

LEVELS: THE REASON FOR THEM

A lecture given on
20 October 1964

What's the day today?

Audience: October 20th.

Twentieth? Twentieth of October, AD 14, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course.

We're, as you know, just as an announcement here, we're dividing the course into Central Org and field personnel. Several reasons for this—is one, the course is very large at this particular time and it's one way to divide it. And Central Org personnel are always used to working very, very hard, so we thought they could stand about three or four more hours of a study day and it wasn't a matter of punishment, it's just a matter of expediency. We have to get them in here and straightened up and taught and out of here.

Central Org personnel are a bit different to this degree, in organizations they do keep right up with their technology and they don't drop far behind, so to put them through the same set of checksheets is actually a bit abusive and as a result, why, Central Org personnel have been divided off and if you see somebody around looking very, very haggard and looking very driven and a face is always missing at a party or something like this, well you know that's a Central Org personnel.

That doesn't mean the program is softened up for the field auditor. Now, we have other curves on the line for the field auditor. The way the course is being rigged at the present moment is that somebody comes in here and we check him out with great rapidity up the line to where he has reached on the levels and where he is expert on the levels and then we give him that set of checksheets to proceed therefrom, you see. In other words, we hand him a set of checksheets proceeding from the point to which he has progressed in his actual auditing application, not his certificate, and take him on from there. So of course, he is on, relatively speaking, a different set of checksheets than Central Org personnel would be on, even though we'll still do this with Central Org personnel. The program is quite different with a Central Org personnel.

He comes in here and the first thing we'll do with him is look him over and find out why he's dragging that way, and find out why he misfiled that despatch and let's get those withholds off, you know, and let's get him straightened out, let's get any bug in the case that somebody hadn't been able to crack straightened out; let's straighten out any subject similar to Scientology that he ever got wrapped up with, don't you see. This is right off the

bat—bang! you see. Then get his definitions real straight, and get him on to clearing with a dead crash and just with a—I think it's 7_ hour auditing day—bring him right straight on up to Clear—bang! don't you see. And then hand him a set of checksheets on R6 and kick him out of here. In other words, yeah, let him go through his checksheets, get him Provisional Classification; he has to take his examination before he ever gets that but that's the idea, don't you see?

And we won't be bothering too much. Why? Well, there's good reason for that. When he gets home he'll still be getting checked out on bulletins, he'll still be getting technology, he'll still be getting this, he'll still be getting that, don't you see? And actually Central Orgs so miss their personnel that they send here that they have a very, very hard time and they've had an awful hard time in the last year and a half. And one of the reasons—one of the main reasons for that has been it's their key personnel very often is missing and we mustn't keep doing that. So it's—be a shorter course for them and a much rougher course.

And the field auditor, why, the course goes on more or less the way it's been going on, straight on down the line, making a different, slightly different basis. They come up to the point where they have achieved their level. Give them the checksheets from that point; make sure that they go through there and then put them through the auditing steps up from that point; mostly it's a training basis, don't you see? And get them well trained up in that particular direction and when their cases are in good shape and that sort of thing, throw them over into R6.

So case, is going to become a requisite for a Provisional VI Classification. And there's a very excellent technical reason for that. You cannot take somebody who has been head-on into R6, I mean, actually running R6—real R6, now, I'm not talking now about running some items, or what we were calling GPMs a year or two ago, or you know, 2-12 or stuff like that—no, no. I'm talking about real honest-to-goodness R6. You can't take somebody who is at that state of training and processing and return him into clearing.

You start clearing up definitions on a person at that particular stage of the game and you're going to be in trouble. You're going to be in trouble. Why? The boy is right that instant sitting in an item “to glopher gofs,” you see, and this item “to glopher gofs,” is all you're going to get and you can take a lot of locks off “to glopher gofs” but if you unfortunately reach too far and got him into the next GPM with your definitions and all that sort of thing—I don't mean, just checking out definitions or words in general, I mean, for blood auditing, you see, and if you were auditing him on this and you got him into Clay Table Clearing and he unfortunately picked up a term that was in the bank, a series or three serieses or ten serieses on down the line or even six items down the line, he's going to get a cracking big somatic and that somatic is just going to get worse and worse and worse. Well, why? Because you haven't got the item necessary to resolve the case which is, of course, the whole item. So he can't say, “Well, I want to improve my golf” “What of you—haven't you understood about golf?”

And he says, “Well, the effort—uh—the effort necessary to hit the ball.”

You say, “All right, put effort together in clay.”

It's an end word. It's way down the line. He isn't there, don't you see. He's up here. Well you won't run into this difficulty with somebody at the lower levels because all the words and all the GPMs are there. They haven't got straightened or selected out. Do you see? They aren't selected out. He's not running on down the track. It's just a globular glutinous bunch of glue and any place that you pick anything off of it, you're lucky, don't you see.

But when you've got this straightened out and you get somebody going on down the line, pocketa-pocketa-pocketa, in real R6 auditing, then you start clearing them; well, you're just going to find the item in which the person is now sitting that was the next item to come up and it's just going to get goofier and goofier, don't you see? And it's going to be very poor—very poor show.

Now, this means, then, that there are technical reasons why cases progress up the levels and should progress up the levels and they're very solid sound technical reasons for these things. That's what this lecture is about.

Levels are not particularly popular because peoples got it mixed up with class consciousness and everybody wants to be equal. Well, I'll tell you... I'll tell you what—what equality to achieve. Let's say yes, let's all be equal but the equality to achieve is OT. You have to work a long time to be equal. That's what it comes down to.

So, the reason for levels—the reason for levels originally was to stretch out auditors into what they were capable of getting results with, see? The first attention was on auditors. It quickly passed from there over into the realization that we were looking at why pcs didn't make good progress because they hadn't come up through an orderly progress on the line. We tried to enforce this on pcs and it didn't go down very well. They wanted to be run on R6 when they had to be run on Level 0, and all that sort of thing and they didn't like this particularly so we took the classification off the pc and told the auditor to retain the classification on the pc, see. We didn't force the classification down the pc's throat but we say, "If you haven't got a Class so-and-so you mustn't run processes above that class on the pc." Well, that's good sense. Well, it goes further than that. Also, if you've got good sense you won't run a process which is above the level where you find the pc.

Now, I'm not trying to give you at this moment an accurate progress that I don't have the bulletin in front of me in which it was laid out—and it is to some slight degree in a state of flux at this moment. I'm just trying to appeal to your reason along this particular line.

Let's take an ordinary bit of raw meat that's drifting up and down the street out here—raw meat, derivation of word: the guy thinks he's a brain. You see, so he doesn't know he's a thetan. He isn't up there and he thinks he's deteriorated into a bit of matter; he thinks he's a body and so forth, hence this derogatory—jocular term rather—raw meat. And of course, he hasn't been done up any particular way or another so it has a side joke that goes along with it, you know.

But it also carries the fact that man is sinking down into—and this is a new thought on the line—into just a food animal. He's long thought of himself as a spiritual being and—with great pride and dignity and that sort of thing, and there's a bunch of revolutionary mutts all of a sudden jumped up on the track in the late part of the 19th century and said, "We have made

a new discovery: you're meat," you know. "You're nothing but a brain. The way you perceive is—the way you perceive is there's a bunch of cells that click against a bunch of cells and this shows against some kind of a screen and this analyzes the new thought and then this gives you a reaction and then the man thinks he thinks, don't you see, and then he somehow or another acts in some stimulus-response fashion."

And they've made man into a stimulus-response animal and they're trying to handle him that way governmentally and they're trying to handle

him that way with advertising and they're going to have an awful lot of failures because there's a big lie on the line. He is not a stimulus-response animal. There is always, no matter to what tiny degree, there's power of choice. And this is the one thing that overwhelms the planners: is the fellow who doesn't like soup, you know? And that plate of soup will stay on that endless belt because he didn't take it off, you know, and it goes in and busts up all the machinery in the whole empire eventually, by concatenation.

Now, if they could just solve this bird who didn't like soup, then they've got it made, from there on, don't you see? Because everybody would pick up their soup off of this endless belt and there wouldn't be any dissonance here of any kind whatsoever and all would be harmony. But what kind of harmony—for whom, for what? The end product of this would be a bunch of machines running to maintain a bunch of machines, which I think is terribly interesting game if you look at it—a bunch of machines running around.

And I remember old Johnny Campbell, one time or another, he used to hold forth at this at great length and so forth. And the reason he parted company with us on the subject of this mind and the spirit and so forth, is because of his dedication to the machine. He wrote one of—a marvelous story by the way; he could really string these things out—and it was a civilization, you see, where man had been dispensed with and it'd become an ideal civilization in there were just machines left there which were repairing machines and that was the ideal civilization. Only he didn't put it out as a Satire. He meant it. Now, the end product of this sort of thing is the super stimulus response.

So, when an individual shows this item called power of choice, they conceive it to be an irregularity. They think that this individual is now going to conduct himself irregularly. Well, this is against the hidden standard that the plans he's given were right. You see, if all the plans for the universe were absolutely infallible, why, then there would be some reason not to have any power of choice over anything. If all the plans laid down by social states—if all of the—of the great designs of Utopia were all of them utterly flawless and would lead to nothing but paradise on Earth, why, then of course, quite obviously a power of choice would be quite destructive. So those who pretend that the ideal has been achieved and laid down and must be followed—those who pretend that and carefully delete from it the totality of power of choice, are going to get in a mess and the way they're going to get in a mess, is simply, that they have told a big lie as the ideal has not been laid down on the political front.

That there are this many ideologies at war with this many ideologies would tell you that there was something in error here. None of these are winning above another one really. Capitalism's still hanging around. I think the Congo now is sliding back toward capitalism. I noticed that Russia—and I had a very funny, a very funny cognition this morning—I shall

have to tell you what it is—I realized what this Khrushchev overthrow is. I just suddenly realized the whole significance. Russia tried to have an election. That's it. She looked at the United States having an election and she looked at England having an election, don't you see, and she went into an obsessive duplication. The only thing that's been holding her up at all is the personality of Khrushchev. Now, what happens, we don't know, don't you see? But they did; that's what they tried to do. I think it's very amusing.

So anyhow—anyhow, the ideal state has never been laid down and get this—never will be! Absolutes are unobtainable. And that absolute perfection is unobtainable. You can get awfully close—you can get close but you can't arrive and never will be able to arrive at a total perfection. And the reason for that is this same thing. The reason why we can't attain this absolute is just this same item. It is that you're not dealing—you're not dealing, now, with a total carbon copy, being to being, to being, to being, you see? So, who would be to judge when the absolute had been attained? You see.

Oh, we always had some tiny disagreement on that if we were trying to apply—we were trying to apply absolute to the arts. All right, what is the perfect piano piece? You see. *Pft.* Ah. Who is the perfect performer? Now, we could go a long way toward analyzing what a perfect piano piece might be, and what a perfect performer might be but then this would get modified at once by the consideration of who was hearing it or seeing it. And once more we would have dissonance on the basis of whether or not a perfection had been attained and therefore the absolute is not achievable, don't you see?

And it's this one thing that man is capable of his own judgment that—now that sounds very odd to you, but man is capable of his own judgment—that keeps the absolute from being attained. Now, that's a very peculiar, a very peculiar fact. So, therefore it could be read as a very evil thing. But who wants to attain an absolute? That's no game at all. See, that's the other question you have to ask.

So, this individual—this individual never, all the way down the line, totally loses his individuality. It doesn't matter how many—how many lead boots you subject him to, how many rats you have in the warm brass jar running around on his stomach trying to get out; it doesn't matter how much economic duress you put him under. This random factor of somebody all of a sudden stands up and bears his chest to the bullets, “There, go ahead and torture me; go ahead and shoot me. Yeah, all right. The hell with you!” See.

And they say, “Well, now, Joe, that's not a reasonable attitude. Do you realize you can be tortured for eight thousand seven hundred and sixty-four days and you can be incarcerated and imprisoned; all your wives and children can be executed out of hand and the whole society will be destroyed?” And you lay up all these consequences and so forth.

And he says, “My answer to that, bud, is shoot me. Go ahead, torture me. Go ahead, put me in jail. But I won't say yes.”

And the hell of it is, is everybody admires him because they recognize this as the last resort of the thetan which is integrity—integrity to himself.

Even the Russian, in propagandizing his own revolution, could only make motion pictures of great heroes of the people. And it is so interesting to watch some of these things.

You might not even be able to understand the Russian but what is going on in this thing is quite terrific—is Dimitri Novgorod leaps forward and says, “You are oppressing the people!” See.

And they say, “Dimitri, were going to fix your clock, bud, but good—but good. We’re gonna fix your clock.”

And he says, “To hell with you.”

And the plot then proceeds. I’m sorry to give you such a short synopsis of it, but I mean it’s rather obvious. And one of these, at the final end, shows Novgorod, who is about to be executed by having a hook hooked in underneath his breast bones—I mean, typical Russian taste—and hoisted high in the air, and so forth; he brushes the guards off and does a ballet leap into the air and collapses down on the hook. The total theme is, “You could not and will never succeed in breaking down my individual integrity.” And even in the midst of the Russian Revolution—making motion pictures which were supposed to superpropagandize how you should all bow down to the communist state—all they could do—all they could do, you see, was deify individualism and integrity. They deified the revolutionary because they wanted these people, of course, to revolt against the other state and ever since they’ve had this problem of counterrevolution.

Now, the individual can only be pushed so far. You want to watch one of these situations where, well, the ship’s company is given a terrific beating by their Commanding Officer. They’re just chopped around madly and according to the Bligh school of thought, don’t you see, this is the perfect way to handle the crew. Well, I knew such a ship commander at one time—his name Richmond Kelly Turner because I wouldn’t want to be exposed for libel on the thing, and he was in command of the USS *Astoria* cruiser and he did this kind of thing and it was all pretty doggone confounded grim and it was strictly a Bligh sort of government of the ship, don’t you see.

Well, now, you’d say, under normal circumstances isn’t this perfect—this best of all form of worlds and this best of all form of—of management? All right, naturally, you would have had a perfect running ship. Oh, no, quite the contrary. There wasn’t anything on the *Astoria* worked. Nothing worked, nothing! You turn on a water tap and no water came out, you know. All right, well, then the ship fitter that was responsible for that would be put up on the carpet you see, and “Why had his people been so remiss as not to fix up that pipeline?” Crash—crash—don’t you see—thud—thud. Oh, he’s going to get a general court or something like that if it isn’t fixed up there at once and so on.

Yeah, well, they go down and they take apart the pipes that had to do with this one pipe, see? They take apart those pipes very carefully and they see that there’s seven of them that need replacing but they only have orders to replace one. So they carefully take apart the *whole* bulkhead where these pipes run, you see; they take off these *huge* sheets of armor plates you see, at enormous expense and labor; they take off all this equipment; they disconnect all the electrical connections that go in there. This is a fabulous operation.

You see, a modern man-o’-war is built like—it’s built like a lot of watches enlarged into a much greater complication, you know. And you probably could touch them anyplace

and they become vulnerable because the complexities. And then they will fix that one pipe. But there are seven pipes in there that needed fixing but they haven't got order to fix the six, so they fix the one. Now, having fixed that one pipe they then put together all the electrical wiring at great expense; they put back on all the armor plate at great expense, you see; they put everything back together again—you can't get at those six pipes now. And now they turn on the water faucet and it runs and the ship fitter says, "Well sir, the water faucet now runs." "Very good, very good." The next day in the next cabin the water faucet there doesn't run. It's called a white mutiny, it is the technical naval term for that. Do exactly what you're told and don't do anything else.

And all the way from the top to the bottom a thetan will do this. He never gives up—never, never really gives up. No matter what state you eventually find him in at the bottom of the barrel, he really has not given up. And he could look like he's given up. He could be down on skid row, filled full of booze and that sort of thing, and what do you suppose this is? That's a way of getting even, too, isn't it? Being no good; being a burden to the society, a liability, setting a rotten example to everybody, and so forth. No, he hadn't given up. Not at all.

So, what—what accounts for production and that sort of thing? Well, the Russian state right now, in its overthrow, only had one real liability in it, in that its people didn't have anything. They had to buy enormous quantities of wheat just to feed people something, and they had a lot of difficulty in keeping their economy going. And one of the reasons why they had trouble in keeping their economy going is their collective farms didn't produce well. They had a little law in there that they really couldn't quite get rid of, that every peasant or comrade or whatever they call them these days, now had a little plot of land of his own, and he could raise things on this little plot of land of his own and he could sell those. See, Russia even got back the income tax not too long ago—they could sell all the produce on this little tiny plot of land, you see. But he was mainly supposed to work on the collective farm. Well, Russia's food supply, and I don't know the exact figure and I don't think anybody else does, but is 60 or 70 percent from these little tiny food plots. The bulk of their produce is coming from this privately produced materials of life. Still running on private ownerships, you see, right there in the middle of the communist state. And over at the collective farm, yeah, they sit on that tractor—of course, it won't run—but they sit on there from 9:00 in the morning or whenever they're supposed to work on through till about 5:30 and somebody comes around and says, "Why isn't the tractor running?"

And they say, "Well, we don't have any parts."

And, "Well, why haven't you got any parts?"

"Well the gearshift went out the other day."

"Well, what happened to the gearshift?"

"Well, I *don't* know. It was just being worked. It was Ivan over there who was operating it at the time and the gearshift went out. We need a new gearbox."

So, the head of the collective farm, of course, he is actually an elected character. They got democracy amongst them, too. So this bird, instead of being the commissar which he was once upon a time and so forth, is more or less an elected representative of those workers of the

collectivism, you see. So, this bird, of course, has-is in the danger all the time of not being reelected to head of the collective farm by his own workers. I don't know how the Russian managed this because over his head is a commissar who has the right to shoot him dead. So, he's left at a point where the authority breaks down. He's in a pitiable position. He feels that he can't shoot anybody dead but he'll be shot dead unless things produce. So anyway, he passes on up the line and finds out that the same condition exists all the way up the line to the tractor factory. And the tractor factory, of course, exists right on out into the mines. This whole situation is awry all the way down the line. They can't get the spare part for the tractor.

Well, if this were an American farm or something, they'd go out and clip some pieces of bailing wire off or something like that, and hold back one of these confounded gears that kept slipping into the other gears that were stripped and they'd wire it down in the gearbox, so that it couldn't mesh, don't you see. And they'd get a couple of gears that would mesh and they'd run the tractor in second gear from that time thereon with a frozen shift, don't you see? And I've seen them do this. You had to leap quick on this tractor because when you started it, it started to run. Clutch gone, you see so they just wired the drive shaft straight into the crankshaft.

You won't find that in Russia. Why? See, it's a sort of a white mutiny goes on all the time. They don't approve of this and they don't approve of that and so they're in revolt against the perfect state. This isn't a lecture against communism, it's just a statement of that. Be very nice if someone could invent a perfect society, you see.

But there are societies which are more perfect than others and I know perfection is not supposed to be—have grades or degrees. You know, “best” is not supposed to have a degree and “worst” is not supposed to have a degree and that sort of thing, whereas, as a matter of fact, life is full of these little shades of gray. And to attain an absolute then, in terms of conduct, by making everybody conform to Rule A and to attain this absolute by *denying* him—now, this is what's wrong, you see, it isn't actually, “Let's conform to Rule A,” that's just an agreement, don't you see? But now, denying him by duress and continuously, any judgment or initiative with regard to Rule A.

Now, there's two things that makes managers or supervisors or something like that fight this. One is the person, before he knows Rule A, is very prone to violate it because he doesn't even know what he's violating. And he isn't going to get any result or get anything done or make a factory run or anything else because he doesn't even know there could be a Rule A, don't you see? So, he's just extrapolating off of nothing. He's just trying to figure out something from nowhere, don't you see, not being aware of the fact that there is an agreement on this point. Well, maybe he could figure out something better but it's his disagreement with everybody else who is running at that particular moment on Rule A that gets him in trouble. Well, he doesn't know of its existence.

Now, now—now, look at this difference. Now, he knows Rule A and becomes very good at this Rule A. He knows what Rule A is; he knows why it's there and he knows how to exercise it; and he does something else and he gets away with it and it works. Do you see this? Well, that's not a mutiny; it's an improvement. He knows very well what Rule A is and he knows how to use Rule A and that sort of thing and he can still keep the agreement in with

Rule A and he can still exercise his freedom of choice with regard to other factors with relationship to Rule A. It takes a—it takes a very well-trained, very skilled fellow to do that.

In auditing, if you took somebody in your HAS class and you said, “Well, you really don’t have to follow a comm cycle, you know. That’s just a…” We’ll take a comm cycle as Rule A, you see, out of an auditing cycle. “And you don’t—really don’t have to follow this, you know.”

And he says to himself, “I really don’t have to follow this.” So, he just sits there, and he doesn’t say anything to the pc and he acknowledges in the middle of the pc’s sentences and that sort of thing. You’re going to have gobbledygook. And you aren’t going to get any auditing done at all because this item does exist called an auditing cycle.

All right. Now, let’s take the middle—the middle area of auditor training—the middle area, Level II, III and so on. You have to be, at that level, pretty awful careful that that auditing cycle is followed, man; that’s really followed. This guy could follow it in his sleep. He knows what it is. Bang! Now, the reason he’s following it is because he knows what it is. He knows why he has to follow it and he knows what results it gets when he does follow it and so forth. He’s getting more experience on it and he is following it. And the auditing cycle at the other end of the line, why, he’s very expert with his auditing cycle. He doesn’t even think about using the auditing cycle while he’s using the auditing cycle. He thinks about the pc and so forth.

Now, you take him on upstairs into very, very, very skilled, very experienced auditing—a very odd thing about it is, is occasionally one violates the auditing cycle, but you’ve got to be an awful skilled auditor to do that. The pc is saying, “*Yappity-yappity-yap,*” and your sensitivity to the pc, you know exactly where the acknowledgment should be and you modify the acknowledgment by a little bit of nod, you know. And pc goes on, and so forth and so forth, and you find out the pc is answering this question now, one right after the other. He’s giving you answer after answer after answer or something like that. You know if he’s—you can see this just blow. You’ve just hit some kind of a line charge on the thing. And if you said, “Yes!” and “Thank you!” every time he gave you one of these answers, you’d stop him cold in his tracks and you can see this thing blowing so you just sit there and let it blow, you know. And you give him a little wink of the eye and a nod and you still got that and so forth, “Mm-hm-mm,” you know. There’s no acknowledgments going on. The auditing cycle has gotten into too blurred a blow, don’t you see? It’s blowing too quick for anybody to do anything about it and he sits there and when the pc finally runs down, why, he now knows all about auditing cycles and that sort of thing—he sees the pc’s run down. The pc hasn’t got anything to say on that subject. He says, “All right.” He said, “Thank you.” See? He puts the intonation of voice. He’s got different things now in his auditing cycle. He uses his auditing cycle.

Now, you can teach a fellow all about a violin and you say, “If you saw on the violin while holding your finger down at this particular point you get A,” and I remind you that that doesn’t make a Jascha Heifetz. It’s very possible that Heifetz possibly, occasionally, doesn’t even touch a string at a particular place to make a particular note. Did you ever think about that? He possibly doesn’t close the string at that particular place to make that note. He may

very well find out he can just as easily make it on a harmonic on another string, or he can make two notes sound together—they sound just like the other note which you heard so it doesn't matter whether he hit the string at that point or not. In other words, this is... Don't you see? He can—he can render the effect with such case and such virtuosity, and so forth, that if you were observing it, you—if you observed it very, very—if you were just listening to it, you'd think he was following all the rules but if you looked at it very, very closely, you'd find out he wasn't really following all the rules. Now, if he was following them, he'd be following them with variations.

Well, how well did he have to know the rules in order to follow them with variations? See, that's what gets interesting about all of this, and there is where the person comes a cropper who is trying to learn some subject or trying to follow out some industrial plan or something like that.

There are two conditions, which are a Variation from the “must do it”—two conditions. And one is the condition of just total ignorance and rebellion which is based on aberration. You know, the manager is a blond. This guy was in the war and he killed a lot of German blonds, you see. He didn't like blonds, of course, so therefore, anything the manager says is wrong, you know. That's, “What wall?” So he doesn't even bother to find out what the plant's manufacturing. And yet he's supposed to be getting his coffee and cakes from this plant. He hasn't bought himself a job, he's bought himself a point from which he can revolt, don't you see? Management sees this! Management sees this and they say, “Shoot that guy from guns.”

Well, that's a Variation, don't you see? And the other end of it is this happened one time down in south China when they were trying to industrialize—trying to industrialize China is one of the more amusing activities because, of course, industry puts people out of work and the Chinese have only one ambition and that is to get everybody—get everybody a job. Between these two things you get quite a clash. But they themselves have terrific production potentials. So, here's the Chinaman and he's got a—he makes tin cans. He's sawing out the tin for tin cans for Standard Oil down there in some southern China plant and this is before China went boom. And there's a guard on this band saw that he's sawing metal with, you see, that is a safety guard that keeps people from cutting their hands off, you know. So a new American manager took over this area, and he went through the plant and he saw this old Chinese standing there at this band saw and this fellow was sawing out pieces of tin that were to make tin cans, and he was going at it with great rate, and he saw no guard on the table so he said, “*Yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow, yeow*, and where is that guard?” through the interpreter, and so forth.

Why, the old Chinese workman there, he said, “Oh, yes, yes, yes, there's a guard. There it is, it's down underneath the table there.”

“Just make sure it's on the machine.”

They picked it up and put it on the machine, and so on. “Is that where it belongs?”

“Oh, yes, yes. Well, that's it.”

“Oh, you make sure you leave it there.”

And he came through the next day and the guard was back underneath the table. So, he got ahold of the interpreter and he got ahold of the couple of foremen around there and he said, "I want that guard on that table of that band saw because somebody's going to cut their hand off on the band saw, you see, and that guard prevents them from cutting their hand off, and it's an automatic control so that nothing can go into it but the piece of tin." And he explained it all to them with terrific rationale and reason and all this sort of thing and they put the guard back on the table and everybody said, "Yes," and went away very happily, and he came through on his inspection the next day and the guard was underneath the table. So, he explained to everybody where this guard belonged and he himself put the guard on the table that time. He was thinking very seriously about this—about the revolutionary spirit which must exist in this particular plant and it was all centering around this old workman. Well, he was making a fool out of himself. Of course, the end of the story is that after the seventh or eighth day of the same performance and so forth, he just walked on by the band saw table without even mentioning the absence of the guard on it that particular day, you see. The old Chinese had won.

The sense of the thing is, is he had a—he had a highly skilled workman there and this guy could have probably sawed tin into scallops and scrolls and done anything else he wanted to do with this band saw, and of course, this guard was from—for some knuckleheaded—knuckleheaded kid that might be doing his job, but let's notice that the knuckleheaded kid wasn't doing the job; it was being done by a skilled workman, and the necessity of this guard was absolutely nonexistent because if we looked carefully at the old Chinese workman we would have found he had all of his fingers, hands and arms. He'd been working it for five or six years and he still had all of his fingers, hands and arms, and he hadn't had any guard on the band saw either, so you would have thought somebody would have used some sense.

So, it requires sense from the person who is handing out or enforcing the rules and it requires skill and observation and judgment on the other side, to make anything work, simply because there are no perfect solutions.

Now, I *don't* care whether you're making a great—biggest piece of machinery in the world work, or whether or not you're just teaching somebody to swab off windows on a skyscraper, or something like this, with a piece of cloth. You can lay down all the rules in the world and all these rules are very sensible, but after a guy's understood these rules and after he's understood what the job is, and that sort of thing, to keep going around asking him if he has had his safety belt tested for its stress analysis, and so forth, at the local plant testing office in the last sixteen days—it's supposed to be tested every sixteen days or something like this, and so on. Well, at that point we have to decide—it must—somebody must believe they're dealing with a fool. This guy's not going to be on the 45th—floor window, with a weak safety belt. And he doesn't test it at the plant test room. When he hooks it on—when he hooks it on and starts to do his job, before he even he goes out on a window ledge, he usually puts his foot against the wall and goes crunch! you know, back against the belt. "Oh, that's—that's good today. That's good, you know." He comes down, he said—one day he said, "I gotta have a new belt." Well, the plant testing room tested the new belt. They're liable to get something like this: "Well, I don't care what the hell it has to do with the plant testing room but it so happens that this belt has a weak point on it. I don't care what they think, it's

what I say and so forth. If you don't believe me, you don't have to like it." Anybody in charge of the job who was very clever—an experienced workman says, "I need a new belt," they'd just say, "All right. Here's a new belt."

Young kid comes up, has no experience at all. Everything's been passed, tested and standard and he had no experience. He hasn't anything with this and he says, "Oooooooh, I—I—I—I got an old belt here. It's got a grease stain on it, see. I—I got an old b—belt here and I—I—I—I—I th—th—think it's awful unsafe and I'd better have a new—n—new belt." Don't you see?

You say, "What's a belt for?"

"Well, it's to keep you from falling."

"Oh, yeah. Well, what else is it for?"

"Well, I don't know."

Of course, it's leaned back against so you can get yourself some pressure against the window in order to put a polish on the window, you know. Why, he doesn't even know what a belt's for. How does he know whether he needs a new belt or not? He can't use the one he's got.

This is quite normally what happens to amateurs in photography. They can't use the camera they got so they always got to have a new camera which is their fixation on buying 50,000 new cameras every fifteen minutes. It's quite a different operation from somebody who's trying to get a camera that grooves in easily and it goes snap, pop and doesn't give him any trouble. Because he knows he's trying to get a certain result and the certain result which he's trying to get, he cannot squeeze out of the exact equipment which he's got. Well, all right.

Now we've got some reason for shifting, but we're shifting from the viewpoint of virtuosity. The fellow can already do this. Do you follow that? He knows, in other words, what he's trying to lay his hands on and, of course, he's also knowledgeable enough that if he gets hold of equipment that doesn't particularly service him or pick out this result or he can't hang back together again... You'd laugh, I got a new camera the other day, and putting it together, and so forth, and it didn't function at all, so I put it full of gaskets—oh yes, I have a piece of news—I got my certificate today. I graduated in earnest. Thank you.

But I put a—I put a piece—a couple pieces of cardboard underneath the lens mount to hold it out another thousandth of an inch or something like that so it focuses properly and it's a piece of ordinary cardboard. If anybody were to buy that camera they'd probably be horrified because they'd open up the lens mount and they'd see there was an old piece of cardboard stuck in there and they'd wonder what this old piece of cardboard was and they'd say that doesn't belong there so they'd pull it out and then their camera wouldn't work.

I was just taking some pictures a few minutes ago. I didn't have any parallax corrector for it. I knew about what the parallax must have been on the camera so I put my thumb underneath the finder and tipped the finder up about what the parallax would be which I, you know, which I thought was about an eighth of an inch above where the thing should have

been. But taking pictures holding a loose, flopping finder would have given you fits. You understand what I mean? When I say parallax I mean the lens takes one picture and the finder sees another picture. So you got to make the finder see what the lens is going to take. Well when they don't—when they don't true up one for the other and so forth, the normal course of human events is to just grit your teeth and bear it and wonder why your pictures have all the people's heads cut off in them, don't you see? Well, this finder's loose so what you do instead of putting the finder down where it belongs you know, the viewfinder, because it doesn't agree with the lens, why, just sort of hold it there in your fingers and look through it, you see, balanced at an angle which you guess might possibly be the proper angle with the lens so it's looking at the same thing the lens is looking at and therefore you're not cutting somebody's head off. When you get a finder that's extreme this way, it's much more accurate just to—just to sort of hold the finder in your hand. You could get down to a point where it would be actually more accurate to dispose—dispense with the finder entirely, don't you see? And you say, “Well, there—this edge of this camera lines up with the upper right-hand corner of the picture so we'll just squint along the edge of the camera and say—well that'll be the upper right-hand corner of the picture,” snap! See?

Well, how could you do that? Well, you'd have to know the theory of what you were trying to do, you see. And you know—have to know what you—why it was happening and you'd have to know what was going on and what was liable to go on particularly, what was liable to happen if you didn't do something about it, you see. You'd have to know the whole game all the way around the line. Not a rule you could quote about parallax. “Parallax is the logarithm of the wiziroids as they go into the wuclabugs.” It's actually, of course, different for every distance. You go another inch, the parallax between the finder—this works on box camera, too, you see your finder's up here, your lens is down here. So of course, the picture you take is looked at up here, the lens is taking the picture that is looked at down here. They're two different pictures. Cut people's heads off so therefore, you're really—in lots of cases as you get up close to things—much better off never to look through the finder. Going give you a false picture.

But you'd have to know that, see? You'd have to know that existed; you'd have to know well enough that it did exist, that you didn't suddenly find out you had forgotten to remember it just afterwards, do you understand? And then all of this stuff about parallax becomes very—very uncomplicated. Why, it doesn't amount to—to lots, see.

But when you were studying it, my God, how you sweated over this—”What was this thing, what was the formula, how did the coincidence, what's the difference between the axis of the lens and the axis of the finder and what is the formula that you apply and work on—on your slide rule, you see, *brrrrrr*, and what are the various rules that relate to this thing, *huh—huhuhuh*,” you know? He's having an *awful* time with it, you know? And then you'd get up so you'd be very, very careful about this, “Does this camera have parallax and this camera doesn't have parallax. This corrects its parallax and that doesn't correct its parallax *ooohooohoo*, good.” And you get up through your total confusions about that sort of thing.

After a while you take a big view camera, hold it up in the air, squint over the corner edge of the thing and shoot it simply because you know that the lens is going to view what

appears on the film. You know that—you know that very well now and you also know there's lots of ways by which this is not likely to happen. So when in doubt, you just short cut all these ways.

So the amateur, busily trying to make his achievement or attainment or something like this, is trying to get something else to do it or get the perfect instrument to do it. He's trying to get the perfect instrument to do it. I was looking over cameras the other night, it was very interesting to me to find out that I already had a camera that was doing better than any of the cameras I was looking for in spite of the fact that it was very far from a perfect camera. These other cameras were much more expensive. But it was very far from a perfect camera—the camera that was better than those other cameras, by sorting out all of the angles, all of the little liabilities.

For instance, when you vary the speed at which you take a picture you don't know where you are, if that's always variable because you have to take a picture very quickly in order not to get any motion in it and most of the blurs which you get in your pictures are from motion. They're not from anything else. They're not the grain of the film or any complicated reason whatsoever. It's just because you're waving it around like a red banner on high, don't you see, at the time you were taking the picture. So, the way to get over this is take a picture very fast. Well, if your picture's going to be very fast one moment and very slow the next moment and you're not going to know about it then you could never take a picture without blur. And you know the most expensive cameras made today are fixed up so the shutter speed varies. In other words, so they don't know whether you're taking a picture fast; you don't know whether you're taking it slow. And that's true of most of these automatic cameras. So, that's why a pro really wants nothing to do with an automatic camera he can't control. That's one of the reasons. There are a dozen more, too.

But look at—I'm just giving you this as a progress of rules. At first you run into this thing called parallax and it's as puzzling as the first time you heard me use the word, see. And then you find out that's just a parallelism between the lens and the finder and you find out finally that the lens is looking at one picture and you, through the viewfinder, are looking at another picture and that these are not the same picture. So there's a thing called parallax correction which the closer the object gets to you, the more the finder has to be tipped over to see the same relative view, you see? And you get this through your head. Now, you've got the formulas involved with this thing; now you get how this happens; now, you've got all the methods of correcting it; now you've got this and now you've got that and now you've got these other things. Now you're getting into a very complex subject. Well, by the time you've mastered this whole subject, why, you now, finally, come out the other end of the line and you don't correct parallax or figure out parallax anymore, you know about what the thing would be, you squint over the top of the box and you find out there's one line of the camera that is always parallel to the lens—film line and that more or less occurs up in the top right-hand corner of your picture and that you can squint along that. You wouldn't even need a finder. But look—look, you'd have to come through all of that to come up to a point of virtuosity.

So you see there are two breeds of Variation. There are two things that are variable and one of those things is sheer ignorance, just crash! Unbelievable ignorance and unfamiliarity.

There's no familiarity with it—they haven't got a clue, you see. All right. And there's the other kind which is a variation which stems from familiarity and knowledge. There's hardly a good cook in the world makes it up according to the recipes, you see, anymore. They take a couple of eggs—they may be very precise, but they take these eggs and they throw them in one direction, another direction, and so forth, and they say, "Cookbook, cookbook? Oh dear, haven't cooked out of a cookbook for years," you know. Beautiful cake.

When you try to shoot that one down, you're in trouble because that's got experience, familiarity, judgment; the individual has earned the right to vary it. I told Graflex Camera Company that—one of the oldest camera companies in America the other day in a letter, very insouciant—I was writing the letter and I said, "I see that you have invented a new camera term. But having been in business as many years as you have, you have a perfect right." This really got a laugh out of them. They recognize they have a perfect right to invent a new term for a camera. Perfectly valid. You'll find the terms going to be used every place very shortly. They have a perfect right to. They're familiar enough with them. But some Johnny-come-lately company that wouldn't really know cameras and wasn't making a good camera anyhow, they put a new term out on the market—I wouldn't pay any attention to it, see? That's your difference.

Now, when a management makes no differentiation between these two things, whether in a company or a political area, or a training area or anything of this sort; when nobody makes a differentiation between these two things, these two reasons for variation then judgment is denied the individual and from that point on you really get in trouble. You can handle that first one—the first kind, the sheer stupidity, with duress because you're being helped by all of life. The person does the action wrong through stupidity, they're in trouble. They don't get the result. Everything goes to hell anyhow—if you can pardon my French. Life is assisting you in punishing them, see. It's a sort of a Q and A. Well, they're going to get their heads blown off. All right, blow their heads off. You know. Well, all right.

Now, you could use then a certain amount of coercion, a certain amount of persuasion and so forth, to get people through that point, make them see that there is something there. And very often this is very hard to do. An Instructor very often finds this in teaching that it is quite rough getting across that early point, see. Well, right here, pc's getting no better but the auditor hasn't observed the fact that he isn't following an auditing comm cycle. Auditor sometimes sits there for five—ten minutes, you know, and never says, "Yes." Pc's also not talking. Nothing is happening so auditing isn't working. Well, a certain amount of coercion is necessary at this point, or persuasion or something of this sort, to trace the source and cause of this no action in the auditing session. Do you follow? All right, that's training.

Now, the Instructor who, carrying through somebody all the way and passing him successfully all the way and their understanding is up all the way—to let us say Class VI—and then calling to the attention of a Class VI Auditor, whose pc was running like a startled gazelle, that he was not following the auditing cycle, would be pure idiocy. This fellow was following as much of the auditing cycle as is necessary to resolve the case. He's using it with judgment.

So you'd have an entirely different viewpoint. Your viewpoint of what was going on would be different because of your knowledge of the person's experience. You'd say, "We're dealing here with virtuosity. We're not dealing here with stupidity and ignorance." Now, almost everybody confuses these things, and what messes it all up is the fellow who is ignorant very often considers himself very virtuous. "Oh yes, I'm—I can drive cars beautifully," he says, as he goes over the embankment and into the gully.

And also what gets it fouled up is no matter how great your virtuosity on some subject is, you every once in a while have a catastrophe. This is, after all, this universe. People are, after all, people. And you also once in a while will run into some unexpected turn in the road that—svuh—nobody could have done anything about it at all. It was absolutely beyond any power known to man to have averted what happened.

Well, now, virtuosity simply is measured by how quick is the recovery. We simply measure that. So we find somebody has made a colossal, screaming blunder in the first half-hour of his session, horrible blunder in the first half-hour of his session and it's still a blunder, still in full force two-and-a-half hours deep in the session. Oh well, there must not have been very much virtuosity involved here because the recovery wasn't quick, don't you see. Guy who knows his business, recovers quick. A guy who knows his business doesn't always never make mistakes—to give you a double negative. But that also confuses the situation.

So, does a person know his business or doesn't he, is what has got to be decided. And this is decided on the basis of result. Is the person obtaining his results or isn't he? And you can assume then that a person who is protesting against the rules—and this is a very easy measure—protesting the duress with which he's being made to follow the rules, who is himself getting results, duress or no duress, don't you see, we can assume that we must be dealing with a considerable virtuosity here. But a person who is protesting against all the rules and isn't getting any results, we must assume that he should have had more rules, not less. Because what we're dealing with here—we must be dealing with ignorance. You see, his departure from the rules does not result in a—in a—in a better gain—a better end product. His departure from the rules always winds up in catastrophe and when he makes one of these catastrophes and so forth, his recovery is absolutely zero. See? He not only goes over the cliff, but he never gets back up the cliff either. Now, that person protesting against the rules is the only fellow who gives management, instruction, running states and so forth the bad, duressful character that these things develop. It isn't the state that develops it. It's this bird. He doesn't know what he's doing. He doesn't know where he's going. He doesn't know why he's going there. He hasn't a clue and yet he's agin it. And to get anything done you go across his dead body. And the only difficulty is he never dies.

There's only one way that you could ever pick him up or ever get the show on the road or anything like that and that is to pick him up and that is the one thing which a very stupid management, state or Instructor would never try to do. They would never try to pick this boy up. They want this guy in concentration camps; they want this bird starving; they want this bird way downhill, don't you see. So, it's actually their combat with ignorance that's giving them trouble. Their combat with ignorance is what gives them the trouble and which gives them the broadest excuse to use force and duress and so forth. Now, when we move this back

over onto the other side and they are foolish enough to go into combat with virtuosity, now they put leadership to the revolution and we have a new Khrushchev tomorrow.

There are only two types of people who were ever exported to this planet. There were distinctly two types—the very stupid criminal, destructive personality and the genius. These two personalities without any gradient between them of any kind whatsoever is the total export to this planet and comprises the population of this particular planet. There's no in between. Anybody who says there is an average human being, an average which end of the scale human being would be what you would have to ask. I could tell you long stories concerning that particular line, but it's both those people, you see, give an unthinking stupid state (which believes that it has the perfect political answer) the only trouble—one is reactive and the other, however, happens to be intelligent self-determined trouble.

When you run into intelligent self-determined trouble and try to handle it with force, this of course, is handling thought with mass and it just doesn't handle very well and everything starts going up in small plumes of smoke, because the biggest power the individual has is his own power of choice—his own self-determinism. And this expresses itself in the very stupid, the very ignorant as well as the very brilliant. Only when it expresses itself in the very stupid, it expresses itself in total destruction and when it expresses itself in the very bright it expresses itself in the terms of a total *volte-vis* for all the forces involved in the situation. In other words, you just stay and change the whole lousy lot—*volte-vis*, about face—French military command. So, do you See?

So, somebody has decided, on careful consideration, that we are not running in a perfect condition and we're—that condition has become sufficiently imperfect to merit a change. This is on due consideration, not on a reactive consideration and then follows the thing on through with a well-ordered program and that changes the whole ruddy lot. Nothing much to that. And generally this individual will accumulate to himself a lot of other individuals who are on the upper strata of being able to shift things around and change the whole bloody lot.

Yeah, but this would be a revolution which would normally come about on an evolutionary basis. It would come about rather easily. It would come about rather inevitably. There wouldn't be anybody being able to stand up to it very good and all the other people who just revolt would probably revolt then, too, at the same time unless it were alleviated and things worked a little bit better in their particular direction in which time they wouldn't be likely to do so. But why did they have to stay stupid and that is our question in Scientology. Why do they have to stay pushed down into the mire? I'm not saying that we are saving the lower classes, you understand, but why—why is such a large segment of the population just in a state of just solid protest? Why do they have to remain in that particular debased condition? A lot of other such questions as that.

Therefore, this gives you some kind of a view of what you're handling when you're handling pcs and moving them on up the scale. When they move up through levels with great unfamiliarity, they say, "I want to have a shot in the gluteus maximus with a number 22 needle on a plastic syringe with the spot anaesthetized first, you see, and that will make me an OT," and here we go into the wild blue yonder. And you run into this bird and you run into

lots of them, see, and he's going to be an OT in the next three minutes because you're going to wave a magic wand. In the first place, the factor which he neglects utterly is becoming an OT has to do with his own power of selfdeterminism, power of choice, power of observation. That's him that's going to become an OT, you see. That's not you. And if you waved a magic wand that caused this sort of thing to happen it would just result in a further effect on him—an effect to such a degree he wouldn't be likely to get over it.

In Asia, poor old Buddha tried to pick up man and waved a few too many magic wands and turned the Asians into utter complete debase slaves for about 2,500 years. I think it's rather—the most—most horrible example of a guy's postulates going wrong way to that I ever heard of. He would be utterly *shocked* and probably is every time he takes a look at a bunch of these brass images sitting around, you know. “How...” he'd say, “No, I wasn't talking about that, *ooooooooow!*” you know. It's probably a matter of total outrage, you know. And a fella down here in Asia Minor, where they're always having trouble, sent a bunch of swine over a cliff and turned some fish to loaves, and so forth—into loaves of bread or did something remarkable and everybody went, “*Gosh,*” you know. And 1,964 years later, see, everybody is still overwhumped. And you know I don't think that bloke was trying to do that at all. Well, so much for the twenty-two gauge needle into the gluteus maximus and you're OT tomorrow, see. Just result in further overwhelm.

Now, the unreality and unfamiliarity of the situation; the fellow doesn't realize he's got a road to walk and he hasn't got a clue of what he's walking into and he therefore says to you as an auditor, he says, “Well, all I want you to do is to put me on the pad and light the fuse and here I go,” you know.

Well, man, you can put him on the pad and you could light the fuse but after it burned out he'd be just a little more carbonized.

Therefore, we get really the unpopularity of levels because there's an unfamiliarity with the road that's to be walked so therefore we don't say much about it to pcs and I think the less we say about it to pcs the better off we're going to be. I'm talking about pcs here, there and every place, don't you see. I don't think this is a profitable line of progress at all because their unfamiliarity doesn't teach them that they have to go anyplace.

Here's this guy sitting here—here's this guy sitting here saying, “Well, are you having any trouble?”

“Well, I really don't have a great deal of trouble except with breakfast food and so forth. I always have a lot of trouble with breakfast food. It makes me throw up,” and so on.

“Well, do you have any more trouble?”

“Well, yes, I have about two or three different jobs a year. I keep getting sacked.”

You say, “Well, isn't that a lot of trouble?”

“Well, no, the State, you know, kind of takes care of it between times and so it's really no real trouble to me.”

“Ah well, what about your marital situation?”

“Well, um—oh that. Well, I try not to think about that.”

“Well, all right. Now, at the beginning of this session here, do you have any present time problems? Is there anything worrying you here in present time?”

“No, no, not really. Nothing really worrying me.”

Well, you happen to know that he’s about to be thrown in jail tomorrow, you see, for something of the sort. You say, “How about that?”

“Well,” he says, “that’s just fate.” Then he says, “Well, what I want you to do is make me into an OT so that I can totally escape out the bottom.”

His comprehension of the situation, you see, hasn’t anything to do with the fact that he has anything to do with these problems, that he has anything to do with his environment, that it’s necessary for him to become slightly causative in his environment and even in the auditing session—at least able to talk to the auditor. Goodness heavens, we’ve got to—yeah, he’s got to be able to project himself at least those three feet to a sympathetic listener, before he projects himself from here to Arcturus.

So, you have levels. I told you I wasn’t going to describe the levels today. I’m going to try to tell you the sense behind them. Well, that’s the sense behind them. And that’s really much—all there is to it. You’ve got to get the guy up to a point where he can talk to an auditor enough and tolerate control enough and be keyed-out enough of the glutinous mass he’s sitting in so he’s under sufficient discipline—as far as an auditor is concerned—to go through the motions necessary to confront the very real objects of the bank necessary to run out to resolve his case. And that may take quite a while. That may take quite a while.

Technically, the easiest thing to do on something like this is to unburden the case by getting locks off and you do this by first unburdening the session environment—you know, you got to educate him a little bit, tell him what he’s supposed to do, get him used to be able to talk to the auditor. Well, I started to audit somebody just a few months ago and was very shocked to realize that I was—was startled that I had not estimated the situation because this person is apparently very glib all the time and this person was not willing to talk to me as an auditor at all. I had no session. I had no session. I was actually trying to do something for this person and I had no session and I had overestimated the ability of that case to project, you know, to talk, communicate and so forth. So, it was startling to have made the mistake, don’t you see? Don’t often make a mistake like this, you see. Person was perfectly willing to talk about all the social subjects under the sun, moon and stars but not willing to talk to an auditor. And you thought I was going to say about personal subjects—no, no. Was willing to talk about all the social subjects under the sun, moon and stars but was not willing to talk to an auditor. Not about anything, you see, just not willing to talk to an auditor. And you’d have to ask, “What would you be willing to talk to me about?”

“I guess I don’t know.”

Probably you’d keep that up for—for hours. And all of a sudden the person’s considerations with regard to this would have come into view and we would have had to straighten up the subject of auditing and we would have found some unhappy experience with

regard to some such associated thing. We would have gotten this by itsa; we probably would have found a little bit of difficulties they had had and worries they had had which hadn't been straightened out by some similar subject to Scientology. We'd gradually get them to talk to the auditor, see. We don't care what they're talking about. We'd find these other things were there and we'd gradually get them so they're talking to the auditor. *Huhuhuh.*

All right, now, we've got the thing of what are they supposed to do now—this was just itsa, see—now what are they supposed to do. Well, the auditor says something and they're supposed to do something so you pick out something very simple that you say and they say and then you okay.

Now, you could even teach them what an auditing cycle was and so forth and this is a rudiment. When you tell them to touch the chair you want them to touch the chair. You have to explain this to them, and so forth. Don't just leave it all on automatic and so on, and so forth. And you finally get it—you finally get this thing up so that they can be audited. Got the idea? They're sessionable, or something. Invent a new word as though we don't have enough.

And they're quite auditable and they haven't been audited on anything really. You think, "Well, we must have made quite a bit of progress on the case because the case did mention that they had been in the Holy Rollers and they hadn't done anything for him so that must have cleaned that..." Oh brother, no, they probably won't hit that again until they're up there about Level IV. Leave it alone. You haven't got any clue to this case yet. So, case is just able to be audited that's all. We've achieved this now.

Now, can we audit the case so he isn't so disturbed with the immediate present time problems he has at this moment all the time in his environment? Let's handle that environmental situation. What PTPs is he running into? And we're not going to do anything very deep about these PTPs. We're just going to get them counted. Let's get him to look over these things. Let's get him to look over problems and so forth. Now, let's get the session—now, to go over the steps again—let's get the sessions, so it can run. Get the pc so the pc can be in a session and respond in a session and not be upset about the auditor or the—or some kind of a room in a session, straighten this up, see, so get that step.

Now, let's get the environment so the pc can be audited on the immediate present time environment. Do you realize that's a little bit different than auditing him on the environment. No, no, he's not auditable yet on his environment. He hasn't got his environment sufficiently disentangled to know what to look at in the environment. He'd be in a total confusion all the time. You said, "All right, now this big problem, you're talking all the time about your wife and so forth."

He said, "Aoooooh, aoooohahh, I—I—I—I don't know that wed better go into that. Heh, heh, heh, heh—h—h, ooooh."

You say, "What's the matter? What's the matter?"

"Oh, it wouldn't do any good."

So, in other words, without making—without straightening out his orientation on his environment, we start to audit him on his environment. We picked out one thing in the

environment. It overwhelmed him at once because all these things were in the matter of stuff. In other words, we didn't straighten this boy's environment out so it could be audited.

We could do this as simply as, "All right, now, give me the parts of your environment." We do a case assessment on the environment, you see. But it's not real case assessment because it's not going to be done with a meter or anything else. We're just going to sit there and say, "All right, what's your life all about? Now, what are the various parts of this environment," you know, "that you live in?"

"Well, you're a part of it." That'll come off pretty quick. "And then there's my job. You know sometimes I have the feeling my job is a good place to escape to."

Of course, at this moment if you've said, "All right, now what problems do you have about your job?" you'd just be doing a Q and A because we're trying to straighten out the environment, don't you see? I mean—well, all right, he's got a job, all right, see. He comes to that. He doesn't—it's a good place to escape to. All right, that's fine. "All right, now, what are the other parts of your environment?" and so forth.

And way down at the end of the line someplace he, all of a sudden, mentions his parents. They live with him. But we've heard about this guy and we've heard about this guy and we've heard about him, we've listened to this guy and so forth, and so forth and he just never mentioned the fact that his parents live with him. And that his wife and five children and his parents live in this two-room house. He just never seems to—he neglects to have told us all this, don't you see? Well, he himself by the way has never confronted it, you know. And while he's telling you, if you've straightened out his environment anything up to that point—as I say this is down toward the tail end of getting his—parts of his environment named and straightened out, put in their proper—you don't realize it, you see, but his job sits over there within a foot outside that door. I ain't talking about a crazy person now; I'm talking about a pretty good guy off the street. And his—his entertainment, you see, his entertainment is over here just back of that wall don't you see—the theater he normally goes to and he's sort of sitting in his own office while he's sitting in the auditing room, you see. His environment's confused. Well, you get this—just get these things spotted. Just where are they and what is all this about and where do you live and what do you do and that sort of thing. Well, you're getting his environment auditable.

Now—now, that you've got that all straightened out and you've found out these various things, you'll find out that he's making good case progress along this line if you aren't pushing him too hard. Now, you maybe can start auditing the environment. "Now, what problems do you have in this environment?"

"Oh, well, yeah, I do have problems in this environment, I..." and so forth and he starts to ease in and he starts listing this problem and that problem. You finally find that he's named a problem that he can't seem to get his mind off *of—vooh, boom, chug*, you know. He's stuck with that one, you know.

Well, you could be so feather light as to say, "All right. Well, what communications didn't you complete with that?"

“Oh, gee. Well, you see I never wanted to communicate with it at all, you see, so...” And he gives you a long list of communications with regard to that problem that he himself has never completed and you don’t even bother to get the overts off. See. That’s rather accusative after all. Too light, you got to handle it too light.

“Oh, are there a lot of communications you didn’t complete about that problem?” That problem doesn’t bother him now. All right. There’s a lot of other of these things and you get all those things straightened out with similar feather-touch processes.

Now, now, we’ve got the period from this auditing session to the next auditing session somewhat cared for so that it isn’t always going to be coming up in the next auditing session, don’t you see. Now, we’ve straightened that out. Even though it took us several sessions, we got that straight, don’t you see. What are we doing? We’re expanding the perimeter. Comes from the auditing, what is auditing; expands out into the environment, what is the environment—just that you know—to the problems of the environment, you see and we’re now involving the case. Now, the case is getting involved. That is to say we’re coming up against the outer perimeters really of the reactive bank now.

Now, after we’ve done all that, we want to know something about the person’s past and future. Ah, but we’re going out into two different spheres now—isn’t it? Well, do you know you could, you—if you’re going to audit a person on his past, ARC Straightwire is so wonderful, simply because it orients the past. It’s just the person, you know, there it is, you know, there it was. If you say, “Give me a date out of your past,” you’d be doing almost the same thing, by the way. “Give me a date out of your past and where was that?” “Yeah, what—what date can you remember something happening on—out of the past—where?” It wouldn’t matter what you were doing, you’re carrying this same area and zone of familiarity, you see, into the past. Do you follow that?

Well, when you had him up to that line, why, then maybe you start him at Class II—pardon me, what’s now Class I materials which is repetitive commands and auditing cycle, and so forth. Now you didn’t think he got anyplace—you thought he got a long way didn’t you? He hasn’t gotten anyplace at all but he’s just now in a state—I said II, I because actually II has just been downgraded to I and I was talking out of force of habit. Your HQS is Level I now. You have some new of them—one of these. The reason why is, is we needed room at the top.

HQS—repetitive processes—is Level I. It’s not Level II now. I know, you say, it’s changed. Well, let me call it to your attention it was never broadly released because of that. See, I’m—and I told you—been telling you for quite a while this is in a state of flux and study. I keep telling you exactly where do we fit in these various points in order to bring off these various points. In other words, where do we fit in these various levels? Where has the guy got to go in order to get into these various levels? And it’s a pretty hard thing to figure out. So the finalized result is all we’re talking about.

The guy can now stand a repetitive process. The guy can now sit there and run on automatic, is all I’m talking to you about, you see. He can have the auditing question asked him again and again and again and he can answer this and he can involve his mind with this, he can blow locks, he can get rid of a lot of things, don’t you see, and so forth and he’s

flying—he's auditable. And I will say that it is to our shame that some 80 or 90 percent of our pcs have never been brought up to a point of where their environment was sufficiently straightened out. They had been brought up to the point where they were sufficiently straightened out to be audited in the room but they—always picking up PTPs between sessions because their environment has never been even oriented enough to address, so their problems have never been handled enough, so we're always faced at the beginning of sessions with PTPs and where auditing becomes very involved, very complicated and very upsetting and you can't really get on with the process and what you're all doing is—what you're doing there is getting tangled up with the pc's disorientation in his own environment. He doesn't know what problems he does have. Now, they keep coming up and smashing him in the face and so forth, between sessions and you try to carry on in sessions, and so forth. In other words, we haven't lifted the audibility of a person very high.

Now, if you run this person on up into, let us say, healing—Clay Table Healing now and you're going to heal up some of their body conditions and that sort of thing—their environment is so confused and from session to session it's going to—first their auditing could itself as a session—and the conditions for being audited are so confused they couldn't be audited at all. Well, huh. That goes without saying, you see. Their environment's so confused that from session to session we can't make them make any real progress. They keep going back downhill again. That's because their environment has never been straightened out.

Now, you're straightening out something that they have been worried about—their body, Clay Table Healing—health, that sort of thing. We're getting them so that they can live and not be so worried about pains and somatics in their body that every time they get a little somatic from their upper level auditing they don't all of a sudden start going into a screaming fit of terror because their body might be destroyed right on the spot. And you, of course, get rid of their hidden standards and that sort of thing as a result.

You move on up then into healing and then you're handling the locks of the reactive bank—the GPMs, you're just handling locks, locks, locks, locks, locks, locks, locks and you just handle them by the ton and the person isn't into the actual bank and hasn't been sent down the line—then the bank itself straightens out sufficiently so that it could be audited. You might find the person going onto whole track at that particular point, and so forth so you're really including a bit of Level V in.

When you get up into your R6 however, you want to make sure that that person's reactive bank is sufficiently unburdened, the GPMs are lying out there like a doggone long parade all ready to go *bzu—bzu—bzu*. You haven't got the fifteenth tangled with the first and that sort of thing. The only reason they're tangled up is he's so disoriented himself he can't put his attention on it.

You try to run somebody on R6 when he hasn't been brought up the levels, you're going to be in trouble all the way. Because he isn't auditable. And a great deal can go wrong at R6 and he's insufficiently under control for you to put it right. So that's a very difficult situation that you walk yourself into.

Those are the levels. Those are the reasons for the levels. And the individual revolt that I was talking to you about, he revolts against what you're trying to do. He doesn't understand

what you're trying to do. Well, give him some chance to find out what you're trying to do and give him some... Let him—let him get his feet wet before you throw him into the icy drink, you know. Let's get him—get some familiarity on it and if any variations occur as you go on up the level, let them be from the level of intelligence and selfdeterminism merely than from reactive revolt. I have spoken.

Thank you.