than some people that don't rock slam against you. Of course, all the time they're with you, they're trying to slit the tendon in the back of your ankle and so forth and slip the ground glass into the cornflakes. They – somehow or other they'll get this emergency call on the telephone – they happen to be the only one present – telephone rings, they get the emergency call. And it's a call that you'd better come down to the hospital at once because of... And then somehow or another – they're intentions always seem to be so good!

See, they actually can't be detected, because a thetan is a clever beast. And they'll write you a note and they'll put it on the edge of the table closest to the sideboard. And then, as they walk out and put on their coat, it will brush off and fall down. And then they can show you that they did write you a note, but that it fell off.

You never can quite spot it. You're left with this odd feeling of "it isn't quite all right." And honest to Pete, you can go around getting ready to blow your brains out. As a matter of

fact, you'll start shooting down good people after a while if this keeps on and that's just what they want. Now they've accomplished it – they've started dissent.

The rock slam. The rock slam will be dramatized by this person. If you slip up and aren't auditing this person very directly, then that rock slam is going to catch up with some part of your activity. You'll find out that all of the silly things you say you're going to do, they will agree with and make sure you do. And all of the smart things you were going to do that really should have been done, they'll somehow or another dissuade you from doing them. But you'll never quite be able to trace exactly how you were dissuaded or influenced. You'll probably think it's your own idea. These people are pretty weird.

Let's take a husband and a wife. The wife has always been good. She has always been perfectly good and she has gone along, she has done her job, she has done this and done that, and on the surface of the thing appears to be a little hero. And the husband, he's gotten so he drinks quite a bit and he stays out late at night and he isn't working. You get the two of them on an E-Meter and you say to the wife, "Consider committing your – overts against a husband," or John or Bill or whatever his name is, see, and see if she rock slams. And get a hold of the husband and put the husband on an E-Meter and say: "Consider committing overts against a wife," Mabel – whatever her name is.

I don't think anybody was ever as unlucky as to rock slam against his wife while his wife was also rock slamming against him. That would be catastrophe, man. The marriage isn't likely to break up; they're stuck – but it would be pretty grim.

No, but one of those will rock slam against the other and the one who is rock slamming is the one who is doing the other one in. No matter how innocent it all looks, no matter how many motivators this person seems to have, that is the person. There's no question about it. That is the person.

You watch that. You'll be able – when you're called on for marriage consultation, things like that – you'll be able to use the principle there to great advantage. So she's insisting that he get audited. She probably rock slams against Scientology too, see. That'll mess you both up.

Now, you can stay out of an awful lot of trouble if you know these principles. You can handle a tremendous number of situations having to do with groups if you know these principles. And you can understand human behavior, knowing these principles, better than you ever have before. If you haven't got your hands on the person's dynamic, item and goal, see – if you haven't got your hands on it – you can at least say, "Okay, that person has got a goal which is antipathetic to this other activity."

Well, it doesn't mean that all activities are good and it doesn't mean that all the goals are bad, because goals are assistive in life as well as detrimental. They've given one an experiential track. They've done all kinds of wild things. Maybe a person can't operate very



well these days in the sphere of his goal. Maybe he has an awful lot of hard luck, but delete that goal and you've given him back all the effectiveness in that zone. You've given him back his whole experiential track and that's not nothing. You've given him now the ability to carry it out.

Therefore, in an organization; in a clearing co-audit; in a marital situation or in any other group, you have a sure-fire way of testing the person who has to be straightened out or the person who is messing it up. It's the person who rock slams when that group is mentioned. That's the rock slammer. "Consider committing overt acts against." The magic words. You never saw this before, because we didn't have the magic words, "Consider committing overt acts against." We just said, "the group," you see; we just said, "the dynamic," we just said, "the item." We never saw the rock slam and didn't realize that the rock slam was a concatenation of accumulated overt acts.

Now, it isn't just one bad act that makes a rock slammer. It's trillions of years of bad acts that make a rock slam. So don't treat a rock slam as something that is light. A rock slam is very meaningful. It takes a long time to make rock slams so the person has had a long time to do suppressions. So somehow, sometimes, you have to tiger drill the thing that you were testing before it'll test. Yeah, you just give it an ordinary Tiger Drill, polish the thing up and say, "Consider committing overt acts against it," see.

Let's say we're trying to test for an aircraft company so we say, "aircraft company," you know. Then tiger drill aircraft company: "On this company, has there been – has anything been suppressed?" you see, just tiger drill. Clean it up and see if the person rock slams. But the action I'm trying to bring to your attention is, is we are without enemies – we are without enemies, basically. If we lose, everybody loses. And if we win, everybody wins. We're in that weird situation. A situation that nobody has ever been in before. Therefore it's a little bit hard to understand this situation. If someone were to cave us in and knock us out, they would lose. Well, isn't that weird? If someone is actually able to paralyze you as an auditor, then the person would lose. So let me give you the last one-two of the Security Check.

It's an overt act of an auditor not to pick up and pay attention to the rock slammer. Because he's letting the person lose and making it possible then for everybody to lose, don't you see? I'm not trying to hang you with an overt in that direction. But look at it that way rather than "This poor fellow is being victimized by us because he rock slams." No sir, he'll only win if you do something about it. He'll never win otherwise. Because he's rock slamming, as far as we're concerned, in the wrong direction.

And that's what we have been facing and that's what we've been fighting for the last twelve years. The few isolated rock slammers that misguidedly wish to knock us off because they confuse us with their items, dynamics and so forth. And don't think that any amount of argument will make them go straight, nothing will make them go straight but finding the goal.

Wherever you see trouble in Scientology, you are looking at the action of a rock slammer. Wherever you see an organization creaking, wherever you see pcs being dispersed or co-audit being knocked to pieces – somewhere, mixed up in that, there was a rock slammer.

The way to straighten it up is to isolate the rock slammers. Don't refuse them auditing. Put them over in a little group, over to the side. Say, "Now, we're going to take care of you, going to fix you up." Give them some hope, because they're alive too, but don't let them mess up the rest of it because then they never will get Clear.

Now, there's a sensible program for handling it. A sensible pattern as I think you will agree. That's what's been giving us our trouble. That's the only thing that's going to give you trouble. There you are. Of course, the greatest enemy of man is not man. The greatest enemy of man, of course, are goals which tend to condemn man and everybody – when straightened out – won't.

That's a very interesting view and vista, isn't it? So no matter how troublesome a situation looks, you look into it, you'll find the rock slammer. You solve the situation by removing them, talk to the rest of it, bring in peace to the area. That is the formula and there's something more powerful than any aberration and that's auditing. And you've always got that as a weapon.

Thank you.