

CLEARING, WHAT IT IS

A lecture given on
3 September 1964

Thank you.

What's the date?

Audience: Third of September.

Third of September, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

I had a bunch of things to talk to you about but my mail line has been hitting me so hard in the last few minutes that I'm a bit discombobulated and so forth.

There is a storm going on in London at the present moment. And it was a protest by the Director of Prom Reg of the use of the word Clear in *Certainty* magazine and she carefully went around to the staff and collected all the entheta that everybody was saying on staff on this particular word.

Well, frankly, if you went back and used the technology of 1958 you could make a Clear. You wouldn't make a 100 percent job of the line, don't you see, but something on the order of 50 percent or something like that. And they'd stay that way nicely. And some of them would stay that way for years.

. Now, the point I'm making on the situation is a standard term which originally came out of the field of adding machines. (I'm actually talking to you now about PE and that sort of thing, and I'll gradually remember what I was going to talk to you about.)

In the field of adding machines there is a button that says, "clear" and that's what Clear means. And that's a fairly antique definition because it probably—it goes back in Dianetics—it goes back to *Dianetics, Evolution of a Science*, which predates Book One, of course, and the example is given in that.

And it goes back to the invention of adding machines which is quite previous to Dianetics and Scientology so this is an old term. That's actually what Clear means. It's the c—l—e—a—r which is written on the button on an adding machine. Now, let's just become factual about the definitions here and let's say exactly what they are.

Now, why is that there? Well, in the world of electronic Computers they sometimes have solder trouble. This gives you another—another viewpoint of the same problem; they have solder trouble. There's these tremendous numbers of circuits that they build up inside of one of their computers and these circuits are extremely complex and when somebody gets in there with a soldering iron occasionally to fix in a new transistor or something of the sort, why

they'll drop a drop of solder or something, you see? Well, the second he does that he will add some figure into all the computations. All the computations will now have this additive figure because it's short—circuited with a drop of solder, you see, and so that when you say "How far is it to the moon?" this will give you the answer but then multiplies or subtracts this soldered figure. So it never comes up with the right answer.

Now, in plain, mechanical adding machines you can do this very, very easily. This is not a computer—let's get back more—more elementary. On a plain, ordinary, garden—variety adding machine used in every accounts office anyplace in the world—except the abacus, but I imagine you can make the same mistake on the abacus—yes, you can. You've just got through adding up yesterday's receipts and then you start to add up today's receipts and you never push the clear button. You never push that clear button and pull the handle down twice. If you don't believe it, try it sometime on an adding machine. You get the most remarkable answers. See, you've added this all up and now you've still got a total unseen in the machine.

So when you reach over here and pull the lever, put another figure on it and add it, it just keeps adding this total. Only you don't notice that it's adding the total into the whole line because—until you are clear down to the end of it. So, you have added yesterday's receipts, you see, and that figure is still lurking in the machine, uncleared.

And now you start to add up today's receipts and you get yesterday's receipts and today's receipts in the total. So, the answer, you see, if there wasn't a clearing in it, was a cumulative answer which depended on some old data modifying the present time answer.

Now, the mind, when it has an old experience will add that data into its current experience. And it keeps coming up with wrong answers. A professor looks at some college student with a slight twitch of the eye and this girl says, "He has winked at me," (and dust got in his eye at that minute, you see?) "He has now winked at me so there is nothing I can do now but quit school."

And you say, "Well, that's crazy." No, no, it's a perfectly correct answer according to that computer because she was assaulted when she was ten by a fellow who winked at her first and it messed her up considerably, you see?

So to prevent this experience from occurring she adds the old experience into this new experience and gets, really, a wrong answer. Well, she actually is incapable of observing the new experience because she's still got the old experience, you see, so she can't come up with the right answer to this situation which is some dust got in his eye. This would never occur to her. It must be very meaningful that he winked at her. And this means, of course, she is going to be assaulted; and this means of course she is going to get messed up like mad and therefore she is going to have to leave school. That's the only answer to the situation.

And you say, "Well, that's silly; that's outrageous." Well, that's because she is not cleared on the subject of winks. Do you see?

Male voice: Yah.

So where she still has a lurking datum which is an aberrated datum—and what people have never gotten, I suppose, is this word, “aberrated.” It means *NUTS!* Have you got it?

I love the—some people’s evaluation of this particular thing because it’s a, “Well, he worries a little bit when he gets broke, so therefore he’s aberrated.” Oh, no, people worry when they get broke, see, he is not aberrated on it. No, it means *NUTS! See?*

This guy’s shoes in the morning are found to be where the left one—the right one is where the left one is, and the left one is where the right one is; they are crossed so their toes go out slightly. So he looks at this situation alongside of his bed and has a nervous breakdown. That’s *aberrated! See*, people are not operating in the degree of the uncleared datum. See? They’re going out here and saying, “Well, sunlight when it shines in my eyes hurts my eyes, so therefore I must be aberrated on the subject of sunlight.” Now, that’s not aberrated. That’s not aberrated. That’s—might be peculiar in degree or something, but that—that’s no aberration.

No, it’s much worse than this. The guy is walking along in the dark and his eyes hurt because of the bright lights he sees in them. That’s nuts! He doesn’t know where they’re coming from. There’s no source for these lights. He goes around worrying about it. He finally decides (wrong answer because he is not cleared on the subject) that Martians keep landing in front of him all the time! He’s nuts! Now, that is a datum that needs to be cleared.

The girl with the aberration on the subject of every time she sees a man’s eye twitch she has to leave college or something—that’s interfering with her life like mad! And that is the datum that needs to be cleared. And a Clear wouldn’t have those. It doesn’t add in yesterday’s totals into a completely wrong answer for today. Do you follow? That’s all a Clear is.

Now, it also happens that when a person is very, very aberrated, and I hate to have to say, very, very—let’s just call it aberrated because that is the missing word here as well as Clear—when a person is aberrated he can’t remember a thing! Nothing, along some given line of action.

Now, this girl whose—the professor winked at her and she has to leave school, can’t remember where it happened, what class she is in, when she enrolled in that class. She’d have to think for a long time before she’d finally even come up with a subject, don’t you see? It’s where did she put her textbooks, you know? Anything connected with that, her memory stinks! Do you follow it?

She’s—usually goes down the hall to this particular classroom and goes into the wrong classroom. Do you get the idea? In other words she cannot remember on this particular subject. And as far as being able to remember the subject itself, she’s going to flunk her finals, man, she is going to flunk them. Memory bad on that particular subject. Have you got it? *Lousy! Oh*, she can remember everything else, she can remember letters from her girlfriends and she can remember this and she can remember childhood, she can remember all sorts of things, but anything connected with this classroom, she can’t remember. This thing is buried. She doesn’t even remember the assault on her when she was ten! This is—little gimmick is

what made Freud famous. Just this one, little, tiny gimmick—that if you could get somebody to remember what had happened to them, they were better.

, Now, she doesn't even remember that—the assault on her when she was ten, much less what the subject or class or anything else is about that it's associated with.

In other words, it's a motion—picture screen with no projector, no film and no audience. That is memory on this given subject.

Memory is not a *broad* condition.

Everybody is going around saying, "My memory is bad. My memory is good. He has a good memory. He has a bad memory." Bull! Nobody's memory works that even. Nobody's memory works that evenly, it doesn't work that badly, and it doesn't work that goodly. Memory is not a uniform Condition It's as spotty as a Leopard!

This fellow, he can remember, oh man, you ask him—you ask him, "Now, what were the dimensions of the last building you built?"

"Oh!" he says, "That was 97.5 feet wide and the bricks were 3 1/4 inches above the cantles and *blah—blah—blah—woof—wulf*, and the roof poles were so forth, and we put 3/16 inch, you know, reinforcement in the ruddy rods, you know." He goes on and on and on. He's a walking ware—warehouse—not—not—not he's a walking memory, he's a warehouse of memories, you see, on the subject.

And you say, "What did you have for dinner?"

And he says, "Well, I don't know. I don't know what I had for dinner."

"What did you have for breakfast?"

"Oh God! Don't ask me that. That's too long ago. That's hours ago, see."

On the subject of food he's a dead blank. On the subject of figures and construction and that sort of thing, man, he's a running racehorse. And that's people. That's the way they are.

And the worse off they are, the less they can remember.

And now, if you got a total blank you would simply get the Condition known as unconsciousness or amnesia. And that is simply the culmination of all the held—down fives eventually adding up to a total wipeout. But that is the extreme Condition and you can't even talk to that bloke. He can't even open his eyes much less see anybody wink. So, it actually, from the world's standpoint doesn't matter much whether this fellow can remember or not remember, observe or not observe because he's not even there! So it isn't a question of memory, it's a question of not-ness. He is not, memory is not, past is not, present is not. Don't you see? Everything is not. Not there. There isn't any.

Well, you could get a Culmination of adding up all his bad memories into a totality of bad memory, but would you have at that moment a normal human being No, you would not have a normal human being. You wouldn't have a human being, you'd just have a lump of

meat, see? So to say somebody has a—has a bad memory. On what? It's an incomplete statement.

If you said, "Somebody has amnesia," yes, you could say, "Well, all right, that is a total bad memory," but of course you can't even classify it as memory because he's not even there to remember. It's a gone dog that we're talking about now.

So memory is not an even Condition. People remember some things well and remember some things badly.

Now, if you wanted to improve somebody's memory you'd also have to say, "on what?" See? The guy says—sets a goal for the session—"I want to improve my memory." Well, all right, he set it for the session and you are an auditor and this is his session and you're not going to argue with him. Let him make a mistake, it's his mistake.

But if you were handling this sensibly, you would have to ask the remaining—I mean, don't say that you should do this in a session, you know, but I mean, in investigating the situation you would have to say, "Improve your memory on what?" Now you would have something to work on, wouldn't you? But up to the moment when he doesn't add the "on what" you don't have anything to work on. And you're left with this complete lie that memory is an evenness, don't you see? Memory is an even goodness or badness or memory as a whole subject can be improved. Oh no, memory as a whole subject could only be improved—yes, whole—as a whole subject it could be improved but only by stressing the particularities on which his memory is bad. And then if you kept picking up each thing on which his memory was bad, having asked this burning question, "Improve your memory on what?" you would now get an answer like, "Well, improve my memory for—for—for names."

"Well, any particular names?"

"Yes. Girls' names. I just don't seem to be able to remember—I meet Agnes and I think she is Bessie. Aluur—Iuur! You know, bhuuul! Horrible!"

Well, man, you're right on the track of that button called clear because it goes hand—in—glove. Just as the held—down five in the electronics machine that is held down there with a piece of solder, just as yesterday's total receipts are being added in unobserved, why, so he doesn't observe that zone or area where (quote) "his memory is bad" and that is where he is aberrated!

You couldn't ask for a nicer little set of scales by which to measure somebody's nuttiness.

He says, "I want to improve my memory."

You say, "What do you want to improve in memory?"

"I want to improve my memory on names."

"Any particular name?"

"Yeah, I want to improve my memory on girls' names!"

Now you as the auditor have something to run down. And you'd run it down and you'd find some—now let's go into Dianetics—you'd find some traumatic experience. "Traumatic" was a word invented to bedevil medical students. Some painful experience of some kind or another that is buried, not in the subconscious—there is no subconscious for anything to get buried in—it's just buried in the guy himself. It is an occlusion (to use a big word on you). Occlusion. To occlude, to slam the door in the face of, to close the window quickly in the front of. You know, to drop the blind; occlude. It is not there, that window he can't look out of, that backtrack he can't look into, that's gone. And sitting on it will be a nuttiness, and it will be a good, big nuttiness. It's not a little, bitty nuttiness and sometimes—he doesn't even know he's got this nuttiness or he wouldn't have it, see? It's—it will be something on the order of, "If doors are half open, it's bad luck, and all day long people will be mad at him." That's sane, isn't it? He's got it added up into "won't be an even flow of time" or something, see.

He can explain it to you, but once he starts explaining it, it's a gone dog, his memory starts opening up on it at once. All you have to do is turn a spotlight on this thing. All you have to do is start looking at the machine and find out where the figure is held down, where the five is held down. All you've got to do is just monkey with it a little bit and it starts to clear!

And every time you can find someplace where somebody is off the beam, you will also find—these facts all go together—you will find someplace where somebody can't remember. He got a bum datum. Painful past experience, see; these are all of the same family of stuff, see?

He's got a painful area there that hurts him to look at, so of course that gives him a bad memory on that particular subject and this gives him wrong answers in present time. It's just a fact. Wrong answers all the time.

You'll find out he'll take irrational decisions consistently and continuously. If you ask him to design a door for a house, why, he'd fix up something a cat could get through but a man couldn't, you know? There would be something nutty on this subject. This thing, though, would appear at first glance to be very hard to locate because it has so many locks, it has so many appended associated experiences, things that are like it, and it's just a great, big pileup of stuff—a great, big pileup of stuff Well, you start removing these things and you start getting down to the core of this thing and all of a sudden we find the traumatic experience of some kind or another, we find with it the big overt and we know now the misunderstood word and when we've got this thing unplied, why, it flies apart like a clock that a baby has just slopped a hammer to, see? It goes blonnnngg! That's the end of that aberration.

He couldn't get it back if he tried. All of a sudden when he thinks, it doesn't get stopped by the clock, see, in there or something. He—we think—he starts thinking on this subject. He sees a door and the door is half open, you see? Well, formerly the door half open meant so—and—so and so—and—so and meant so—and—so and so—and—so and so—and—so and so forth and therefore he shouldn't probably go through the door because of so on, and it's very bad luck to have such a thing and so on, and the only—the only thing for

it to do was to count the number of steps he had taken to the door, and then walk the steps backwards.

You say, “What the hell was this all about?” Well, that’s what’s the matter with it, it’s what the hell is this all about? You see, the one thing which is—which is true about these things is their sum total answer is incomprehensible. The horrible thing you’re watching in—in the field of psychiatry is them trying to make sense out of the incomprehensible. Well, you don’t make sense out of the incomprehensible, you find out what caused the incomprehensible. You don’t—don’t enter it on the wrong side and say, “Well, let’s see, how does this all add up? How does this all add up? Now, let’s see, what does he really mean?”

Well, he doesn’t mean nothing, man, he just means he’s got a wrong answer. He means he’s nuts, I mean that’s all you have to understand about it.

We don’t care what this bird’s chattering about—we don’t have to—we don’t have to do anything about it at all! You see? It’s just *bleahhhh* and so forth. And you step backwards in order to open a door, but if you didn’t do that and something or other ... And he feels depressed and blue all the time because doors are usually half—open. Somebody is trying to add this up, you see, on the other side of the ledger he’s trying to add this up this way.

“Let’s see, now he probably has something to do ... And there is probably something in all of man that has to do with square shapes excite a complex.”

You can’t add these things up into general behavior because it’s just this bird’s aberration. You see? That—he’s just nuts that way. That doesn’t mean there is anybody else in the world crazy on the subject of doors half—open, don’t you see? But this guy is.

Well, all you have to understand about it is, is the guy doesn’t understand it. See, if you could just understand that it’s—that it’s not necessary to understand what the hell he’s talking about. All you’ve got to find out is, “What—.” Let’s enter it on the other side now and let’s say, “What started all of this? Where did this come from?”

And of course, you’re going to get forty or fifty weird—sounding things come off of this one thing. And we find out that when he was four or five years old or something like that, why, it was he who let off the brakes of the family car and ran over his baby brother, and the reason his baby brother has been crippled ever since. And doors sort of add into this in some wild and peculiar way that he—you know, he had to open the door or something. And you’ll find out it is some phrase in the engram like, you know, “Open the door and get at him quick,” you know, or something like that. Or he’s got a stuck picture of a half—open ear door or something like that, see?

But that’s—that’s how it explains, is: What’s the original experience that is the cause of this bird being aberrated or nuts on this particular subject so that he can’t remember on the subject, so that he can’t think on the subject, so that he can’t get right answers on the subject, so that he is around the bend on this particular subject? You got it?

You know, nobody is totally crazy. Nobody is totally crazy. The wildest madman in the insane asylum is not totally crazy. And this has got everybody bugged. Everybody else goes crazy on this datum, see?

They say, “Well! Crazyness should be a state! Insanity should be a general state!”

Here we got again this thing I’ve just gave you of memory, see? “Insanity should be a general state!” And we have—we have magistrates sitting there in their moth—eaten wigs, you know, and these fellows are saying, “Now, Mr. Sawbrain, the local psychiatrist, is now going to give us an opinion as to whether or not somebody is sane or insane.” And so, after a few gibblings and dribblings and so forth, Mr. Sawbrain gets up and says, “I certify, Your Honor, he is insane. He’s a—he’s a *kleptosis skidabuff ruffboof*. And the—the psychiatrist then had made his pronunciamento, so the man is “legally insane.”

Ahh, what kind of a comedy sideshow is this thing? Because nobody is totally insane.

Even the girl in the catatonic schiz state if you could get her to open one eye is liable to ask for a glass of water. Well, that’s not a—an insane request, don’t you see? So, it isn’t an insane act.

But man, with his thirst for totalities, his thirst for allness—which you should recognize as just a desire to identify A with A and A with A and everything is A. It’s just total identification, you see. Has to have, even in his legal systems, a thing called “insane.” There is nobody insane. There is no such thing as a total insanity. So therefore there couldn’t be such a thing as an “insane state.”

He would have to be insane on some subject. Or he would have to be insane in some area or field of endeavor or action. And it’s just that the rest of the sentence is missing. “This man is insane” is actually this kind of a sentence, an incomplete sentence that requires the dot—dot—dot on the end of it to show that it is incomplete. “This man is insane dot—dot—dot.” They have never finished the sentence. “This man is insane on the subject of women.” “This man is insane on the subject of the State.” “This man is insane on the subject of green cheese.”

But if they knew that much about insanity, they could cure it. Because what I’ve given you here is, of course, the missing link in the scientific research area. And it is in the Definition of their terms, which is there is a state called “general insanity.” And they always are trying to dream up new names for this sort of thing. They call them schizophrenics, and they call them this and they call them that and paranoids. They’re trying to get this broad, pervasive label. And they’re so interested in getting a new term to put on this thing, that they frankly have never asked what they’re trying to label.

And if they would just realize that they just haven’t completed their sentence, they would have opened a door to a cure. All they had to do was complete their own sentence, don’t you see?

This fellow is dancing around in a straw skirt, and whereas this wouldn’t be particularly odd looking in Hollywood, this straw—skirt dancing, if it were taking place in Boston, would be cause for comment. Somebody would notice.

Well, it isn’t even the environmental difference. The guy was nuts whether he was in Hollywood or Boston. But in Boston they have this sort of thing called “conduct” or “reserved

conduct” or “unseemly conduct.” They inherited it from Cotton Mather and the other jokers that were back there way back when.

Anyway, we get ahold of this bird, see? A psychiatrist says, “This man is insane!” Incomplete statement, see? He’s going—he should have said, “This man is insane dot—dot—dot.”

Your position would have been to open the cure for this fellow and an understanding of the situation. “On what subject?” would be your innocent remark. Well, that of course blows up the whole field; that opens the doors to cure. “He is insane on what subject?”

The psychiatrist says, “exhibitionism.” Ah, that’s not a subject, that’s a Condition. That doesn’t say, “Exhibitionism. All right. ..” He—that’s not good enough. That doesn’t give you anything to go home on. What’s he insane on? On what subject? Let’s finish out the sentence here.

Well, they would have to observe the fellow for a few minutes to find out what was going on before they could finish the sentence, and that would force them to observe the patient and even—and at that point they would find out that there aren’t any similarities in insanity, so you can’t classify insanity.

So we observe him for a few minutes and he kept saying, “*Boola—boola, ooga—ooga, boola—boola, uga—ooga.*” And we find out what he’s insane on now. We find out that—why, we say—we say, “Why are you saying, ‘*boola—boola, uga—ooga*?’”

And he says, “Well, you have to. This is the South Seas, you idiot!”

Well, he’s insane because he thinks he is in the South Seas. Well, now we’ve got the door open.

“Hey, bud. Please explain to me why you are in the South Seas.”

Oh man, we are carving away on this aberration now with axes. See, we are going to town on this sort of thing. We don’t have to cut up his brain because the aberration is being cut up, which is the proper target. And we find out finally—we find out finally that this bird is stuck in a movie someplace that he has observed and so forth and we find out he has a thwarted ambition in some particular character and we find out that in order to accomplish that ambition he committed a fantastic overt act at some time. He stole a whopping great big piece of money in order to go to Hollywood and be in the movies. And he was never caught but he didn’t get to Hollywood and get in the movies either. And he didn’t go off the rockers on this particular subject until he’d found out that the person he’d stolen the money from had as a result gone broke and committed suicide. Too much overt.

Now the gray walls start to move close to this individual and he doesn’t quite know what all this adds up to. But we have now a traumatic experience. We get off the overt and he all of a sudden doesn’t have all this nonsense going on. We carve it down. It would take adroit auditing. You couldn’t do it in the absence of the discipline of auditing, you see? You would have to have that right on the groove, otherwise you’d never get the data, you’d never carve it back, he’d never be able to blow any locks.

You can't just stand over a fellow saying, "That isn't what's wrong with you! It's something else wrong with you. You realize, don't you, that you're an exhibitionist *raf—raf rah—rah—rah.*"

They don't blow locks when you do that.

In other words, it takes the discipline of auditing to have carved down to that.

Now, what would we have accomplished at the final end of that line?

We would have found out the overt, we would have found out the basic experience with regard to it. We probably would have found a little bit of an underlying experience of some kind or another, we'd find a failure to understand something or other and when we got all of this up, he would no longer be dancing around in the streets in a hula skirt saying, "*Ug—goola—boolabua.*" And that's—what have we done then?

He'd also be able to remember that period of his life. And when you said, "Motion pictures" to him he didn't instantly go and get his hula skirt and jump out in the middle of the street and go, "*Uga—boola, boola—boola—boola.*" So, the right answer to a hula skirt he finds out was not jumping out into the street and going, "*Uga—boola, boola—boola.*" Or the right answer to motion pictures—the right answer to motion pictures is "sit and look at them." And now he sees a motion picture he sits and looks at it.

Take a drunkard. This fellow is drinking to escape, or he is drinking to this, or he is drinking to that. But I don't think he's really drinking to anything. I think he's drinking.

Now, let's go it the other way, too. That—there we've got an overelaborated explanation. He's got a total solution to how to get through life: you drink. See? But you wouldn't even know whether he had it as a total solution or it was a symptom of something else or it was something else lying on something else, until you carved into it and asked him what this was all about.

All right, now you say, "He's insane on the subject of what?" And you finally find out he's insane on the subject of liquor. When he gets enough—a glass of liquor in front of him, he has to empty it. And when the glass of liquor is empty he has to fill it.

Now, you start pushing this back again and you may find it at two years old while he's lying in his crib, you—you may find the wildest piece of stuff. See?

"Drink your milk! Drink your milk! Drink it up! Drink it up!" Maybe the kid's got a temperature of 115, see?

"Drink your milk. Drink it up. You've got to drink it now. It's good for you to drink it. You know, you'd better drink it up. *Drink! Drink! Drink! Drink! Drink! Drink! Drink! Drink.*" So, he could *drink—drink—drink—drink—drink—drink—drink—drink.*

The solution to all of existence: Drink.

Well, this fellow can't remember his home life and he can't remember his mother and he can't remember the names of little children and he can't remember this.

Well, you start scouting down this line someplace or another and you find out he can't remember what his memory is poor on and then if you've got the channel—now, you as a Scientologist know that it's very beneficial to get a pc cogniting.

All a cognition is, is a return of memory. The reason why a cognition is so very, very beneficial to the person is because you are on the track where his memory is occluded and so therefore you are in the process of clearing something. It's quite elementary. The pc cognites when his memory is returning.

If you are on an area where the pc is cogniting, you must therefore be on an area where the pc was aberrated. You must therefore be tracking a fi—a held—down five. If the pc never cognites you aren't tracking down any five that the pc has got held down. I mean, it's as elementary as that. It isn't a particular kind of pc that cognites and some pcs cognite and some pcs don't cognite. This is not true.

What is true is when you are tracking down an area where the person is *unclear*, you are going down an occlusion area. The person can't remember on that chain. And when you start cutting into that area, why, he all of a sudden remembers and we call it cognition. He has ideas and he puts the thing together and he has realizations and he—we give it the general, blanket title of cognition.

Well, if you're not going down that track, in other words, if you're not processing what the pc has to have processed, why, you of course are not going to get any cognitions. And you know very well processing a pc who isn't cogniting is a waste of time. It would also be a waste of time to process a pc who isn't aberrated.

But if you are processing somebody, you ought to be processing what they're aberrated on. You have to finish the sentence, in other words.

The guy says, "Well, what do you want—what's—what is your general goal in processing?"

"Well, my general goal in processing is to get bigger."

Well now, if you're going to get anyplace on this thing, you're going to have to keep your ears open. All right, good, he's got a general goal and he's going to get bigger. All right, that's fine. Let's buy that for a little while and that sort of thing. But remember that this was an odd—sounding goal. So we're going to press this thing. We're going to push it; we're going to push it a little more.

I don't care whether you say "Why?" or "When?" or "What?" or anything else, let's push it. And all of a sudden we are going to find out, "Well, you see, I'm very tiny."

"Are you?" This fellow is six foot two, see. "All right, you're very tiny." Well, you just slid off of the rational being, didn't you, over into the ditch here someplace. The guy is six foot two and he's complaining because he is very tiny.

Well, if you were to say, "Well, how big should you be?" : 'Oh, well, I ought to be at least normal size."

'Well, good, what's normal size?"

“Six foot two.”

And the reason you don't find these aberrations in people, you're not looking for anything that's nutty. See? You are all the time prospecting for something that is normal. You can always find the normal. People are far more normal than they are crazy.

Something like somebody sent you out to look for a red rock in a whole desert full of gray rocks. And you keep coming back, and you say, “Well, I found a gray rock. And I found a gray rock. And I found...” “Sure, you found a gray rock, you idiot! The place is full of them! Anybody can find a gray rock, how about finding a red rock?”

“Well, maybe they don't exist.”

“Why, maybe they don't exist.” Look for them anyhow. You know why I think it exists? Because your pc—your pc doesn't look good. So, I think there must be a red rock around there someplace.

“All right. Well, let's—I'll go out and find it.”

All of a sudden, if you really—if you really know your business, you'll pick up a red rock, you know, and you'll say, “My God. A red rock.” You know, you hug it to your bosom.

“Oh, you—you want to be normally tall? Well, all right, well, how big is normally tall?”

“Six foot two.”

Now, you have to be enough of an auditor not to say incredulously at this minute, “But, you idiot, you are *six feet two!*” Now you've found yourself a red rock, see, in a sea of gray rocks. See, you could find any quantity of gray rocks. Don't bother with them, you see? Just handle gray rocks until you see there is one edge sticking up of something that might be a red rock and then you follow that on down. Now you dig for this red rock.

And you find this fellow not only is not six feet two and is not normal size, but he's only three years old. Marvelous. Well, you try to plot it, you're—you're going to—you're going to be in trouble. You start—what we used to call “writing script”—you try to write this guy's script for him. You could never guess these corners because they are just totally aberrated, see? That's the trouble with them: they don't go in logical sequence. And you suffer from the fact as an auditor that you are not getting a logical sequence, so you try to hang it up together so it's logical.

And of course, the reason he is crazy on that particular subject is it is not logical and never will be!

Not till the sun perishes in the sky will that be logical. So there's no point in being logical about it. No, your attitude is you want to be informed. And you'll eventually find out all about it.

Now, if you know your business real sharp and with this new technology on the subject of overts and words in definitions and so forth, you're going to run it back to some

traumatic experience of some kind or another where a word was grossly misdefined, where a word was really knocked in the head; you're going to run it back.

So you know what you're trying to run it back to, you know what he doesn't understand, you know where you're trying to get to and you all of a sudden would be able to put your finger on this and the guy says, "Do you know, I've always..." He tells you now, see? "Do you know I've always thought of myself as being three years old? And you know, I'm not. I just realized that. Huh! That's funny, isn't it, how being—I don't know. You know, there—there must have been something happened—that—that would make me think that sort of thing. I wonder what it could be."

Help him out, keep him talking, keep him plowing, keep your meter running, let's just see if we can find this and all of a sudden—you see he's going in on the top of the thing to that degree—you all of a sudden find—find this wild bit of business: He had always thought of himself as a little fellow, and he had to go on thinking of himself as a little fellow because of some weird, wild reason, and—and the word—the word, "fellow" is misdefined, it means—it means, "a splendid being" or something, see. And it means that some ally always referred to him as a little fellow. And he's got it firmly fixed in his skull one way or the other—with overts and withholds and nonsense all mixed up—he's got it firmly fixed in his skull that if he goes on being a "little fellow," then everybody will like him and he will be all right and he can get away with it, and see? And he can live. But actually a "little fellow" doesn't mean what he thinks a "little fellow" does mean, but it does mean it, but it doesn't mean it. And all of a sudden he gets this thing all straightened out and you watch that button come up on the adding machine! Now he can think on this subject of size. He can get the proper answers on the subject of sizes, he can get the proper answers on the subject of his relationship with other people, he can get proper answers with regard to children, he can get proper answers on anything associated with that particular subject. And on that subject he is *cleared*.

What does Clear mean?

It means, on any given subject, not nuts anymore! On any given subject, not nuts anymore.

Expand the Definition On any given subject where the person has been pretty confounded, cotton—picking nuts, he is not now nuts!

I don't know how to make it any plainer without introducing more complicated words.

This fellow is now—you would have to put it into a framework of relationship. "On the subject of children, this man is a Clear." That would be an interesting attitude, but then, that would be a perfect, accurate one. Now, when you've got a majority of these points plowed up on the individual so that there are no great obvious ones around on which he is nuts, you would then have a person that you could bend the terminology around and call a Clear, which would only, however, be short for "a cleared person" or a "cleared ability to think." Now we're right down to rock bottom when we are talking about this sort of thing.

Now, when we talk of clearing, the basic business of an auditor on the subject of clearing would use any technique or any technology which located (I mean any Scientology technology; none of the rest of them will) which located areas of aberration—that would be the selection—located areas of aberration in the being. *Areas* of aberration in the being. Not tried to determine whether he was sane or insane or something of the sort. And then which followed those areas down until the individual recognized an earlier causation for this condition. And the nature of aberration is such that he actually couldn't put it back together again if you gave him mortar, sticks, stones and a psychiatrist. He couldn't go nuts on that subject again if he tried.

So, talk about the instability or the impermanence of a Clear is nonsense. The person who has been alleviated on one particular area can't really make himself crazy on that area again. He has an awful time because he's now not only got the thing gone which was being very tenuously held together by some horrendous series of mishaps and oddball circumstances, you see? The chances of becoming aberrated this way were very slight to begin with, you see, and it happened that all the right conditions existed for his particular Temperament at any given—at some given moment and they all came together at that moment, why, the exact combination necessary to produce this condition occurred.

Now, by the time you've gotten back and chipped a few pieces off that, why, that all starts to fly apart. Well, he can't put that back together again because he'd have to have a new experience of some kind of similar accidentals, and just the odds are against it occurring, you see?

Now, he also has the education of having been crazy on it and that is the real thing that defeats it. He knows he has been nuts on it. So then when he sees himself leaning toward a condition where this condition might occur again and so forth, he already preunderstands what might happen to him and it doesn't happen. Do you see?

So having had it is like being indoctrinated or vaccinated or something of the sort, see? Inoculated or vaccinated. Well, he's—he's got himself—he's got himself now a—he couldn't go nuts on that subject again if he tried.

All right. The state of a—of a really cleared up alcoholic, somebody had really worked with an alcoholic and cleared him all up, well, just the way I've been talking about processing, you see, using this type of system approach; man, that guy trying to become an alcoholic again would be a—would—he would be a laughing thing. I mean, he'd be a very laughable object. You know, trying to, "Let's see. I guess I will be a drunkard." You know? Well, liquor doesn't any longer have the same effect on him that it did, don't you see?

And liquor, believe me, has different effects on different people. So, this sloppy degradation that he always used to experience so deliciously and all that sort of thing, that doesn't occur anymore, you know? It isn't that he doesn't get drunk; he can probably get drunk or something of the sort but it doesn't have the same effects. And he would—he could—he could probably sit there and pour down the hooch by the tumblerful and maybe nothing would happen at all. This would be very, very horrible, don't you see? No, you

wouldn't want to become an alcoholic again. But I'm just giving you the reverse side of the coin that if he did, he'd have a hard time to.

So, talk about the instability of Clear.

Well, a person having to talk about how stable Clears are is simply being driven to the wall of having to make a statement without being able to explain the mechanics of the subject matter and he's having to make a loose statement just to satisfy somebody's curiosity and that's a very dangerous thing to do.

The actual facts of the case are—is once a person has been cleared on any given subject, he hasn't got a prayer of getting that way again. So on a subject on which an individual has been cleared he is not only stable, he is unrecurrent. It ain't going to happen again.

Now, how Clear can you get? Oh, I don't know. I'm sure you don't know. But I can tell you that it's not in the field—total clearing does not happen to be in the field up to IV. It doesn't happen to lie in that field or sphere of processing. It requires new skills and the state reached is not a state of being unaberrated on certain, given subjects. The state reached is cause over matter, energy, space, time, life and form and so forth, which is the state of OT.

So, the final state attainable is not a state of Clear but the state of total causation. It's a different subject, see. You—you—in the middle of a—of a flight, you are all of a sudden saying—having to say, “Well, this is a total absolute.” Well, they are not only unobtainable in this particular case, there is no total absolute because it isn't the way it goes.

The reason it doesn't go that way is a person has to have a mind in order to become aberrated in that mind. You see? And clearing is something that applies to the mind. Clearing also applies to the individual in relationship to his mind or his mental abilities. And clearing is a subject which is very, very, very precisely related to a finite state of existence. “My name is Joe. I live at 64 Elm Street in Peoria, on the planet Earth at this corner of the universe. And I happen to be a news vendor.” This is finite existence, you see, labelable, finite existence, the ability to survive and to handle a normal, what you would call average sort of environment.

In other words, we're now talking in the realm of man is a being who is inhabiting a universe and we are not talking about anything unusual or anything remarkable or anything else. We're talking about a being; we're talking about a mind; we're talking about thinking; we're talking about experience and of course we're assuming that it happens in the universe across a span of time. We're assum—we're assuming it happens from present time moment to present time moment to present time moment, to pocketa—pocketa, pocketa—pocketa, pocketa—pocketa time track. We're—you know, that existence is going forward. We're talking about an existence in which one goes home and eats soup at six o'clock. You get the idea? We're talking about living.

Well, we have run fresh out of that subject when we go above this level and try to make Clear into an absolute; we just go fresh out of it. Because from that point on, you don't clear. You get all the side effects of clearing, but you're off in a different direction. You are not trying to fix this guy up so he can think, you're not trying to fix this guy so he can ex—so

he can suffer or react. What you're—you're not trying to even fix him up so he can remember. You're trying to fix this guy up—well, you're not even trying to fix this guy up! Do you understand?

And the final product that you wind up with has no relationship whatsoever to a fixed—up guy. It is a total resumption of beingness at total causation. And it doesn't take place necessarily any longer in the physical universe. And it doesn't necessarily at all take place in finite time. The final product that you are aiming for and to try to call this Clear is impossible, unless you've now bent the whole terms of Clear all the way around backwards and said, "As escaped from, or sidestepped from" or something or other, or if you treated—well, you just have to bend the term so creaky. Yeah, we cleared him of living in the universe. See? It sounds kind of weird, see. So you've got to go off on a different tack.

So clearing is an assist to finite—meaning within limits—existence. Which just means that it's—a guy is living, that's all.

Now, a bunch of people who have been indoctrinated in the world of religion or spiritualism or something are going to try to bend these two things together. And they are going to take the supernatural or the unnatural or the totality of existence or the infinite mind in an infinite book or something like this, and they are going to bend all these things together and try to wobble it up against the normalcy of existence or something, and *wow!* That's how they got tangled up in the first place.

Man doesn't leap from a state of total aberration to a state of total divinity because of three flicks of a prayer wheel. It's a road that must be walked and it's a long road.

And the earliest part of that road is totally involved with the environment in which he finds himself. The girl next door, the cars, restaurants, theaters, bosses, economy and so forth. And they're all walked in that world. And if he walks long enough in that world and if he graduates himself up along the line, and he gets cleared of more and more of these aberrations, and he is more and more free, the gradient scale breaks down only at this point: When he tries for his next goal he is going for broke, he is going right on out. Don't you see? He is no longer walking in the finite existence. Now he's running things called GPMs. They are intimately associated with what makes a mind. How come he does all these things? Why is he on a time track? You see, it's handling a different kind of a problem.

And the people don't consider this normal, let me point that out. An individual to have no time at all would not be considered normal. Don't you see? You're talking in a different framework. So how you could explain this framework, Lord knows. If you tried to explain it on the basis of, "We're going to clear him totally" or something like that, I don't know what you're talking about. Because clearing is a finite existence of fixing the individual up so that he can get proper answers in a proper world. That's the—that's the place where it belongs. And that's about all there is to it.

Now if we're going to pull the big—the big medicine drum out, you know, and we're going to—we're going to bow down before the altars of God—help—us and figure out exactly what is man's relation to the cosmos? What is man's relation to divinity? What is the exact nature of this universe?

Why, we're propounding philosophical questions that he's never even come within kicking distance of And most of the questions he hasn't even asked. You look in vain for a philosophy of what's man doing on a time track? You don't find it. Why, he hasn't even gotten up that high.

Now we've got a different thing. Now we've got a different thing. Now, actually, we have to shift gears and at this point we can no longer strip away from the being, just strip away, strip away and shed and so forth. We've got an individual who will appear as an individual now and through his understandings of what is around him and his exact handling of the masses and significance in his immediate vicinity, don't you see, and his gradual emergence and cognition of what's going on, we're knocking out his whole concept of existence and we're replacing it with a wh—a total knowingness of existence. And that individual is merging toward causation, not being cleared.

This individual is going to the point where he causes the past, not cleared of the past. The aberrations which you're taking away from in R6 are not timed aberrations. That's what makes them very rough. They are not something which when you date them on the meter, they go away. Try dating a GPM on a meter some day. It dates now very perfectly. It isn't something that happened in the year 2681 B.C. or something, see. That's quite different than a—than a—than an implant, something that happened within the universe. You can date an implant and it—I don't care if you know the line plot or not, it will go *bizzzz*. You've put on the time track, in other words, you've fit the thing in relationship to time.

Well, you fit it in against the GPMs in relationship to time, and of course you get some very interesting things occurring. You get any engram or experience such as we are talking about when we are talking about clearing, and you only have to date it and it will tend to just go *bizzzz*. You find the exact experience you are looking for and date *it—bizzzz*. Pc wouldn't have a prayer getting the thing back.

Yeah, but where's this time come from that you are dating it in? Do I make my point that we are in an entirely different field? Now we are asking .the question of "Where does the time come from that you are dating the clearing in?" Ah, well, now you're in the field of R6, you're in the field of OT. You are in the field of re—creation of the individual, you're in the field of the individual rising up toward total cause. It is a very, very long and arduous road, even then. It is not a short road. We can sit there and run GPMs, my God, and run more GPMs, my God, and run—you don't run out of them very fast. And you raise your head and look around at the existence in which you find yourself still surrounded and so forth and you reorient yourself a bit and move up the line and one day you happen to notice accidentally that you are moving much faster than you ordinarily would move. You just notice it in passing, because it doesn't bother you.

Somebody who lived around you consistently and observed you consistently from a normal viewpoint and so forth would notice one Christ—awful difference, if you'll pardon the French. But you wouldn't even notice, see.

You say, "Well, that's a funny thing, I don't think I've been worried about that for the last two or three months." "That's very odd, but I was able to finish up that job in fifteen

minutes, you know? And it used to take me all evening to do that.” You know, just a fleeting idea, you know, a comparison, so on, a little lock blew or something like that, he paid no further attention to it.

The individual is coming back up to where he is more causative over the universe; he’s less worried about what the universe is doing to him. And so he doesn’t add it up—he ceases to add it up to self—progress. Do you get the idea? See, he’s no longer looking at it in this particular field.

I’m just trying to give you that there’s a separation point here, where you walk from the finite universe and start into the infinite. The world of total philosophy, the world of total beingness, the approaches to—well, not only whether did the chicken or the egg come first, but who thought up the question, “Which came first, the chicken or the egg?” See? You’re off into another line. Now we are going for broke.

Now, people who are interested in clearing are normally interested in their physical condition, they are interested in their mental responses, they are interested in their behavior pattern in its relationship to other human beings, they are interested in accomplishing finite goals in the physical universe, such as “How do I keep my job?” “How can I better my economics?” They’re interested in this particular field. Of course, a person going up the other track, if he hasn’t totally followed a clearing track and so forth, is still interested in those things, too. Perhaps not as absorbedly, but still quite interested. But people are only interested in that who are very interested in clearing. This is a subject which takes that area in hand.

Now, we get a long run of this thing and we take some guy who is a gibbering, screaming mess in some insane asylum and we’re going to take off enough separate—understand, separate—aberrations off of him. We’re not—you see, as long as we approach this as an—as an all subject, we’re going to lose. This guy is *insane* and we are going to return *sanity* to him. That is why you just can’t take that little old needle and stick it into the bottle and get three ergs worth of lepidus guk 652 and squirt it in his *gluteus maximus* and have him all *of a sudden* be in perfect condition and so forth. It’s perhaps a beautiful dream, but it’s a very batty one and it shows that there is no understanding of what they’re up against at all, see.

We’re going to take this bird and there he is gibbering inside the gates and we’re going to take up separate aberrations, the ones that we can contact, the ones that he could free himself of and one by one shake these things down. We are going to see that his general state improves. That is probably what makes people believe that he is being generally made saner, you see? He’s not *generally* being made saner, he’s being cleared of separate and distinct areas of aberration.

Now, we could also say that his memory is improving, but what—that leads us again into a cul-de-sac. We should say, “He can now remember in certain definite, specific areas” and we’re—we’ve made a better—a better approach. And this fellow eventually is risen up to a point of where he’s only worried about the bedbugs which are biting him all night long, except nobody can find them and we finally even get that one traced back. And this was the

symptom that landed him in the insane asylum in the first place, so now suddenly people pronounce him sane.

You—actually you couldn't ever have said he was totally insane and he is certainly a long way from totally sane now, he just isn't worried about these bedbugs anymore. Anyway—that doesn't make him sane. You are not sane because you don't worry about bedbugs. You get the point? So there would be no sense in making a general statement about the bird. But let's say, now, he isn't any longer dangerous to society, so we can let him loose.

All right. Now, that guy has got a long, long road to walk, man. That road—that road is a very hard road to look down even with a great, big, signal spyglass. You—you have to look down with a lot of power on that glass just to begin to see the vanishing point of that road. You wouldn't ever see the gates at the other end of it. You've got to walk down that road. And he—because he had a lot longer to walk than anybody else.

Now, instead of just abandoning this fellow and saying, "He is now sane, so we're not going to worry about him," if you were going to carry him on up the line, you would have to continue clearing his aberrations. And it would just be the process of finding an area on which he was a bit *rahhh* and run this back, and find out what was the cause of that and knock that one out and square that up and now let's find another area where he is *gluuup* and let's locate the basic causation on that, and let's walk him down this road and all of a sudden this guy is flying.

Well, someplace along this line he ceases to be interested in becoming clear of his past. Somewhere along the line he ceases to be interested in this, and he begins to be very sincerely, not on an unreality, but he begins to be sincerely interested in causation: personal, individual causation. What is his relationship and responsibility in regard to the physical universe—with regard to the physical universe. What's his relationship to the physical universe? What is his relationship to other people? Exactly where is he going?

Now, you can also go nuts in this direction and think you are God or something of the sort, but that would only happen if you were still inside the gates.

So you start thinking in these other terms and immediately there is another road. It isn't this infinite road that walks endlessly to a distant and never—approachable horizon. See, it is another road. And it's actually a shorter road, but it is shorter in terms of is it closer to Alpha Centauri, you see, or Beta Centauri, see. It's still a long road, but it happens to be a finite road in its turn. Only it's now—you see, clearing now became almost an infinite road because actually you've gotten to a point of where the individual could recognize his basic GPMs, he could recognize where these things came from and that sort of thing. Well, there's no point in clearing him because, you see, ordinary clearing procedures won't touch him. So clearing at that point ceases.

All right, now you walk over here into the long road of running GPMs, and there's plenty of them. And there's lots of tricks in them and you have your ups and downs and so forth and now you actually don't start noticing your tremendous forward progress.

Your progress is probably two or three hundred times per unit of auditing time what it was under clearing. But a person is interested in different things so he doesn't pay much attention to the forward progress.

He very soon gets over the idea of wanting to blow out the electric light, wondering if he could and short circuiting things like this. He very soon gets over it; he gets more serious—minded about the situation because it becomes more real to him; it becomes more natural to him. And he walks on up the line. He stops worrying about other people getting to be OTs and all kinds of little oddball things fall away. And he's got the—he's got an end of trail in view. It's finite. It doesn't la—I mean, it doesn't go on forever.

But there is your road, see, these are roads which we are taking and they are not one road, don't you see?

One has to do with processing somebody within the limits of time and experience and it has the deletional aspects of looking for things which—that delete. You have to delete from the individual in order to make him get right answers in existence, you see, and you are looking for those specific things and you are diagnosing them in certain ways and you're running them down. You've got a different approach now. You can strip away GPMs *pow! pow! pow!* But there's lots of them. You no longer have this same approach to auditing. Your auditing character changes, the individual's reaction to auditing changes. A lot of these things shift.

You could still take somebody who is running that road and you can put them back on clearing again. You can do various things.

Well, isn't that interesting that you can shift them from one of these processes back to another one. The odd part of it is, is after he has started on the OT road you can't shift him back too much or too far or his meter jams. It isn't whether or not he likes it or not, but you're liable to shift him back over onto finite clearing and he has already exceeded this. And what you'll do is in trying to give him finite clearing, he simply collides with the next GPM and it jams the meter. In other words, the only thing that is dominant or able to influence this case now is a GPM. And the locks are all on top of GPMs, they're not any longer on top of traumatic or life experiences. These are different actions.

Well now, as far as Clear is concerned, let's go back to where we started out. If you leave yesterday's total on the adding machine without ever understanding it or cleaning it up, you're going to have a hell of time getting the right answer today. The wrong answer is going to add into every line. The button on the machine called clear, that's where we get the term Clear, that's what clearing is all about.

Why anybody should go into a violent fit because we have mentioned Clear in a national magazine, and somebody saying, "Oh, he's going to start that again..." Yes, he is, he's going to find the person that said that and he is going to start it again.

Well now, that gives you an idea of the approach to the definition of a word and how much can go awry and how upset people can get over the definition of a word.

Now, actually trying to explain the definition of a word without the technology required in the explanation can only be done in the field of allegory. And you can only go so far in the field of allegory without getting into a hell of a lot of trouble!

So, I invite you to use all the allegory you want right up to the point you find yourself drowning on the subject and then to shift gears and get down to brass tacks. But you can't get in too much trouble trying to explain this if you really understand what it is. But it takes a lot of understanding.

The term in the first place is not an elevated term, it's a good, lousy, mesty, typewriter mechanic type of term. You know? It's corny. Clear. You can see the guy now on the bench all covered with grease and so forth, and he keeps yanking the lever of this thing and the damn thing won't clear.

Actually you are in the same boots in a much cleaner and more elevated position when you keep looking at the pc and the pc keeps saying, "But my father beat me and beat me and beat me." But you can't ever locate one single moment when his father ever beat him. "But my father just beat me day and night, day and night, day and night. Morning, noon and night my father beat me. And my father beat me and my father beat me." And that is all you can get out of this pc. Well, you feel like yanking his lever hard. And you can't find any entrance point on the thing.

Well, you must be looking to some point that isn't an entrance point on the subject of clearing anything. That's what you have to decide after a while because it isn't going anywhere and you weren't clearing anything, so you sure better find something that you can clear.

And that's what generally defeats the auditor when he approaches this subject of clearing, is he gets his pc into some area that either doesn't have to be cleared—the pc is already sane in that area—or the pc has leaped into some area which is not about to be cleared. There's some interim area in between those two that is approachable. And the auditor, unable to find this, gets desperate and says, "There is no such thing as clearing. You can't clear. There are no Clears. Nothing could ever be cleared." See, he gets desperate.

But his only error is that on the one side he may have been looking for something that didn't need clearing, and on the other side of the thing he may have been looking so deep into this case that he is not about to produce a relief of anything of the sort. He is not on a track then that is going to produce relief. And that doesn't mean that necessarily the aberration was too big or it was too small or it was too this or too that.

Also, it might not exist. It may be just advertising of another aberration. And then he is defeated, of course, also when he tries to get too logical about what's wrong with a pc.

If he tries to take how logical the pc's reactions are or illogical they are and make them logical by some sequence of events which he himself is explaining, he'll almost always be wrong about the pc. Almost always, because you see, he is describing something that is nutty. And of course, what makes it nutty is it doesn't make sense and the auditor sitting there trying to make it make sense is going to be wrong because it is nutty.

See, “I’m going to leave my husband because he is a brute and he goes out every night with strange women.”

And the auditor, all of a sudden, can find no real infidelity on the part of the husband. As a matter of fact, a little bit of checkup finds out this pc has been telling this to other auditors. The husband is pretty desperate about this situation because his wife keeps saying this all the time. Husband hasn’t been out of the house for fifteen years.

Well now, you can just see you now, sit there and try to figure—figure—figure out, “Now, why is this girl doing that?” Well, that’s the wrong approach. That’s totally the wrong approach.

All you have to do is recognize that she is not Clear on the subject of husbands because she is getting wrong answers. Wrong answers: She isn’t Clear.

All right, what’s the held—down five? Well, of course the thing that parallels a held—down five, of course, is a bad recollection of that particular area. So we could just improve recollection of the area. See? We could use other approaches on the subject of husbands.

Well, actually—actually old Creative Processing, you know, wasn’t that bad. It was just because it bit a pc here or there and so forth when they’d get into the big GPM on the subject. You could actually have her mock up two husbands for a short while or something and something is going to change, don’t you see?

But you’ve got to work on the subject of the datum she’s got in wrong, either by improving her memory on the subject or by clarifying her view on the subject or getting her to recall a subject or, I don’t know, call the husband and have her reach and withdraw from him for a while. It doesn’t matter what you’re doing. You’ve got to open up this track and you’ve got several lines by which you could open up the track. And you keep trying to open up the track, sooner or later the pc is all of a sudden going to start cogniting.

You find out it wasn’t quite husbands, it was homes—homes, that’s the one that is making sense now.

The pc starts cogniting, “Homes!” you know. “It’s stay home and go away from home, and the husband goes away from home and it’s home, See?” But home was always present in the pc’s statements, too, only you never heard it, see? “Ah well, homes. Well, let’s get down to brass tacks now on the subject of homes. Well, how many homes have you had?”

“Ths—uh—duh—bvow, remember—remember—remember, da—da—da ... Homes, oh my God, yes. I must’ve lived in forty, fifty, I didn’t have any home when I was a little boy. Boo—hoo—hoo.”

Now, we get the mis—semantic of “a house.” All of a sudden, “a house.” And there’s some misdefinition and incomprehension on the word “house.” And it’s all in backwards and it’s all upside—down, it doesn’t make any sense and it hasn’t got anything to do with anything and that suddenly pulls out of the lineup and house was in there with the wrong association and upset and so forth and so forth. And that was—then caused a traumatic experience after the fact on the subject of house and homes and then caused a building aberration on the subject of house and homes, don’t you see? And then caused lots of overts

on the subject of home and then caused a justification of the overts on the subject of home, and then caused a tremendous necessity for motivators on the subject of home. And the motivators turned out to be the husband! The only person around the home—the home never kicks you in the shins, but husbands can be made to do so. So now we've got the thing all untangled, it all goes up the line and everything—life goes along beautifully after that.

You see how it worked out? But it just worked out by you getting in there any way you could to ventilate this particular area and move it back, by any type of process—and you have many of them.

And it winds up at the other end, you have now cleared this person on the subject of husbands, houses and homes. But don't be too upset if you find out next month that you've also got to clear the person on the subject of family! This was a separate one. But if they had one that was that crazy, that close, then they were pretty plowed in when you first came along. See, they had lots of them!

Because the closer the association between two distinct areas of aberration, the closer they are found to be together, why, the more of them the person has. It's quantitative. You don't have big aberrations and small aberrations. It's *lots* of aberrations and not many aberrations. You got it?

The violence of the aberration is usually pretty violent and the nuttiness is very nutty. But it isn't even necessarily dramatic or interesting. That's another thing that is upsetting to auditors sometimes. They're sitting there with their tongue hanging out to find the blood at the other end of this thing because maybe they found out it caused a near murder. And then they find out that it had merely to do with being hit over the head with a gin bottle when they were two because it fell off the sideboard. And they—they—it's like waiting for the other shoe to drop, you know? That was the total incident. The pc is trying to make more out of it and so forth, you know, drunken father, drunken mother, we find out suddenly neither one of them ever drank much and we finally find this gin bottle falling off the sideboard. There is—something happened and it will be very anticlimactic sometimes.

Sometimes it goes quite in the reverse. You're following down this line that the person just doesn't like to see threads around and that sort of thing, and you suddenly run yourself into a great, big, juicy murder.

It's quite unpredictable because it's crazy. And it's crazy because it's not susceptible to comprehension. And the person can't add it up because it isn't comprehensible.

But you can find—today find the source of it and plow it up and throw it away, so you can clear and clearing is permanent. That's all.

Okay?

Audience: Yes.

Thank you.