

AN INTRODUCTION TO STANDARD TECH

A lecture given on 24 September 1968

Thank you very much. Thank you. I wish to announce the opening of the Class VIII course.

Now, you're the lucky ones, actually. And I'm very happy to see you well turned out. I'm sorry the stage isn't high enough; a bit higher, so that I could see all of your faces. I like to look through an audience and see the misunderstandings.

This is a very... this is a very stellar day, actually, in Scientology. And all of these years have piled up and have made the thing called Standard Tech.

Now to celebrate this, we have certain congratulations here. Here is one from the... all the staff at WW, Ron, Class VIII Students. Dear Ron, Sir. Our congratulations and best wishes for the universes' first Class VIII course. Your gift of tech and now most wonderful of all, standard tech, cannot be measured in terms of man's freedom and sanity. The students you are training will bring back a priceless commodity. Our thanks to all who made it possible, and to the students, but most of all thank you Ron. From Roger and all staff of your Office of LRH, WW.

And this next one. Here's our very best wishes and congratulations on the first Level VIII course. You've done it again. Much love, from LRH Comm, London, Executive Council London, and all staff from London.

Our love, good wishes and abundance's of Class VIII auditors for the world. The commanding officer of the Pubs Org and all staff.

And here's one from, relayed, from Cape Town. Dear Ron, congratulations on first Class VIII course. All the best. Love, E. C. Cape Town and LRH Comm Cape Town.

Now, what is Class VIII? Why Class VIII? Well, I wish to welcome you all here to a series of revelations. A series of very, very interesting revelations known as Standard Tech. You are about to get wins. And about to guide through wins that you have never heard of before.

Technology was actually not summated until 1966. Individuals follow what is called the hidden data line, mostly. Um... Didn't get a laugh. You don't even know what it is. But a student on the Saint Sill Briefing Course is given all the research materials, now of eighteen years, so that he'll have a good background and a good rounding out on which he can operate. and then he goes into power and his lessons in simplicity begin to occur. Only an expert can be simple. A one—ace trained individual, „Uh, no, ah, ah, where—where's the tone arm?“ Much less where's the PC? „I, I, it looks awfully blank, and uh I think that blankness,... and see, I think blankness, I don't remember calling anything... I'd better develop some technology. Let's see. I've got a new process now. 'Who's blank? ' Yeah, that ought to crack his case, yeah. 'Who's blank? '“ They don't even know there's any technology there, boy.

In other words it takes a total expert to be totally simple. And you just gonna be surprised studying this Class VIII course to find out how totally expert you have to be to be totally simple. It is a fantastic revolution. It's a revolution, it's a revelation.

And then there's this other thing called a hidden data line. This thing called a hidden data line is one of the most fascinating things I ever heard of. Now, Captain Joe Von Stodden, Captain of the Flag Ship, has given some thought to this as an old, old, old time auditor, as well as a very good captain. He

sort of racked this around for a while, and he finally found out how a hidden data line occurs. Or how a hidden command line occurs. And I'll just read his dispatch in full here as I received it this morning. It's very, very good.

„Regarding the subject of a hidden data line, I have observed the basis of the hidden data line, and it is simply this: The hidden command line. This is the only way command intentions can get alter—ised apart from outright non—compliance, which I feel, if looked at closely, is also due to a hidden command line.

„For example, a level 3 auditor does a green form without an E—meter. A level 6 asks him, „What the hell are you doing?“ And the level 3 auditor says, „I have just come back from the AO and they do it like that.“ And the level 3 auditor gives a big explanation of why it goes that way. And the level 6 auditor pursues the issue and finds other auditors from AO doing a green form this way, and therefore it must be OK. So the level 6 auditor starts doing a green form in this way. This is an extreme example, but the point is the level 6 started backing off when the AO was mentioned.

„The higher up the command line, the level 6 wouldn't have just taken it from the level 3, but the 3, being just... having just had close contact with a body higher on a command line than the 6, starts off the level 6's doubt. And the higher on a command line the power is drawn from, the wider area the alter—is covers. Like it seems someone figured this out and just put god there. You know, somebody just heard from god, so that's the right thing to do.

„Religion is a pretty good example of a hidden command line. There is policy on 'If it's not written it's not true', and 'The only standard tech is found in HCOBs, tapes and books', yet tech gets alter—ised in Orgs, and the form of the Org is difficult at times to keep. I conclude from this that command lines are misused and not understood always.“

The Class VIII course is handling the tech line, and I really feel will get the data line in from source, and kept in by Sea Org Class VIIIs doing a patrol of tech. To handle the design won't it be a good idea to run the Org Exec course based on some principles, the same principles as the Class VIII auditors course here? To put in the command lines with a thud, then, we will be able to turn out cracker jack auditors and a cracker jack to back them up would be a great help. So it undoubtedly occurs organizationally as well as technically. And those are very, very important considerations.

The laws of listing. They were all on tape, they were in bulletins. And somebody has removed both tapes and bulletins from the training line of the Class VI course.

Now, do you realize that the morale of an organization is proportional to the accuracy of the technology? If they haven't the accurate technology that works, works, works, I will tell you what. Their morale goes to pieces because they haven't got anything left to work for.

Now I don't mean to appear violent. But when you have talked your lungs out hour after hour, day after day to drive one point home and it doesn't drive, and it evaporates, it demonstrates that the subject can be wrecked by deleting from the subject line a piece of key data. As well as somebody who just came in saying, „The advanced. That's the way they're doing it at the advanced. They run the PC standing on his head and the E—meter plugged into the light socket.“

Do you realize that Scientology very remarkably well stays together in spite of the absence of standard tech? It's remarkable. It's the only hope man's got. But when it's done wrongly, when that is done wrong, man is being betrayed. And he's being very, very badly betrayed.

Now there isn't in actual fact much of a trick to auditing. There isn't much of a trick. I'm not saying how bad it all is every place. I'm just saying, my gods! If it hangs together on the crappy jobs of god—just—auditing you see around, what would it do if it went up to 100%? And guess what? It's running on this ship right now at one, zero, zero per cent. Three provisional Class Vllls. Some of them are a little resistive, some of them more resistive than others, but they're all the same case. And they're just rolling along.

And the morale went up and everything went up, and bongety, bongety, bongety, bong! But if tech was even slightly out on the Flagship, what do you think it is in the outer Orgs? Pretty grim. Pretty grim.

Now. I don't want to give you the idea that I'm angry at anybody. I'm not. I'm not even ARC broken about having talked so long and often on certain points and find them violated. In fact I'm very calm about the whole thing, and it will be completely dispassionately that we hang from the yard arm any auditor who does other than standard tech. We'll pat him on the back as we send him into the sky.

'Cause everything we're fighting for is attainable on a standard technical basis which doesn't alter a hair line! There is not one case in this whole stinking MEST universe who is one millionth of a millimeter sideways from standard tech. And that's the first thing you have to know about standard tech. There are no variable cases. None.

But let me show you what people think is a variable case. PC comes into session, his TA is high, and the auditor's trying to run the right thing, they've been trying to run some things on him lately, and, the TA is high; and they haven't gone anyplace, and so they try to dream up something like, „What principles of psychoanalysis would apply to your case?“, you know? They go rushing in to the case supervisor or the D of T and say, „I can't get him on there, uhuhuh, he's still... ahahah, god damn him! Here, get me a process!“

Your class supervisor goes through and he thinks of something, and gives it to this fellow. Doesn't even look at the folder. And the guy goes tearing back to session and runs some bunk, and the TA goes a little bit higher. Now this is actually, this is actual fact. I get hold of such a folder, and this case is so, so standard, it is pathetic. Except for the last three months anybody who did a GF or a rudiments on him got an R/ S on missed withholds as connected to a suppressive person. (Laughing) They R/ S! They don't read, they R/ S! And no auditor has resorted it to ethics, has done anything about it, has tried to pull the missed withhold, or anything, so of course we have a very peculiar case.

So a case that isn't run by standard tech becomes a very peculiar case. And that's just about the first law of standard tech. All peculiar cases were cases that weren't run by standard tech, and guess what? Still can be. So that doesn't make peculiar cases at all.

Now the degree of precision which I have talked about on the Saint Hill course is so many miles wide of what we now call standard tech, as to be completely fantastic. There're literally miles of widths in 1965 which don't exist now. The width of tolerance on standard tech probably couldn't be measured with an engineering micrometer. It is absolutely exactly hair line.

Now what do you have to do? What do you have to be, in order to run tech that close? You have to be the god damndest most screaming expert you've ever heard of. You have to know all of the width and body of the Saint Hill course, the research line, all the books, because that enough was a pathway. That was a roadway. And then knowing all that you know the total boundaries. You know the total boundaries the tech can reach.

Now, in through that data there is an absolutely hair line, little, tiny, knife edge pass. And you have to know all of that to have a grip on where the path is. And exactly what you do.

Honest to Pete, standard tech is so standard that it's practically drop a nickel in the auditor and he runs off the session. But what does it take to make that kind of an auditor? Look at the grip he's got to have on it. Smokey Joe sits down, and he sits down in the auditing session, and he's in really bad shape, and he was audited out in Keokuk, and didn't do any good. And his TA is at .9, and the needle is terribly stuck. And what do we do? We do Ruds or green form to F/ N and next grade. (Laughs)

And then there's this fellow comes in, and he's been in New York, and he's been down on Harlex Street in New York he says. And he's a member of the British government so he's pretty confused. And most of their wives are in psychiatrists' beds, I mean care. I didn't mean to malign them or anything. Anyway, so he sits down and says his psychiatrist has just told him something or other. And he's just had umpteen electric shocks and he actually has been boozle—bozzled, and etcetera. And he's been given an implant that Scientology doesn't work. And uh, it's, it's, it's all pretty, pretty grim. And what do you do with this guy? What, what do you do with this guy? „Oh Christ, that is a hell of a god damned thing to figure out. What will we do with this fellow? Oh dear! Let's run in to see the case supervisor without even showing him the folder and get the solution, you know? That's the way it is.“

Well in standard tech you don't even know whether or not he's a resistive type case, so you do the Ruds or green form to F/ N, and the next grade.

Now, you'll have to be pretty, pretty good. You have to be pretty good. Because look at the bait that's thrown to you all the time. Now all you do is consider these wildly different cases as just bait on a hook trying to get you to bite. Everybody is so different. And boy, they're just about as different as the same spot of ink sitting on the same spot of ink.

Now, by George, it is pretty, pretty dog gone interesting, the session control and the self control which an auditor requires to actually go down that highway. All invitations refused yet ARC isn't broken, and so forth, and yet he just runs him. Now there, there's the way it is. Now if the case proves to be a very resistive case, and we don't seem to be able to do anything with him, you will find out that we can't do anything with him only if he has already been subjected to the unusual. So standard tech has to include cases which have been run very non—standardly. You know, been audited in D. C. No, I won't malign D. C. All Orgs are just as sour as all Orgs, and by the time this course is being taught they will all be snapped up to battery again. And they will be running fine.

I am embittered by the folder I just got in from that quarter, that's all. It's pretty god damn grim. The earliest folder, the earliest session, has about a three page list in it as the first list made, followed by a second list which is about a three page list, and the first list hasn't been nulled, and no item was

given the PC, and the second one has several reading items on it. What the hell were they trying to do?

But the last one, the last auditing report is the real panic in that one folder. It is a real panic. I mean it's something to sit down and cry about or laugh uproariously about. The TA is high, so she was probably overrun on OT1. After doing two unnecessary S and Ds, which had, each of them, at least three items on the list reading. TA was higher at the end of session. See how the, see how the rules are avoided? Now there's only one item reading on the list. It's just about the damndest thing anybody ever heard of. Do you know, do you know in actual sober, sober, sober, sober fact, that this can be interpreted, that you have three items which read on the first nulling, and then you nudded it again in such a way to submerge two of them and leave only one reading, and then that fulfills the requirement of one item reading on the list. Now whatever jackass figured that one out, and whoever copied him, ought to be sad. Because it's completely bonkers. It's completely bonkers.

Now there've been people on the line who have put out re-written bulletins and things like that, and there is a re-written bulletin which shows just that happening. But that is bonkers! So we can assume that people who are a bit inclined to malign, knock apart and shoot the human race, and have that as their only goal, can get into Scientology and can remove things from the technical line, or pervert or alter things in the technical line, which then makes Scientology unworkable.

Therefore, we have entered in upon a program. And this program simply is that you, called in from your various Orgs, are being taught rapid-fire as hard and as clear and as bold as we can

teach you. Standard tech. The auditing of it and the case supervision of it. And we will send you back as Class VIII provisionals.

Do you know that absolutely standard tech, complete, proper, hair line standard tech, used in organizations throughout the world will at least triple the stats of each within 90 days? Couldn't help it. And if it was really applied in a business like fashion, and nobody messed it up in any way, shape or form, one of our Division 5 people said we might even be able to take the planet within a year. It is hot.

Scientology is so much hotter than anybody thinks it is that it is fantastic! You don't have to take my say so. You'll find it out as you go along the line. You'll find it out. You're about to have, as an auditor, some very exciting adventures. Cases start falling apart in your hands, without any unusual solutions at all. It's only when you goof it up that you have trouble.

Now there are two actual spheres of instruction in this. One is auditing of it, and two, case supervision of it. And the case supervision of auditors is a more difficult subject because the auditors, they're not going to follow the case supervisors' instruction. I know on some folders in which we were teaching this I have seen one student auditor fail to follow for three consecutive sessions the case supervisors' instructions, winding the case around seven assorted telegraph poles, and driving the case supervisor straight up the wall, so that the case supervisor then started to offer very unusual solutions trying to rescue this PC before it was too late. And the PC came out right, I think, by just going back and doing the case supervisors' instructions in the first place.

There are various sins on this line. But if you think the auditor has to have, if you think the auditor has to have it, a grip on tech, what does the case supervisor have to have? He's the crystal ball boy. He's got his job, to pick 'em up after they've fallen on their heads. Now of course all cases are case supervised. There aren't any cases that go through any, there must not be any cases going through any, there must not be any cases audited any place, that are not case supervised—by a Class VIII. the next session may not be given until case supervision. Now the auditor, if he is a very well trained auditor, can refuse to do the case supervisors' instructions, because it's the auditor who is going to be hanged. But he can only refuse to do them and not audit at all. He may not ever vary or alter a case supervisors' instructions. He opens up the folder, and he sees a case supervisors instructions, and he himself perhaps trained to Class VIII disagrees with these completely. Now he must take it up with the case supervisor. He has a right not to audit them, but he has no right whatsoever to audit anything else. You see how it's sewn up?

You say, „Yes, but this PC could sit there for a month without any auditing.“ It's god damn well better he did. If there're two people who have entirely different opinions on what ought to be done with this case, then either one or the other of those two different people do not know standard tech, because if they knew standard tech they would not have any divergence of opinion.

Now there are certain things that get wrong with cases. There and so forth, auditing him with Dianetic audible commands, „Dowt mmemblem mmand, wmm dsmtm thmmm wmmmb. Mmmwm fwmm mm cmm. Amm jmmmm...“ Yea, for Chris' sakes! Didn't you ever hear of telepathy? We do it all telepathically. Jzzzt! Bump. Toot zee! Zzzzmmmmnl Phew! (Laughs) And as far as 7 is concerned, and 8, all the materials of 7 and 8 are sitting there, I haven't written them up. There's no reason to write up 7 and 8 without standard tech in up to 6. And, the other thing is I'm so far into 8 that 7 has gotten awfully dim. I'm just being lazy. And besides this, people haven't been nice to me lately. They haven't been nice to me. They here and there, here and there, why, there have been non—compliance's with standard technology, and although people say, „Yes, we're doing just as you said“, and so forth, the review folders don't follow. So, I, I think I won't release 7 until auditing is standard through the world. Actually 7 is one of these little jolly old go—carts. 3 goes zig and 7 goes zag. And if a guy can't audit at 7 he may as well quit.

And you can talk all you want to about uh, the guys start getting into trouble, do you understand? They start getting into plenty, plenty, plenty, of trouble, if they can't audit well at 3. Well, if they can't audit well at 3, boy they're going to go down for the third count if they can't audit well at 7. 'Cause 7 is much tougher to audit than 3, merely because it's just more or less straight auditing job, but it's got zig zags in it. You have to know your business.

And as far as 8 is concerned, well 8 is very airy—fairy, and uh, well I'll give you some kind of a notion of it. The lower grades are dominant C, communication. They're dominant C. Somewhere in the vicinity of Power, one passes into the band of R. And R runs on up to, pretty close I suppose, I haven't made a graph of it, but somewhere around 3. And then from 3 on up it is pure A. That is the dominant. It's affinity that runs on up from there. And

when you get up into 8, why the three start to harmonic, one after the other. You get R and you get A and so on. Your dominant stress.

It is only because a person is out of dominant communication, or C, that you can have solo auditing at R6EW. He doesn't any longer need a communication cycle. But he needs R. mainly and what he does is get heavy increases in R. And these increases in R move up, and if he has done all of his grades like a good boy, he will arrive at 3 with sufficient R to be able to flip over into A. And it's uh, at 3 where it starts going into heavy affinity. Affinity is the dominant.

You get into all sorts of conditions. You, when you get 3 you start finding yourself loving everybody, and so forth. So these, these are just some of the considerations as they go up along the line.

Now, it's actually just interesting. It doesn't change anything. It's where the person is progressing. But, if a person has neglected his grades, lower grades, and neglected C, and hasn't picked his C up as he comes up through the grades, why when he gets into solo his reality is inadequate, and it is not possible for him to, in actual fact have any R on 3. No reality on I. Well that means he's out somewhere along the line, don't you see? He hasn't made it in that wise. And then if you find him hating everybody when he gets to, when he gets to 5, or something like this, well you know very well that he actually hasn't made it there either. These'd just be tests of whether or not the guy is done.

You will find out, oddly enough, that the trouble with cases is a failure to make the grade. (Laughs) Not to make a horrible pun out of it, but if you were to hand Clearing Course materials to Joe Blow of Hoboken, if you were to hand the Clearing Course materials to Joe Blow of Hoboken you would find out that he would be in a completely unreal state. He doesn't even restimulate. Most remarkable thing you ever heard in your life. He doesn't even restimulate. What wall?

Now the E—meter reads just above the level of the individual R. Pardon me, it reads just a tiny bit deeper than his extant R. So a fellow could be there, sick as a pup, his leg broke and everything else. Maybe he didn't have any reality on anything that was wrong with him at all, and he doesn't think anything is wrong with him. So you ask him, „Is anything wrong with you?“ And he'll, „No, feel fine.“ Baffling. You'll say he has no subjective reality. Well I don't know why you're using the word subjective. He just doesn't have any reality, period. That's all. (Laughs)

So anyway, the E—meter will read just a little bit deeper than the guys' R. Now that it happens to be a basic law. That happens to be a basic law. So you ask this bird for an ARC break. And he's just been knocked in the head some way or another and anybody would have an ARC break. Anybody. He doesn't have any ARC break, he doesn't know what happened.

So you as an auditor know what is wrong with the person, usually far better than the person does. And as a result you know far better than the person what is wrong with the person, but this little law gets in your road. The E—meter reads just a tiny bit deeper than the guys' R level. And the meter didn't read on it, so it is either suppressed, or it is below his R. So if you try to do anything more about it at that moment than that, you've had it.

So Class VIII takes what it sees on the meter. And a Class VIII auditor knows the meter has read, or knows that it hasn't read. He really doesn't even know what it has read on. He can suppose that it read on the question he

asked, but it also might have read on a fly that just bit the guy in the ankle. So if he gets an unusual reaction in response to his question, along with the read, then he always checks for a false read. Did it read or didn't it read? See, he doesn't go on the slavish academy level action that the meter read, and therefore it was. Now he not only cleans up the false read he got, but he feels that if this thing is falsely reading it must have falsely read for somebody else too. So he cleans up the false reads on this subject.

I'll give you a little kind of a, of a total loss of gain. An individual had gotten off a terrible second dynamic withhold. And he had gotten this off in London to an auditor in the London HGC. And he felt great, he felt wonderful, he got someplace else and some auditor was auditing him, and got a read on a withhold and he immediately assumed that it hadn't blown. So he went on for the next two or three years giving up this withhold to every auditor because it always read, and he knew he couldn't blow it, so therefore Scientology had failed.

I myself was the review auditor in this particular instance, so I, of course, immediately checked for false reads when he came up. „Ah“ he says, You know.“ I could read it, you know. He said, „That again, well it's just like this.“ And I said, 'Wait a minute. Uh, you've gotten this, some withhold off before.“ Yeah, he told me all about how he'd gotten it off before. I just checked it for false reads, traced it back to the first false read we could get, cleaned it up, the needle flew like a bomb, he had his gains back all in a batch. Pongo! About a two minute operation.

So, there's something to this. Now, if auditing is working as it is, as has been done prior to 24 September 1968 A. D. 18, if auditing is working prior to this date when we are launching standard tech, it is a terrific testimony to the subject, because the subject has been, being, applied in a very sloppy, knockely wackely fashion. So it's a great testimony to the fact. It's a great testimony to auditors.

Now from this point on we have a very narrow track. And having an extremely narrow track that we can follow we have to have, one: Confidence that it will give us the gain and that confidence is borne out of experience. And it will give you the gains. And, we have to have an application of it in uniformity, and we have to be able to patch up every non—standard run case there is. And that sounds like a tall order, but standard tech patches them up very easily.

It's only—certain laws, certain rules, and so forth in this subject. You can only repair so many repairs, and then you'd better take the guy who has been fixing it up so that repairing repairs had to be done, and you'd better get him grooved up so that when he is put to repairing something with a perfectly valid C/ S, case supervision, he actually does it, and doesn't produce something else that has to be repaired. Do you follow?

So it is a very bad thing to begin to repair repairs, because you can start repairing the repairs of repairs, and then repair the repairs of those repairs which fail to repair. And the folder gets thicker, and thicker and thicker.

Right now, Quals through the world prior to this date of 24 September 68 are mainly engaged in making up repairs to be repaired. And the folders are very fat indeed. Now, Quals' stat used to be volume of money paid, but if a person can't get out of Qual, if he's held a prisoner until he does pay, which I understand is being done here and there. That, if that is the case, then, then, then the statistic itself doesn't tell anything. You could actually just fix a case

up so that it had to be repaired and Qual would make a fortune. You see? Now your good case supervisor that's runnin' 'em along in the HGC and over in Quad, and he's runnin' 'em along—Then Qual folders are very thin, and then HGC folders are damn thin too.

Now the thing that is most neglected is just this. Is cases are set up to fly. Standard tech goes this way. You take a case, take the bugs out of the case, you know, the missed withholds and

the rudiments that have been out, and the guy has been on gasoline for several years, but you get this guy set up and you just take the bugs out of the case. And then you set him up and you point and fire him. And you don't give a standard tech session unless your PC is flying.

That's who you see those huge letters F—L—U—N—K exclamation point, exclamation point, in my C/ S folders. It is a real flunk to run any major action without the case already flying. He says, „But what the hell, what are you talking about? The guy's PTS, the guy's PTS. His wife's in review. His wife's in review. That is why he's having a review, because he's all caved in, he's all caved in, and he's... and he's... he's PTS. And he's all caved in and that's why he's having a review... uh, and what do you mean he's got to be set up and flying before you do a major action? And then you say an S & D's a major action. Oh, what the hell? What... what's this? Well the S & D's supposed to set him up.“ And you say, „No, boy. No. No. Down dog; down Rover. No, no, no. ' A major listing action. You set him up to run it. Well, how do you set him up to run' You get the Ruds in. „Yeah, what if it ah, ah... ' „You get the Ruds in. ' „Oh, I see. You just make sure they are. Uh, yah... you just pull an ARC break“ and so on. „No, no, no. You get the Ruds in to F/ N.“ „Get the Ruds in to F/ N? Yeah, well, of course. 'Course. Uh, son. Well what happens if he doesn't...“ „Well, you do a green form 'till you get an F/ N.“ „Yeah but wait a minute, wait a minute. If you're doing a green form and so forth you can't do this S and D. You won't do... he won't do an S and D unless he's... it says he needs it on a green form anyhow. Oh I see. What if the guy didn't need it?“ „Oh yeah, yeah, undoubtedly the guy needed it, but you might have gotten an F/ N on the green form before you got to PTS and then you wouldn't do it.“

„Well, what's this? You consider it a major action. You say major action is an S and D. That's right, remedy B is a major action. S and D is a major action. You set up the case to F/ N. Now, what, what if we don't... what are you, what are you talking about? You mean we're not going to run any more S and Ds?“ „No, no, we're not going to... we're going to run S and Ds when the guy needs some S and D. Why, you'll get him an F/ N before you run it.“ Oh. Well golly, if we didn't have S and Ds we just couldn't keep Qual solvent at all“ he'd say. And you'd say „Good. Go broke for all I care.“ I like broke Quals. I'd just be as happy as a clam with an that never ever had anybody ever walk through the door of Qual. And spider webs and cobwebs accumulating around the desk. That'd be just great. Because right now Qual is being used for case gain. But that isn't where you get case gain. You don't get case gain in repair. You've just got it backward. You get case gain with grades and major actions. You put the case up to fly. You never audit the case unless he's flying. So you always fly a case before you audit it.

Now you begin to understand what it's all about. You don't try to heal the case with grades, you try to give him advances and gains. Big, major gains with these grades. And they get 'em, boy, they get 'em. They'll fly.

Standard tech isn't what I say it is. It's what works. And what works has already been established. So it isn't for me to say it's different. And it isn't for anybody else to say it's different either, because we fought for it, and we won it the hard way. Now let's consolidate it. Now let's get it practiced.

The history of standard tech is a very long history. It is a very hard fought for history. There is a tremendous quantity of technology in Scientology and Dianetics. It is one of the largest, broadest bodies of information on the subject of human behavior that has ever appeared in the universe. And now I can say without fear of challenge because I know what's appeared on the back track, and it is so god damned, stupidly feeble that it consists of no more than crass superstition.

Now, the triumph is that out of this large body of material which embraces everything known to man or beast; there's hardly anything unexplored in that whole subject. Out of that whole, mad, wide ocean of material there's this hair line that goes right straight through the middle of the material. So you have to know where the ocean is in order to get on the hair line. Now that's quite an achievement.

Now I'll tell you how the hair line was chosen. And why it became that terribly narrow path which we now call standard tech. It is composed of those things, which if they are out, inhibit and prohibit all case gain. It's a negative assessment. If the points of standard tech are present, unresolved, the case will not gain. So obviously the resolution of these points in their proper sequence is standard tech.

If a fellow has an ARC break he cannot be audited. If he is audited without the ARC break being handled he will go immediately into a sad effect. And months later will be found just sadder and sadder and sadder. Well, it's a fact. Nothing you argue with. It's a fact. So obviously there's the ARC break.

If the fellow has a present time problem, you try to audit the individual with a present time problem you'll get no case change of any kind whatsoever. It just parks itself right there. It doesn't become sadder, but the case doesn't change.

If you try to audit a person over a missed withhold an individual will just plow in, and plow in, and plow in. And he'll natter and get mad, and get mad at himself, and on the various dynamics and so forth he'll have a hell of a time.

If you try to audit a case that has committed some tremendous overt, that he considers a tremendous overt, without ever touching on or letting him discuss or handle the overt, he'll just go into degradation. Now, if the overt happens to be on Dianetics and Scientology I actually guarantee it'll go straight into degradation. There's a horrible trick you can play on to somebody who has just been cutting Scientology to ribbons. If you were to audit one of these, one of these nuts, one of these screaming painted blue monkey—tailed idiots that have been howling around about Scientology, and so forth, standard tech would actually give him a gain. But every time he hits the overt line he would try to do himself in. So, because you improve his reality, and the improvement of reality would bring him to a recognition of the wickedness of his own acts. And you've actually audited him successfully into degradation. The more successful you were with your auditing the more he would become degraded. Do you follow? He would degrade himself. You aren't degrading him. He has been... now he realizes, since man is basically good... man, he realizes that he had been attacking something he shouldn't have attacked and therefore he is just a filthy pig. And the more it works on

him the more he gets to be a filthy pig. You could actually handle it by handling overts, if you found the actual overts. But you'd probably have to couple it with motivators and overts, and you'd have to handle it very slippery indeed.

It's buttons of this type, buttons of this type. Now there are more esoteric lines of action, that's various actions of power, and those are all points on the ladder. Of course, you don't have to go that far, you get to this thing called a service facsimile. Every one of these guys is using some kind of a combination to make people wrong and himself right. And you walk up into the various strata of power, and you walk up into power plus which is a reorientation step, you go up to R6EW which blows whatever he's got hanging around from GPMs, you move into the CCs, you've gone down to death, and you move into what is now OT1, you put him back in the human race, and then you get some more bank off the line, and OT2. And you get rid of the body thetans at 3, and you review him all out straight and make him in beautiful shape, put him in his own valence and fix him up so he can confront things at 4, and then you turn him into an extrovert at 5 and 6, and then in 7 you let him examine what a horrible dog he has always been. (Laughter) He usually, eventually comes to this conclusion. Normally starts out on the basis that he is the only thetan in the universe who has never committed an overt. (Laughter)

Anyway, if we go on up the line we get to the old one, „Know thyself.“ The first dynamic versus the physical universe. The individual and life versus this universe. 7 is actually life vis a vis with life. And 8 is, of course, life vis a vis with the physical universe.

And the first three great philosophers that Greece produced took as their opening saga the relationship of life to the physical universe. They were starting in to the Empire State building on the top floor. You get to know yourself on 7 and 8. Mostly on 8. And then begin to find your relationship, your real relationship with the physical universe. And the ancient Greek philosopher didn't get any place because he didn't have any highway to get there. No highway at all. So standard tech is the highway. And it is built out of those points which, if they are present, no advance can occur. And there aren't any more points. Awful adventurous statement but it's true. There aren't any more points.

There's another trick or two, perhaps, something like that. Blaaaah. Couple of ways to do one or two of these things. But the variability, even on those, is weighted in favor of just one thing to do.

So, as you come curving down the line with standard tech, it goes right straight where we're supposed to go, and you can hold a case in to that groove, and it is a groove, boy. It is very terrible.

Now I can see you now, trying to get an academy auditor to see the light. And you've just case supervised this case and Archibald Swangolen is the auditor. And at the moment he goes in he finds the case supervision cannot work, because the PC actually, as it says make sure that you get the ARC break because the PC is very sad; he goes in there and he's so sure it's because the PC... just sure it's because the PC has a missed withhold. So that is why he ran Grade 4 before he ran...

And you say, Wait a minute boy, what are you doing?“ „Oh well, you see, it's just... and somebody came from the AO the other day and they said it was always best to get off the service facsimile as soon as possible because then

you could get the overts.“ You will be in the optimum position to be able to say, ‘We do not care who came from the AO the other day. There is only one standard tech. And there is only one way to do standard tech. And there is only one way it is done. And there is only one PC, and that is a standard PC. And you ain’t got a standard PC now. Let’s go into this quietly and back into this folder, and where the hell did you miss the ARC break to begin with? And do it the right way, shall we?’“

You, in case supervision, must first know that standard tech will solve the case. And that your direction of standard tech to be done will solve the case if the auditor will follow your C/ S, and if he will keep his TRs in and finish the cycle of action on the case as it rolls along. And your confidence must be such that Aloicious Q. Squashbottom, himself in person, can emerge as the world’s most unstandard piece of balderdash. He spends hours bragging to everybody how he’s very different. And you still go in against this case and you order and you enforce the running of standard tech. And Mr. Squashbottoms’ case will fall apart.

See, the, the attitude of an auditor handling standard tech is that of total confidence. And that confidence is something that is gained. That is won. If, by doing these actions you obtain an exactly predictable result, confidence is borne. And it’s a very funny thing at this stage of the game to be talking about anything as positive as Scientology, as something in which you have to have confidence. The funny part of it is people have run into many cases that have been misaudited, that the cases appear different. Until you look back and find out that the guy has been talking to his first six auditors tried to tell him the PTP to those first six auditors and none of them ever handled it. And then you realize that you’d better handle the PTP.

So therefore it’s a rather simple, simple world that you’re dealing with. But you cannot adventure into this world of standard tech without a total, total grip on the technology itself. You have to know technology so that... well you just don’t avoid these major points. Like the twelve laws of listing. Well, hmf. That you don’t have to thinkety about these things, they just are. You see the PC sitting in front of you, you know the Auditors’ Code to a point where you see that PC sitting in front of you, and he appears just a little bit dirty as he sits down to session And you’ve got sense enough to ask, „Have you had any sleep?’“ And his skin tone doesn’t look good. „Have you had any sleep? Have you had something to eat? Very good. Alright. We’ll have a session.“

You don’t ask the classic I saw in a folder yesterday. „I don’t know, I haven’t had any sleep for six nights,“ the PC says. And the auditor said, „Shame, shame.“ The auditor said, „Tell me an earlier time when you’ve had no sleep.“ That will become a classic. Because it’s a violation of the Auditors’ Code.

So you know the Auditors’ Code to a point where you don’t have to think about it. And so, the standardness of standard tech is knowing standard tech so well that you don’t have to think about standard tech in order to do standard tech. It simply is.

Now one of the parts of standard tech is the tremendous wealth we have here of folders and information. And the wealth consists of the fact that I have done five hundred separate supervisions on cases in the last five weeks. Now that’s quite a few. I do them in my part time while I’m attending to other things. And of these lines the only cases that aren’t flying are the cases that haven’t had their auditing finished yet.

We had one very, very famous case. This case was made unstandard by being very unstandardly approached. The case staggered aboard, terrible condition. The case was audited. Oddly enough, actually did achieve ARC Straightwire. And then the person who was on that line at that time said, „It's a dead thetan needle, so run him more. And ran him two days as an overrun of ARC Straightwire. And then I said to the next auditor, „Rehab the ARC Straightwire and run secondaries.“ The next auditor went into session, the PC was running a secondary. Just like that the PC was running the secondary. The very next step to come up. It was happening. And the auditor was trying to rehab during that whole session. Sad day.

Time marched on, and then we finally found out that his TA was so high, and his case was so unapproachable that nobody could do anything with it, and he got to be known sort of as the black dog of Carnak. The black dog of Carnak was somebody who got on peoples' back and never got off. Because it was a sure assignment of doubt to even touch this case, because he sort of got it fixed so that you did something wrong. In other words, he blew the auditors' cool. (Laughter) In doing such an action the case was bad luck. So, this case then became very non—standard. It was an unsolvable case, and he was un—superviseable, and he was un—auditable, and nobody was willing to audit him. And, uh, I looked back along the lines and I found out that the case had R/ Sed on missed withholds and connected to suppressive groups, and later on had blowdowns on missed withholds and wronging a Scientologist. And in all cases the auditor hadn't paid any attention to this. So I just sent it back into session, we pulled the missed withholds, we got what he was really connected to, and well, all we did was rehab his former release on the track on drugs. And the case flew, straightened out marvelous. Bingo, bango, nothing to it. I don't know how long really it took to straighten the case out. I don't know how long the session was. I don't imagine it was more than about 50 minutes. All I had to find was where standard tech had been violated. And where it had been violated it went to hell.

But anyway, it doesn't mean that you won't run into totally unauditible cases. There are totally unauditible cases. There's Callahans, Robinsons, and by the time these tapes are released and heard they probably have been buried long since in infamy. Uh, but uh, they become unauditible simply because they never come near an organization or present themselves to be audited. And that is the only unauditible case there is.

So you're here to learn this magic road. And you think at the moment it's very easy to grasp this, that's all there is to it, why did I come here? You haven't heard anything yet. It took me five weeks to make three Class VIII auditors. Five weeks. They are cracker jacks. They are marvelous. You've got to do it in three weeks.

TRANSCRIPT ENDS HERE

WHAT STANDARD TECH DOES

A lecture given on 25 September 1968

Thank you. Thank you. And here we are. What's the date? It's the 25th of September AD 18. In the parlance of former religions, 1968.

Well we have a few, we have a few telegrams here. Please relay our congratulations to first Class VIII course, and to Ron who made it possible. You have our fullest Hawaiian aloha. John, LRH Communicator Hawaii, for EC Hawaii and all Scientologists in Hawaii.

And here's congratulations first Class VIII course students. Standard tech is here to stay. Thank you Ron. LRH Com and staff, San Francisco.

And dear Ron, thanks and appreciation from all Africa and Joberg staff and Scientologists on first Class VIII course. LRH Comm Africa and LRH Comm Joberg.

Dear Ron, congratulations to you and all students on first Class VIII course. We know the boom this will be, and boon this will be to mankind. Love, LRH Comms US, ASHO and LA. Executive Councils US, American Saint Hill Organization and Los Angeles.

And send congratulations on first Class VIII course. Love, Executive Council ANTS.

Ron, congratulations on Class VIII course. Will be fabulous to have a Class VIII case cracking super back. Thanks. Love, Kathy, Doris and Phil, Myra, the EC of Seattle Day and Foundation. From Seattle.

Congratulations on first ever Class VIII course. May success ring throughout Earth and bounce between the planets of the universe. Henry and crew, OTL, WW.

To first Class VIII students. Congratulations on being chosen and on attending the first ever Class VIII course. Fantastic. Love from all Africa and Joberg staff and Scientologists.

Very good. Well now, let's get down to business. Where does standard tech begin? What is it? It is the accumulation of those exact processes which make a way between humanoid and OT. The exact method of organizing them, the exact method of delivering them, and the exact repair of any errors made on that route.

Now that is quite remarkable because in actual fact that gives you 100 percent. It's a 100 percent action. There are no un-auditable cases unless they're not present. If you can't get them present they are un-auditable. And that is one of the cases that is unsolvable. And in actual fact the only case that is unsolvable.

Now you can think at once, what about the person who is being audited against his own determinism? What about the unconscious person he is present? What about the psychoanalyst, you know the psychoanalyst, he had a lot of troubled cases And let's see, man's never been able to do this sort of thing before. And there are different cases. And there're also suppressives. And we've got the so forth, and question, question, question. And that's what I'm trying to cure you monkeys of. Impolite.

Now. In the first place as far as the case who is present is concerned, if you did an assessment list and you put down a reading item "isn't present", there wouldn't be anybody to do the assessment on, so that is missing on the resistive case list. But the rest of them, if you can't knock off a hundred percent on it, why you need your flywheel adjusted. The uh... that's a fact. That's a fact. There isn't much excuse for missing. Let us take the fellow who

doesn't want to be audited. And he is somehow or another persuaded to be present in the auditing room. Now you say at once that we will overwhelm the mans' determinism, naturally, by forcing auditing on him. No, we don't overwhelm his determinism because basically his own determinism would want to be audited.

So we have the oldest remedy of this there is, and it hasn't changed for years and years and years and years, and it does exist. And all you do is engage in itsa on how he doesn't and why he doesn't want to be audited. That's all. That's the remedy.

If you can get the fellow to explain why he doesn't want to be audited, why he hates to be audited, why auditing so forth, bopa—wop wop, you've got it. But if you let him stray out into the other dynamics you haven't got it. If he sits there and tells you how all Scientologists are bad, and how no lesson is so hard... then pig face, the big politician has said from the depths of his implantedness how it's all bad, if you let him go off into this line of country you are not following the main line. And the main line is simply, why doesn't he want to be audited? Do you follow?

Now the other may start to blow off but you may repeat the question because he's departed from it. Now if you can get him to explain in the fullest extent this exact process, it is an exact process. It has no discussion of Scientology connected with it whatsoever. It is simply his itsa on the subject of. Now, he will come to a point where a basic begins to appear into view and you simply go on into session and run it. Do you follow? There's nothing to it. It's just a session approach.

So therefore he doesn't want to be audited, and he is asked to explain why he doesn't want to be audited, and he will there upon give as to the reasons why, and then he will hit some basic reason why, and you'll find yourself running something on the order of a secondary or an engram. Now you push him on through it. You don't push him through covertly. You never do any of this covertly. I hear of some auditor covertly auditing. Ooooo! If he hasn't got his hands on the cans you're liable to pass the F/ N. And he'll hold onto the cans. He doesn't know what they are. We don't even know; he doesn't even know what he's talking about. But he will, guided in his itsa, guide himself right down into the channel of his resistance. It could wind up most anyplace. It could wind up in a prep check. It could wind up in a secondary. it could wind up, don't you see? And he'll start answering these questions and the next thing you know he's in session and feels a lot better for it, and he'll go away shaking you by the hand.

Now there isn't anything covert about it. You keep your TRs in, you do your auditing job, you read your meter the same way and everything else. He's explaining why he doesn't want to be audited. Do you follow? And it is the most fundamental rudiment.

Now I, I look with horror at a green form which winds up as one of its' items very late on the green form that the PC did not want to be audited in the first place. It takes this form. He didn't want a review in the first place. Well an auditor's a pretty dim bulb if he hasn't been able to detect that.

A fellow comes in, and you say, "Alright, good. Have a seat here." Now at that moment you pick up the first out rudiment. See, it's actually not something you put in all rudiments, because for the excellent reason it just wastes time. This guy sits down, and so on. Now you could say it's a missed withhold, it's a this, it's a that. We don't care what it is. It's just the fact that

he doesn't want to be audited. So you think now we're dealing with uh,... You think we're dealing with Mr. Swillengullet the famous politician, or Mr. Jogbog who is the famous psycho—anal—ist, and you're not.

You're not dealing with the stellar light, you're dealing with a Scientologist who has walked up to the examiner, having been summoned because he hasn't been auditing for the last six months, to find out what the hell's wrong, and the examiner has said, "Go have a review. n And as the review auditor is sitting there this guy walks in. And he's uncooperative and very soggy about the whole thing. If you simply ask him to explain why he didn't want to be audited he would go promptly into session. It is a process.

Alright, now let's get how far this process goes. A fellow hasn't been auditing for seven months on his OT3 and it isn't flat. So, it's the same process. Why doesn't he want to be audited? You could ask it in the version of why isn't he auditing, but it comes down to why he doesn't want to be audited while auditing. And this situation you will run into every now and then.

Now it flies off by accident on most of these lines. You achieve this accidentally. And you will see so on many case reviews. And you understand standard tech isn't that process which is only used in review. Review is that area where standard tech is corrected back to standard tech. If it hasn't been done in the first place it winds up in review.

Now this fellow hasn't been auditing. As a matter of fact I have just off hand, I know of about three, two of whom didn't want a session, and a third who hasn't audited on her 3. Just, just brrrrt Just this. I think there've, they've been on my desk in the last 24 hours. So it is not an uncommon problem.

And you accidentally hit an ARC break, you hit some by—passed charge, you hit some something that goes down the line and clears up why he hasn't been auditing. And you yourself maybe, if you had a long run on some level, hit some period where you really didn't want to sit down and audit. You sort of wanted to leave the session and so forth. Well, this is the, this is the phenomenon. Now the common denominator of hitting the phenomenon to a trained auditor would be why he doesn't... why doesn't he want to be audited. If some fellow's doing OT sections, something like that on himself, anything from R6EW on up the line, and he suddenly wants to leave session. Yeah, he's sitting there, and he's saying, "Aaiii, ugh." Well the rudiment that's out is a horribly simple rudiment. He doesn't want to be audited. Now he's just done something that fixed it up so he didn't want to be audited. Now at that moment, if he is a not—completely dead in his head, he is aware of his own activity. That is actually the fundamental difference between a Scientologist and a humanoid. A Scientologist can, is aware of his activities, his mental phenomena, he is aware of his behavior, he has an idea of what he is doing. He, he's standing there, nya, nya, nya, nya, nying, yang, yap yap, yap yap. And he's all of a sudden, "Hey wait a minute. Boy, I must have a missed withhold. See, I must have a missed withhold." I mean it's as simple as that. You know? He says to himself "Yeah."

He is aware of his own behavior. It is not that he's introvertedly critical. And you will find characters around, in Scientology, who are not aware of their own behavior. And that is the difference between a Scientologist and one who isn't.

You will find somebody who apparently has had some of the grades run who still attributes his behavior to some sort of an act of god or something. "I, I felt, I felt, I felt bad today. I, I feel bad today." That's about far as the

cognition goes, see?

But this, therefore, is a process. You're sitting there doing your materials, all of a sudden you feel bad. "Hell with it. I think I'm gonna leave. You know, pack it up and get out of here.: Well now, being aware of what you 're doing you all of a sudden recognize this is a symptom. So, something's wrong. Well you'd better find out what's wrong.

And what's wrong actually will show up on the basis of why he didn't want to be audited. If you simply will explain to yourself, that's, just sort it out, you know? Just say, "Let's see. The reason I don't want to be audited is so and so and so on." Now this can go so far as to make a one item list. That is, a list that is listed to one item. Reading. You can actually make a list of it. If you know your phenomena, you're a well trained auditor. "I got an ARC break. I ARC broke myself. Something I don't like." That'll show up, and go bingo—bongo. Now you take somebody, it's very interesting watching somebody being audited on the grades who isn't trained even in the least. They eventually come up to a level of awareness that something is going on but they don't have the technology to explain what is going on, and they couldn't isolate by—passed charge for the life of 'em. They can't, can't isolate. They, they know, "Now wait. Something is wrong in auditing, and something is wrong with me, and wmf wnf wmf wnf wmf wmf, and let's see. Oh, it'd be an ARC break, PTP, what if I'd gone and missed a withholds I've done something here." He doesn't know what to call it. He hasn't got the, he hasn't got the subject matter at his fingertips. He doesn't know what to call it, so of course he can't handle it.

You know there's wmwmm wmm wmwsm. And you will see one of these guys then suddenly moving in the direction of getting trained. He knows he's got a deficiency. He doesn't know what to call it. But it still comes under the heading of explaining why he doesn't want to be audited. And all of a sudden, why there's a long blow down, and there it is.

Now I'll tell you something very funny. Something that is very amusing. As we used to hear, occasionally, where some SP had been operating very well, that Scientologists were far, far harder to audit than people in off the street. Yes, at the level of non—standard tech I should smell 'em out. That is certainly true.

Not a guy in off the street, he isn't hard to audit at all. He's so damn stupid that he lets the auditor do anything. And a Scientologist is only hard to audit by a very lousy auditor. Do you follow? Because he's sitting there and all of a sudden the fellow says, "Uh, alright. Start of session. Good. Now yesterday we were taking up whether or not you had overts and so on, and bla bla," and this Scientologist sitting in the chair says, "Well what the hell are you talking about, man? Where, where the hell are your rudiments? Huh? You haven't got this set up. What's going on?" The fellow off the street says, "Yeah, that's logical. It it, I don't feel very good about it, but yeah, well, overt that we were taking up yesterday. I wonder where Gracie Ann is. I wonder... uh, she said she'd telephone for it. Yeah, we'd taken up overts. Telephone at four. I wonder if she's out with—Bill. Um, wawawa,..." But that's just auditing, it's just life, you know. Uhhh..." Oh yeah, very hard to audit. Scientologists are very hard to audit. By a lousy auditor.

That's very funny. Because as a case supervisor you can sit there and read somebody being driven straight into propitiation. Just like a falling piece of lead on a non—standard session. And now and then you will see in case

supervision my comment in folders saying, "Well, maybe we got away with it." And that's because I found something non—standard in the session. And it's interesting that in the last three days I have had back before me for review, as a repeat after a completed review, only those cases where I read, "Well, maybe we got away with it. I don't know. From this folder it all seems to be O/ R, but I don't know."

And sure enough here, a week, two weeks later, the person in back for a review. He's sick at his stomach, he's this, he's that or he's the other thing. So you can go through the actual auditing actions on an auditors' report, and at this point of the session he is supposed to do whatever he's supposed to do, and he didn't do it. And he did something else, and he phrased the questions in some other odd way, and then you see a couple of Q and A's following this, and then you see the TA rising, and then you see indicating by —passed charge of auditing over the last floating needle or something, and you read down the line on this. And your case supervisor report is the auditors' summary sheet, and so on is glowing, the PC 'Bright toned, happy at the end. Wanted to loan me his car. ' The propitiation has entered in to it. "Told me what a marvelous auditor I was, and good shape." You can expect in a week or two to see this person in Qual with a headache or sick at his stomach, or something else.

And so your well dones are only given to those where the session ran off like a clock, exactly on standard tech, because you know that works. And there's these little divergence's and little zigs and little zags that you see in the session. You don't ever call those well done. Not because you are being pedantic. Not because you are being snotty and mean. But because simply, you know this case will probably appear before the examiner in another week or two, or before the Master at Arms. He will be in one or two of those positions, despite the glowing auditor report. The summary. It didn't go standard, so the result won't be standard.

Now it's remarkable that anybody gets away with what they get away with at all. It is better than man has ever heard before, has ever seen, and it is quite remarkable, but he is much worse off than you ordinarily assume. So the net result of all of this is that when it is not standard he will have had some gain, it's not all bad, but he'll also have not achieved his full gain. And the difference between some gain and the difference between that and full gain, is the difference between wobbly—bobbly tech and very standard, precise tech.

Now standard tech rolls off with a clickety, clickety, clickety, clickety, click, with a total invariability. Now what you get away with sometimes, we see that the rudiments are overrun. So you will see in a ease supervisory report, if this looks poor, and so on, is bring the PC back to session and indicate the over listed list.

Well that is a funny thing to do. The guy was perfectly happy. He's going to loan the auditor his car right after the session. Uh, and he got an F/ N on it, and that's all set, and that's all O/ R. But the proper case supervisor action is to have him brought back, although is was apparently very successful, and have the over listed list indicated.

I just did a folder, just a few minutes before I came down here on a little kid. We have a lot of little cadets in the Sea Org. and they're pretty much on the ball. And this little kid, I don't know how old he is, uh, oh I don't know, seven, eight, something like that. Well, an auditor actually doesn't respect the PC if

he's a little kid to the extent that he did. And it's absolutely fascinating how the misapplication of technology just a hair line knocks the kid around. In the first place he's being audited from too high an altitude to easily protect himself. So there was an over listed list on a power process. It went on and on and on. I can't imagine what the hell the auditor was thinking about. What in the name of god was going on? He had his first blow down, it went bong, bong. he even mentions it. He marked it and everything, and then he went on listing, you know, went on listing, went on listing.

Well, the kid seemed alright. The proper action was to have him walk back into session and have the over listed list indicated. And that did happen, and the needle F/ N'd promptly and at once very abundantly. The little kid knew something was wrong.

And all of that was not much of a review session. I don't know how many minutes were consumed in doing this one action. But of course to do that action, why, you have to fly the needle, and then do the action. So he also got a little, tiny lick and a promise on rudiments, and so on. All of this maybe took 3, 4, 5 minutes, something like that. Indicated the over listed list and got a nice F/ N on the thing and the kid cheerfully went out of session again.

So you say, "God damn that's being picky! Wow! The fellow had the item indicated, it was alright, it was the correct item. Just because we add eighty or ninety additional items is no reason to believe; or just because we added five or six additional items after the blow down on 5A is no reason to be that picky." Oh yeah? One item past the first B/ D on 5A is one too many items. It blew down, that's it.

Now about all the lads gonna do after that is cognite. And if you start asking him for more listing items you've smothered his cognition. So the needle won't fly.

Now I've got a question here. It's what is a flying needle? Now I never punish people for asking questions. They can ask all the questions they want to because in that way I get an idea of how much they've got to learn. An F/ N that is a real F/ N, and so forth, takes off. It flies. You can see it disconnect from the bank and start to function. So it's just a colloquialism, fly a needle. Float a needle. F/ N. That's all.

And the explanation is that if you can't obtain an F/ N promptly and immediately on rudiments with a PC in standard tech, something's goofy. There's something wrong. And it usually is wrong with the session. Doesn't even go back into the past. There's something wrong right there, right now.

So, to give you the difference, this little kid's needle probably was doing one of these half inch floats, or something like that, and when the over list was indicated why it probably went to a three inch float. Full dial float. You get the difference?

Now you can expand the floating needle. But if you start expanding a floating needle with too thoroughness, you get the thing expanded to a half an inch, and then you collapse it to a quarter of an inch. And then you try to fly it further and it all of a sudden packs up and goes stiff. Known as overrun. The PC came out of it, and the PC went back into it again.

Now the essence of standard tech, all of these things to the contrary and merely supplementary, the essence of standard tech then is to get somebody in session. And one of the best ways to get a person in session who won't be audited at all is to ask him to explain why he doesn't want to be audited. Have you got that's a process?

Now somebody's going to say "What's the command?" It's... is if there was a canned command for that, then you would miss a certain percentage of PCs. You might have to ask him in Bottentott, you know? Now the person who has to have the exact words of the command is a person who hasn't grasped the thing that happens when you ask the command.

Now I'll give you an example. Somebody who wonders at what happens with release, or wonders something about how you handle an overrun, or wonders and madly goes around in circles on this subject, has not mastered, hasn't mastered what the hell a release is. Now if he knows what is this phenomenon of release, then he can produce it, he can unproduce it. But supposing you were trying to fix a radio but you didn't know what it did. So let's give a radio to the ancient Egyptian physicians. And say "Fix it." Now you could explain to them that you take this funny, flat bladed thing and twiddle—diddle it into the shiny buttons in the front of it, and that comes down and you hook together the wire when it doesn't run. Now you've got to tell him 8,000 more things, you see, like this wire goes to the that. You're teaching him by rote. He doesn't know what a radio is. So you've got to have all kinds of exact, rote little actions. Do you see? These rote actions By rote I mean the Chinese school, you know, type actions. You'd have to have, "You take the flat bladed end instrument and you put it in to the vertical slot, which is in that, that bright steel thing there, and you rotate it against the sun. Now you'd also have to place the instrument to the south to rotate it to the sun." Ah, boo. You better tell him what a radio is.

Now if he can't dig what a radio is, Christ almighty don't let him fix it!

Now the mechanism of release is simply this. The guy has obsessively been thinking a mass. He himself. We know in the first place that his whole bank is mocked up by himself and nobody else at his bank, but we know also that there's a whole bunch of body thetans that are also mocking up banks. And these body thetans are copying each others' banks and mocking up banks against banks, and he's mocking up banks which are copies of body thetans' banks, and body thetans are copying his bank. And we've got the most marvelous array of counter, Disowned, super copying that you ever heard of. But this, this would be very simple if there wasn't such a thing as a body thetan.

Now this guy is thinking a mass, or he's thinking a thought which keeps a body thetan mass connected to him. That's the exact mechanic of this. And you have made him recognize a thought about that thought which causes him to cease to think the thought that keeps him connected.

If you go on past the point where the needle floats, you have now made him re—think the thought which re—connects him, or makes him mock up a bank, or makes the body thetans who are mocking up a bank reconnect to him.

That's the mechanism of release. Let him finish his cognition. And give him an "That's it." as far as that action is concerned. Now you can release him on other actions which are not immediately germane to that action, as long as they are very different actions. Now this can go so far as if you get an F/ N on a green form, in spite of the fact that you're doing remedy Bs, S and Ds, or any other thing that the green form calls for, and somewhere along that line doing the action called a green form which the PC recognizes as repair, if while doing that action you get an F/ N and then knuckle headedly continue on that green form, you are going to make him think in terms of repair. And

he will re—think the thought which re—connects him and you might as well not have done it in the first place. You get the idea?

So he does the green form to an F/ N. And that is that. It F/ Ns, he gives you his last cognition, and so on.

Now the bank will remedy, will put out, the bank will put out the electrical phenomenon of disconnect a moment before the PC himself cognites on it. The meter reads just a small bit below the reality, or recognition, of the preclear. So that you normally get this odd phenomenon of the bank releases and then the PC says it. He finds out about it after you find out about it on the meter. So you have to make the marvelous adjudication of when to cut his comm. Because you do cut his comm. You must cut his comm.

The trouble with the auditors that you see come in at Level 0 at old Saint Hill courses and so on, you watch them on TV. It's the most agonizing thing you ever heard of. They ask this question and this fellow answers the question and he goes on and itsa's and itsa's, and the auditor's just not there! And he sits there, and the PC talks and talks and talks and talks and talks and talks and talks, and runs his havingness down, and pulls in mass. He's talking to him, and I get a hold of those guys when I'm training them and I said, "Control the session." "Well, control the session, I don't quite know what to do, that's all."

A session consists of starting it, running it, and ending it. And intermediately begins with beginning, handling and completing a process. Then people won't have learned this, if they don't recognize they can control a session. They haven't found out this marvelous, marvelous fact. That you can control anybody's bank better than they can below the level of clear. Anybody exterior to the bank can control bank far better than the guy who is inside. You can run him up and down the track, you can run him into things and out of things, and do ahh! And you get up around level 4, 5 OT section and so forth, you can make somebody scan himself all over the time track. Telepathically. Miles away.

The auditor always has greater control of the PC bank than the PC does. Always! What do you mean you can't control the session? You can make the PC go wherever you want him to go. What are you waiting for? The auditor's cause.

So the auditor tells him a process to run, and he's delivering self-determinism into the hands of the PC, so having started him in that fine line he lets the PC do the recognition necessary to do the disconnect from the, his bank or the other persons' bank. The moment it disconnects his auditor has got to recognize the end of that cycle of action. Which is usually by the additional cognition of the PC. Cognition turns up usually right on the heels of the F/ N. It starts to F/ N and then you hear the cognition come out.

And you've got to get the exact instant where you say "That's it." You run a PC just like you drive a car. The auditor is not an effect point. The auditor is a cause point which is bringing the PC up to cause point. So that's the mechanism. That's the mechanism of release. Well what the hell's the mechanism of clear?

Well the mechanism of clear is he doesn't mock it up no more. He doesn't mock anything up anymore.

Well now what happens after clear. Why do you go into anything after clear, then, if the guy...? Well that would be great if there was just one thetan there. But there isn't just one thetan there.

Now you've got to get him on OT2 now to take enough charge off of the bank so he doesn't plow in when he hits 3, because he starts hitting these things on 3 all he's got to do is miss and the bank will go into a wing ding. The body thetans of the bank will go into a complete spinning, screaming mess. All you have to do is trip the wrong incident, run incident 2 before incident 1, get the PC wheeling and dealing and he'll go into a freewheel which could kill the PC. Could kill him. Nothing to monkey with.

Therefore, he's now handled his own state, and his next action is to take enough charge with OT2 off the case, so that when he starts running these body thetans the handiest, most active body thetans have been discharged down to a point, because OT2 is part of R6. They're... they've been sneaked down. They won't freewheel as long as you run up from, up from incident 1 and incident 2. If you run north of that, and all of OT2 is north of that, it's closer to PT, see? So you discharge it.

And when you throw it into 3 he won't freewheel. That is to say he doesn't automatically start going through the composite group incident of all of these body thetans. Do you follow? There is nothing much to it, it's very simple. You, you take the, you take the jolt out of that portion of R6 with the materials of OT2, which would cause, by overcharge, it's too charged up, the composite mass of body thetans who all of a sudden start freewheeling through R6. 'Cause they've all been in R6 on this planet. The vast majority of them have.

And then you can do 3. And you can do 3 very safely. But at the time you've done 3 remember that this character has now been plowing into body thetans. And he's started to wonder whether or not he isn't mocking something up because he's got a bunch of automatic pictures, and there's things mocking up against these things, and things, things, womp womp. And what he starts doing then is start copying their copies. They'll make copies of the physical universe and then he'll copy their copies and then he'll have the masses of body thetans. He'll make the copies of body thetan masses. And he's so damned used to having there things that he feels weird without any mass in, so he starts mocking up some mass. A lot of wild things can happen. But he blows these left, right and center, and then you rehab him. And then it all goes back quietly into place.

Now, as you move on up the lines, you get to 7, you get to 8, and you're taking away any slightest, faintest obsessive create that might exist. And you're taking away ale obsessive postulatingness. And a lot of other odds and ends of little mechanisms that you may not have looked too closely in the teeth that are the woof and warp and composite of the thetan.

Now. So what are your mechanisms of release? And what are the mechanisms of clearing? We know the individual is simply mocking it up himself. Well therefore it's very simple. All he'd have to do is cognite he's mocking it up himself and he'd go clear. There's nothing to that. Yeah, that's the trick man. He's got to cognite on it himself. You start telling him he is, and that's why you don't see that cognition put out as an end product. You start telling him that that is the end product and, god damn! I've seen several of them do it. They come around and say, "Well, bla bla and bla, everybody knows that I'm mocking it up myself. Yeah, I know I'm mocking it up myself." The guy's mad. You know, bla... He looks like something a psychiatrist put out "Yeah, I know I'm mocking it up myself." And you say, "That's good. Do you have any pictures?", and so on. "Oh yeah, lots of

pictures.” “Are you mocking those up?” “No, no, those are automatic pictures.” The cognition is being used as an evaluation. And you could actually prep check the cognition if it goes off too badly. That is, if he’s mocking it up himself and you prep check him.

Anyway, that’d be a very, very weird thing to do, but it could be done. You don’t find very many cases in this state. You find quite a different, there’s a different composite to this character. He didn’t find any on 3. And you break out your little violin and you say, “It may be so, we do not know, your story sounds so queer. We hate like hell to doubt your word, but... it don’t go here.”

The truth of the matter is the person has a this lifetime, severe physical injury which has jammed several body thetans together so that they don’t answer up. They don’t answer up and they’re impacted, or pushed in, or all one. Severe physical crash, bang will cause an individual to find a very few or none at all. The remedy for it is run a this lifetime engram. Well, somebody’s gonna say, “well why?” What do you tell him? But if you let the guy go out of this lifetime, why he’s, he’s running engrams of his own someplace or another that hasn’t anything to do with his existing situation. His existing situation is a very simple situation where simply a lot of body thetans all think they’re one body thetan, and that’s the primary mistake body thetans make.

And the proper cure for that, along with rehabs and getting in the lower grades, very often you find the lower grades madly out on such cases, as well as this. It’s not always true, but you very often find them very badly out. And you move them up along the line, you find this lifetime injuries. This lifetime injuries or circumstances certainly which made engrams that pushed it all together, and then, then all of a sudden you can run 3. Run some of the phenomena of 3. You, you find this quite common. There is no such thing as somebody with no body thetans. Forget it. It doesn’t exist. But you will find the lower grades are out.

Now, this kind of phenomenon can exist, that doing the lower OT sections the guy blew a lot of body thetans. And then you can find that moment when he blew a lot of body thetans. Actually they all took off.

But the common incident of body thetans is of course incident 1. The next common incident is incident 2. Incident 1 is the basic, but incident 2 is not necessarily true of every thetan because incident 2 doesn’t, isn’t in the bank of those thetans who were elsewhere. Who were elsewhere 75 million years ago. And there are a few of them. Also there were a few who were here who didn’t get it. And so incident 2 is not that general. But it’s sufficiently general that sometimes requires that.

Now, incident 1 is that common incident of occurrence which tends to knit together all body thetans into the kooky idea they’re all one. There is also another incident on the track which implants them to believe they’re all one. And body thetans are not all one. Life is not all one by a long way. Life is composed of individuals. It requires a certain amount of effort to stay in the time stream at this period of time of this universe.

Now, therefore, the mechanisms’ release have to do with these factors. And at the lower grades the individual is so composited that he thinks he is one individual, and he very often hears little voices and so on, but he doesn’t let this bother him too much. That’s just natural. And as you come up the line, as you bring him up the line, why he of course gets closer and closer to this

phenomenon. Very often on the Clearing Course, and so on, people will encounter body thetans and body thetans will start to blow. And you can't get into the OT sections without something happening about body thetans. I don't wish to be invalidative of anybody around hearing this who didn't find any. One of two things should've... one of two things should be done in such a case. His earlier auditing ought to be explored for blowing a lot of thetans. He may have occluded this. And the other one, if he still isn't flying on it, the other one is a severe injury in this lifetime, whereby the body thetans and he and the body are, have in common a savage physical experience of some kind or another which makes them all a group, and makes the group into one being. Those are the two actions which are taken in theory. But these are the mechanisms of release, and these are the mechanisms of clearing. Now those are the mechanisms you're handling, and those are the things you're handling. And if you know those mechanisms well you can do an awful lot. You don't go squirreling around on the edges of it, because the thing which handles them is standard tech. And there isn't much else that handles them. And it handles them case after case, one person right after the other. It completely removes the differences between C/ S's. There are no different cases. There are no cases different than any other cases. There aren't peculiar cases. But I can tell you this, I can tell you this, that a person who does not come up through the grades does not hit the phenomenon. He doesn't hit the release points of the upper grades if he hasn't been through the lower grades.

For instance, if somebody didn't really go into 2, OT2, he's not likely to be able to come very close to 3. See? If he didn't go clear on the Clearing Course, why it's very unlikely he'll go anyplace else. If he didn't do his R6EW correctly he isn't likely to go clear. Do you follow? It's tracking back, tracking back.

Question here, somebody asking somebody something or other a very complex question on the subject of going clear or not going clear, about rehab of Power after a person is clear. Now the law is you don't rehab Power after a person is clear. You do not do it. The reason you do not do it is the person all too often falls on his head. But the operative word here is what's got this person puzzled, is the word clear. If the person went clear on the Clearing Course and you rehabbed or indicated anything that was out on Power, or anything of that sort whatsoever, he would be in trouble at once. But the operative word is clear. A person who didn't go clear on the Clearing Course and didn't go release on R6EW probably has something wrong with his Power. And if there's nothing wrong with his Power he will go release on R6EW and clear on the Clearing Course. If he didn't go release on R6EW, if he gave a bunch of false attests and so forth, and didn't go clear on the Clearing Course, why then there is something wrong with his Power. But if his Power was alright he undoubtedly went release on R6EW, and undoubtedly went clear on the Clearing Course. I mean it's not a question that you wouldn't puzzle much about.

So that if a person was on the Clearing Course and couldn't go clear you could of course go back and rehab the Power, because it isn't a clear, you know, I mean... Simple. All of these things are very simple. They're all straight think.

So, when you're trying to audit a case that doesn't want to be audited, he is stuck into some protest or resistance, and you make him as is it, and if you

haven't at that moment put him on a meter you won't see the moment when it releases, and go on arguing with the guy because you're liable to be incensed. So it is an auditing session. He will go release on the subject and be auditable, and then walk himself right back into it and plow himself in again, unless you see that he went F/ N on it.

So you don't ever go along on the preconceived notion, this is another rule of standard tech, don't continue to hold the same idea of the persons' character. A C/ S must never continue to hold his concept of the PC which was formed at some other level of the PCs case. And you will find that PCs get reputations. Well, everybody who was maintaining and keeping the PCs reputations up the line doesn't believe auditing works. So this PC was a complete dog when he was a Level 0, he just managed to get squeaked by it, and he would have required 18 dozen reviews, and he was just having an awful time, and so on, and then the case supervisor gets this PC when he gets up along the line to about Grade IV. And he right away, he will make one horrible mistake if he does not realize the person's released from that state, or he wouldn't have gotten to IV. So either the person was run to IV or the person was not run to IV. If the person is still this kind of a case, and is now a Grade IV, then god damn it nobody ever ran him up to Grade IV. Do you follow? So you do that by confirm or rehab his Grades up to IV.

Now they will either rehab, or they've got to be run. And if they won't rehab then they've got to be run. Elementary. Sometimes you start to rehab some Grade like III, or something like that, and the TA starts up like mad. Well you have to make out what the hell that was. Probably III was overrun at the time, the moment of release was there, and now I'll give you a piece of stuff out of 7, in actual fact.

It is not a standard action, but what: happened was, is he was audited on that with his Ruds out. A piece out of 7 is you can get the Ruds in on any situation, anywhere in the past. That's a piece out of 7, that's not standard tech in repairs. But you can get the Ruds in on any action of the past, anytime. You can put all the sessions Ruds in on it.

Now, it's very remarkable to see this occur. Because the thing will blow suddenly. Some former instance will blow, which was resistive in the past. In other words, the person was living with his Ruds out.

Now the weird part of it is, is the reason for it wouldn't run, let us say something like that, at the time it was run, it's now giving you a rising TA and going bad and so on. You know that there are still some Ruds out on this case. And some auditor was kidding himself someplace. So what you have to do is fly the needle. And you make it your business to fly the needle. Now you go back and try to rehabilitate IV, and oddly enough it'll rehabilitate. Most mysterious thing you ever saw.

Actually, if you noticed your own auditors' reports, you put Ruds in prior to the time IV was run. IV was run, let us say, in 1965. If you were running down a chain of ARC breaks you found one in 1959. When you found the ARC break in 1959 you took it out from underneath the running of IV in 1965. You actually put some Ruds in in the 1965 session, so it will now run or rehabilitate. If it doesn't rehabilitate, you can now run it. Most mysterious think you ever saw in your life. But you have to know this operative principle. You guys go around and start running some of the odd bits I tell you out of 7 and 8 and so on, you'll probably get your brains blown out. Not by me, but these are very, very rough levels. Ah, but I'll just give you some

of the data. I know where the ceiling is now, exactly. You see at 8, and the retrospect of what goes together from that has to do with the repair of cases, the operation of the mind, and so forth.

So I can tell you that this fellow is still stuck in having lost the battle of Waterloo. He was not Napoleon, he was the cavalry commander who ran all of that cavalry into the sunken road so that infantry could march across the top of it or something, bodies in there by the ton. Something like this. And you just can't seem to run this damned incident. He, he's got all these bodies stacked up there, just there and so on. Well one of the ways of freeing the whole thing up is put his rudiments in for that day. He'll blow. He had a missed withhold from Napoleon.

This is not a procedure, not a procedure that is advised. I'm just telling you what can happen. So that you, just getting Ruds in, then always follow the only procedure for getting Ruds in. And there is no problems, solutions, counter—problems, what are the postulates, squirrel nonsense, upset, bleegle—bloggle, yik, yik, yik, to get in a PTP and missed withhold, or any of those. It is always continuously, always forever, only in standard tech that if it didn't clear you get the earlier similar one.

Now if it didn't clear it was either an earlier similar one, or there was a false read. You don't, however, ask for another earlier ARC break. That is real crocky. That's asking the case to, whole case to run on ARC breaks, because you haven't said "similar". So you invite him off to the side panels that you're not trying to clear up. "You got an earlier ARC break?" Well that's really clown, that's really a clown question. Really clown. Because of course he's got an earlier ARC break. He actually has, by actual computation enough earlier ARC breaks to make the moon astronomical laboratory's computer go crazy. It couldn't write the number. YOU can always find an earlier ARC break, and if you don't know this principle then you will never get the Ruds in.

So what have you got here? You've got an earlier similar incident or an earlier similar ARC break, or you have an earlier similar PTP. "Is there an earlier similar missed withhold?" Always, always, same chain, same chain. "PC, same chain please. Earlier please. Good. Thank you. Same chain, same chain, same chain, earlier please. Thank you."

Now it's either an earlier incident on the same chain or it's a false read. somebody has said he had one when he didn't have, and it's continued to read. So you check for a false read, or you check for an earlier similar one. You don't always check for the false read because that would be a damn bore and a waste of time. That's why standard tech doesn't consist of rote procedures. When you put a nickel in the slot, then the record arm comes over, and goes down, zzzzzt, and, and then the record turns around and plays Methuselah Comes Again. You got to know what you're doing

So, the PC you say, "Do you have an ARC break?" You know? "Do you have an ARC break?" Somebody's asking me for the exact question by which you ask for an ARC break. I'm going to have him write me an assortment of questions by which you ask for an ARC break, as a system. Not to punish him, but to show him that the principle of asking for an ARC break is what we're talking about, not the English language. The principle. The principle.

You ask some five year old kid for an ARC break who never of the term ARC break, you're liable to get a read on misunderstood, and then you've had it. Right? You have to know what is this question ARC break. You have to be

able to say, "Upset? Is there an upset with communication?" You know? or, "An upset with your affections for people?", or, you got to know what you're doing so you can talk it. That isn't driving you off the line of standard tech. You're asking, "Do you have An ARC break?" And it reads, and the PC looks. At that moment you say, "Has anyone ever said you had an ARC break when you didn't?" "Yes, ah ha ha, yeah ha of yeah oh. One time. One time this auditor... still he always asked for an ARC break and I couldn't clear this ARC break. And I used to think Scientology didn't work because I could never clear up this ARC break. And I'd keep telling him about the ARC break. And he kept auditing, and never, and babbaababa." Woom. Boom. "I just realized that I didn't have an ARC break with Joe." And you say, "Good. Thank you. We will now run Grade II." Your actual action is, "Your needle is floating. Thank you very much. We will now run II."

Alright. Now, the PC said, "Ohhh. You got a read on PTP, huh?" (sigh) Well honest to god it's damn near that exaggerated. How the hell I have to tell an auditor that it must be a false read someplace just testifies that the auditor who's reading this kind of thing doesn't know what the hell it is. It's an evaluation. The question is an evaluation of some time in the past. Somebody has said, you know. Now the reverse happens, but only once in a blue moon. This is once in a blue moon that the reverse can happen. "Well, do you have a present time problem? Well that's clean." "That's funny." "Why? „" Well, I was sitting here worrying about my wife. ' "Alright, on that question has anything been suppressed?" "Oh yeah, well I've always had to suppress this problem, and so forth, it's always been a terrific worry to me. I've been suppressing it for years. „" Well good enough. Alright, anything been suppressed? That's clean. Alright. Do you have a present time problem?" "No." People have invalidated the fact that he had a present time problem. Some auditor has actually gone so far as maybe to ball him out for having a present time problem. There's two sides of it. And one is eval and one is inval.

So the eval/ inval always occurs, but it has different workings. You have to know eval/ inval. Well false read, false read. Now you could actually have a situation where, "Have you never had, have you ever had a no—read on this when you did have?" "Oh yeah, lots of times." You can get that reverse situation.

So the net result of this is, is you run it back to an earlier similar, similar situation, you all of a sudden get behind in time the zone or area where he was audited without Ruds, and the area will now rehab. So that's why you always fly a needle. You've done it. Now after you've flown the needle on Ruds, what the hell are you doing trying to fly the needle on Ruds? If you fly a kite, you've flown a kite. If the needle is floating it is floating. There isn't anything else you can do that gets it floating. But you're on the subject line. You're on a subject line. And you can float a needle on any specific zone of action. How is it you can fly a needle on the three questions of 5A, one right after the other? Getting it broader and broader and broader? Well, they're on three different, primary points of thetan interest. But they're three different points of interest.

Now let's get, let's do five S and Ds in a row. I don't care with what question. And the PC collapses. Why? It's all on the same subject; him being suppressed. Him being suppressed or suppressing somebody, it's on the subject of suppression. And it's just like asking the question, "Has anything

been suppressed?", getting a floating needle, and then saying, "Good. Has anything been suppressed?"

Now, what happens? The exact mechanism. Let's look at the exact mechanism here. "Has anything been suppressed?" Floating needle. Now you say, what has happened here now, he's stopped thinking the thought which has kept him connected to, or kept him making up a certain mass. Now he's stopped thinking that thought for a moment, because he's got it gone or it's in view or he's stated it, and now you ask the question again. You have now told him that he has not thought the thought which disconnected him, so he now goes and looks for a thought to think that will disconnect him. And, doing that, he reconnects himself. And the more you do this, the higher the TA goes because the more mass he makes up trying to find something to find..., trying to make something to find something in. You got it? So this kind of a sequence has begun.

So every time you overrun you put him back in to doing it again. Because you've invalidated that he has stopped doing it.

How long will a person stay a release? A person'll stay released until such time as he overruns it. If you cut the PCs comm, what the hell is he gonna do? The needle floats, he's about to tell you "I just remembered I killed my mother—in—law", you know, something like that. And you, he said, "Gee! I..." Needle floats. You say, "That's it!" You haven't got the end of process phenomena hooked up with the floating needle, hooked up with the general thing, see? And you know what the PC does? He says, "Duh, dih, OK... Yeah." And he goes onto the, the next subject, but it doesn't float so well, and so on, and then he goes out. And every friend he's got he gets rid of this thought. "You know, funny thing in this session, session I just had in there, funny thing. I, I just said I'd occluded it totally. I killed my mother—in—law. You know? Occluded it." And he'll tell Joe and Bill and Pete and Oscar and Mazie, and so on and so on. How often, how long do you think this thing is going to stand up? It's gonna overrun, and very quickly. Because you didn't let him finish the comm cycle. But how long is the comm cycle? Well, the comm cycle is as long as it's necessary to immediately get rid of that exact realization. And that is the exact length of the comm cycle. And it is not so many inches on an auditors' report. And how long is that? Well it's just as long as it lists. A list is a list as long as it has the item on it. How long is a piece of string? A piece of string is as long as, from the distance from one end to the other end, and it is the middle part of the string and that is the length of the string. Got it?

Well when I see, as a case supervisor, one and one half columns of cognition after the F/ N, I know the auditor has just about as much control over this session as he has of the evolutions of Pluto. See, no control. No control on the session. He also has no judgment with regard to a finish of a comm cycle. Also his meter reading is out. Also, also, also, also. So, I, I come down on it. So the auditor who chops the comm is gonna get the F/ N overrun right away, as soon as the session has ended. And the auditor who overruns it has already overrun it, and sort of invalidated it, and you'll see that an auditor can invite itsa.

One of the ways an auditor invites itsa is to be silent. A person says, "My gods I just remembered, ha ha. Ha ha, never remembered it before, I never remembered it before. I killed my mother—in—law. Ha ha, what do you know? God, that's funny. Occluded the whole thing. Yeah. I occluded the

whole thing. Ah, yeah. „The auditor’s sitting there, the auditor’s sitting there... Now the PC for sure got to explain why this is important, why this is a cognition. So the auditor didn’t acknowledge it, that’s all and he didn’t acknowledge it with his face, or his voice, or any other damn thing. See? He didn’t acknowledge it. And so he’ll get an overrun. So, when you see a column and a half after the F/ N explaining why it is all, you know that the auditors TRs are out, and you look. Similarly, you know when he cuts the PCs comm, the PC has got an F/ N but there’s no statement. Well either the auditor’s admin is out, or he... (laughter). So you see the case supervisor knows all. The sensitivity to the cycle of action, the sensitivity to the cycle of action.

Now, you’ve got a problem then, in the administration of the process over and beyond the actual asking of auditing questions. You’ve got the administration, and you see the administration before you in the folder, and, was it really delivered? So the case supervisor is always operating against the question mark of the auditors’ TRs. Were the auditors’ TRs good? Did the auditor actually give a good session presence? Because actually, a bad auditor session presence can make an apparent gain not be a gain. The out TRs didn’t actually end the cycle of action, they overran it or under ran it, and it may be that the auditor was just too lazy to write it down, or the auditor wrote it down falsely, or the auditor copied his report afterwards to make it look good, or something like that. So as case supervisor you always have an unlimited number of very low conditions for any falsification, abbreviation, or otherwise, on an auditing report.

The falsification or misrepresentation on an auditing report then becomes a deathly, deadly sin. Because it denies the case supervisor the information necessary to handle the case. And you, if you are out there case supervising, and you have a level, grade, Class II auditor, something like this, and this Class II auditor is busy auditing PCs in an HGC, you’re going to think right away that it’s absolutely vital that we train him up in the entirety of Class VIII before we let him audit anybody, oh my god, he ought to be strangled, look how bad it is. And you go over to the academy and you try to get them to teach a Class VIII course, and so forth, and the guy doesn’t even know the name of the subject yet. He’s got no body of information to correct or go through or anything else. He’s just ignorant. So, you are very careful about what PCs he audits. And you’ll find out that it’s quite remarkable the gains he will get, and you in your case supervision can guide him right straight back onto the straight and narrow. You can. You can train him up so he does it. Now you probably need your nickel in the slot, the record reaches over, the arm goes over and presses this needle on and a tune runs off.

But the best thing you do with a case like this is, yeah, as fast as possible, you get him on up through, and you get him through the whole body of information on a Class VI course, and you push him up through, and you get yourself a Class VIII. But you can’t in actual fact, in a fortnight make Class VIII auditors out of all these guys. But you sure as hell can make it an awful deadly, deadly, deadly, deadly, deadly sin for him to make any false statement, or any alteration on an auditors’ report. And that’s the thing which you have to teach him, not the Class VIII course.

You say, “We’re very glad to have you auditing in the HGC. There’s only one thing you should know about auditing in the HGC. This is the form of the session, this is how a session is written down. Any variation from this or any

falsification of session data, and so forth, and you're hanged. Otherwise than that we're friends. This is the high crime. This is the high crime around here." Because that is the one thing that a case supervisor can't do too much about.

Now he knows it has happened when his PC turns up in review, and he's sick, and when he turns up in a big ethics order. So a case supervisor always watches the review requests and the ethics orders. Then he can judge the quality of the auditing which is being delivered. And he can go back and find out those sessions which have been falsely reported.

Now, the basis of auditing, the basis of auditing is this basic mechanism about the mind. The key out, the key out, he stops making it for now. He disconnects from the being who is making it for now. That's a release. He might think it again, or something like that, and then he's gonna do it again. He won't do it as seriously. The bulk of the charge on it has gone, so it won't be as serious as before, but he can key in. So the mechanism of key out and key in is everything you're handling up to R6EW. Then he has the cognition that he's making it, and then you only have to worry about other things making things. And then that's handled on 2 by taking charge off, and then on 3.

Now when he finally gets around to what the think is, and how come he does this in the first place, and so forth, you're in the zone of OT8. OT8 is the total explanation of why? How come? What's it all about? And the beginning of the line is, the beginning of the line is, that they are not all built the same way. Some are two peanut whistle, some are 44,000 horsepower. Thetans are not all of the same strength. And they're not equal and they're not all the same being, and there's thetans who would really sweat at it to run one foot of a grasshopper, and other thetans that couldn't possibly scale themselves down to leaving the Empire State building standing if they leaned on it. Different sizes, for some peculiar reason. What would be more peculiar is if they were all the same horsepower and the same size.

But the net result of all of this is, is they're all pretty strong, actually, when you get them to straighten out. And it begins at the lowest level, with the same thing that it ends with at the highest level. You're auditing the same being, or collection of beings, except at the highest level you're starting to audit the dynamics, and then you audit it back, so that an individual is an individual, despite the dynamics, and so forth. The same guy, from the bird who comes in to the session and he says to you, "I don't want to be processed." He says it with a look, and otherwise. Now that's the thought. And what you're trying to do is disconnect that thought, so that he can be processed.

So you audit him very smoothly from there on out, and he doesn't think the thought again "I don't want to be processed." So he goes right on up through the roof, very nicely and very smoothly. And he's just the same as every other thetan. He might have a different horsepower, and he may have different companions in his skull. But he operates the same way, and he responds to the same laws, and there is no difference. There is no difference, there is no, definitely no difference, in his reactions. And that is the thing, basically, which you're handling. The guy is thinking a thought which mocks up, or he's mocking up something, he's mocking up something and thinking a thought. And when you clip the thing which makes him stop doing that, without at the same time stopping him, on his own volition that is to say in

answering the question, then at that moment you get a floating needle. It's making him think the right thought to disconnect. Very simple. That's standard tech. And it runs all the way up.

Now you think then there are millions of ways to do that. Surprise, surprise, surprise. I don't think there are fifty techniques. I don't think there are fifty processes. Fifty would be stating it very largely. I haven't counted them. I haven't counted them.

The processes are the same all the way from rehab of former states of release to somebody who has never been audited, straight on through to OT8. Nowhere along the line is there a different technology employed. And it doesn't amount to fifty processes. It just has different targets. The targets shift, the processes are differently worded, the action is uniform. You're doing the same thing all the way. You bring him up to a point of where he knows he was mocking it up, and doesn't mock it up until he mocks it up and says he's mocking it up.

You begin at an unawareness. He is totally unaware of the fact that he is mocking it up, and you disconnect him from mocking it up at that moment. And he isn't even aware of that. He just knows he feels good. And then it's just up and up and up, until he gets to the Clearing Course. You've brought him up enough stair steps, until he becomes aware of the fact that he is or isn't mocking it up, and this time it's the whole bank. He says, "What the hell? I'm mocking the whole thing up. Huh. What do you know."

Alright. From that point on he is not really yet aware of the fact that there are other things around mocking it up. And not being aware that other things are around mocking it up he can get into many puzzles. He sometimes goes out of his head, he thinks "I'll go pick up another body," he thinks this, he thinks that, he thinks something else. And he's liable to get into very severe trouble picking up another body, because there're all kinds of things being mocked up in that body. Anywhere he looks something's going to be mocked up. So he's going to get into a hell of a puzzle unless he goes up through the remaining OT sections.

And then when he gets clear on up to the top and he's beautiful, he's all straightened out, boy is he straight, wow. He can steer it, not too well, but he can steer it. And then he has to handle the, the subject of think. Not mocking up, but the subject of think. What is he thinking? What... something happens and he thinks. Well that's, you know? It's the reactive think that you're handling then. But anyhow, you'll see that when you get to it.

Anyway I just wanted to tell you. This is the same band and it goes from the guy who doesn't even want to be audited up to the guy who's as free as a bird and uses the Empire State building to pick his teeth. Same set of processes, same standard tech, and we got it all, and therefore, I am inviting you, kindly, persuasively, gently, ferociously to use it. And to understand it and not go off the edge of it into the never—never land that connects him all up again.

Thank you.

THE LAWS OF CASE SUPERVISION

A lecture given on 26 September 1968

And this is the third lecture of the series of the Class VIII Course. Now I give it an English accent because they will be played in England and they don't understand very much in England except English. The rest of the lecture will be in American.

It is the twenty six of September AD 18, and the Class VIII Course marches on.

I am very, very happy tonight, very cheerful, very cheerful indeed. Two of the other Class VIII Course suddenly became auditors. Suddenly. And that is very, very good news. So apparently one becomes a Class VIII auditor suddenly. After a great deal of hard struggle, after reading very carefully, star rating on the basic bulletins and the basic materials, after going over this line, after getting a total, total grip on tech, so if somebody says, "The third law of listing," you say, "Brrrrp!", "The fifth line of the Auditors' Code, "Brrrrzmp!" You don't even think. You know? It's right there. Bong! It's not, "Let me see, according to the laws of listing, I... I wonder if I put down this... See I had a blowdown. What is a blowdown? I better look up in this bulletin over here. ' And apparently after about three times through the lines, and got the material cold, and after a terrific amount of study on properly done sessions, now that is the thing which made the difference. And just for the benefit of future students of the Class VIII Course in England, and in America, the two points which make a Class VIII auditor is a total, total grip on basic tech, and a good hard study of well done sessions and proper C/ S which led to the well done session, and a proper grasp of how sessions aren't well done, and the study of the C/ S folders on that. And the C/ S folders to which I refer are the C/ S folders which I did on Flag, on a very long sprint of something on five weeks, over 500 C/ S's.

Now. Therefore, a Class VIII auditor has a total grip on tech so that he does not fumble, he does not have to think, he doesn't have any unfamiliarity. And none of the questions which I occasionally get, you don't have any questions on the line. They've just got the tech, pongo! They apply the tech, bango! And they become a Class VIII suddenly, after they've done all this. It's almost lousy sessions on Tuesday, fantastic on Wednesday.

And then, having become an expert Class VIII auditor one has the difficulty then of becoming an expert Class VIII case supervisor. The marvelous invitations which the non—standardly run PC offers to the case supervisor to squirrel are unlimited. There is an infinity of ways to run a case wrong. There are less than four score ways to run it right.

And any time some auditor misses the missed withhold; we just had one. Guy ran, guy had, "You got an ARC break?", you know, asked "You got an ARC break?" It didn't read. But the fellow says, "Well yes. I have about three or four ARC breaks. And these... well I'm having an awful time of them." Natter, paragraph, paragraph, paragraph, natter, natter, natter. "Well do you have another ARC break?" No read on the meter. "Oh yes, I've got a lot of other ARC breaks," and so forth, "They're really doing me in," and so forth. "Aw for the awful way things are running, they're just terrible. And the way you're auditing is awful." And so on. "Yes, I got a bunch of ARC breaks." And the TA goes up and up and up and up. And the TA going up doesn't even alert this auditor.

One of the difficulties I had at Saint Hill was making a bunch of auditors learn that a missed withhold is a missed withhold, and an ARC break is an ARC break. And never the twain shall meet. But the guy can pretend to have an ARC break when he has a missed withhold. And if you try to pull an ARC break that doesn't exist and fail to pull the missed withhold you're in trouble. So there's a reverse slip to meter reading. Not only does the meter falsely read, but you don't take up things that the meter doesn't read on unless, when you get in suppress it then reads. You can always put suppress on a rudiment, but of course now this is a wide open invitation to pianola. Put a nickel in the slop of the juke box type auditing. "Do you have an ARC break? That doesn't read. Alright. Has anything been suppressed? Good. Do you have an ARC break? Oh, uh, it doesn't read. Do you have a present time problem? Doesn't read. Has anything been suppressed? Dajata degetee to do gee gee gee, boom" Bull. My disgust.

Somebody who asked me, "How do you ask for an ARC break?" I say, "Well now, listen. The answer to that question is a star rate of every bulletin on the Class VIII Course. The zeros included." Why?

The guy's asking questions like that because he hasn't got a grasp on the tech. Do you follow? Now very often you get asked weird questions that have to do with the persons' case. He's asking you, "Do mice jump through hoops?" Well he hasn't differentiated between the basics of life and the peculiarities which have derived therefrom. Do you understand? So you have to differentiate between what are the basics with which you're dealing, and all of the god awful complex screaming infinity of balderdash and nonsense that can arise from a mis—combination of these. Alright? So we get an unsolvable preclear. You go, "Oh, obviously completely unsolvable. We asked for an ARC break and the TA went up, so obviously he's an unsolvable preclear."

If you get pianola auditing, you drop a nickel in the electric piano. The guy can't think basics! So what he wants you to do is to put a tape recorder in his head. Now if I gave you the proper answer to everything a PC ever said it would take you from now 'till the end of the universe to memorize it all, and I wouldn't be bothered writing it. But anything a PC said is indicative of one of another basics, of which there may only be two or three hundred. Anything. Good, bad or indifferent. Do you get the difference? If you've got your basics, when you've got your basics, and you've got a grip on these basics, so that, and, "I wonder if it's true about the second law of listing." Psst! What are you going to get out of that? You've going to get an infinity of doubt, and questions, and all kinds of complications, and PCs are going to become very complicated and they're going to become very unsolvable.

You get the mystery of, "We asked for the ARC break. And we cleaned up the ARC breaks but he didn't F/ N, so there must be something wrong with standard tech, because he didn't clean up."

Actually the situation's completely bonkers. What is the symptom of a missed withhold? A missed withhold is the PC nattering. Bong, bang! Don't think. See? You don't have to say, "Well, let's see. I wonder what bulletin covers that, and blabla... You know? And this... He did... I remember that in a lecture, and blaaa... did did da."

"Do you have a missed withhold?" "Yes. People have been very mean to me." "Good. What's the missed withhold?" "Well, people have been awfully mean to me." "What's the missed withhold?" "Well, I really don't have any

missed withhold.” Read, read, read. How do you pull such a missed withhold? Well you gotta know, you gotta know that you’ve got to pull a missed withhold. Don’t go any place else and do anything else, for god’s sakes, pull the missed withhold.

Well, how do you pull a missed withhold? Well there’s ways of exaggerating missed withholds. There’s—I can tell you half a dozen ways of pulling the missed withholds. What you’ve gotta know is that you must pull a missed withhold.

Now it is either a missed withhold, or it’s a false read. If it’s a false read you clean it up with false reads. You follow? I mean, you have to know how to play this piano.

Now what would you think of a piano player who say down to the piano and had to have somebody put his finger on each key? And then say, “Press.” You’ve got just about as much change of getting Rachmaninoff’s Prelude. He’ll never play it, boys He’ll... His musical sound, pinks, Pink, Pink, Pink! “That was Yankee Doodle. Pretty good, huh?”

An auditing session is a piano. You play it, boy, and you play it now. And you don’t have any time to say, “I wonder where C is.” You hear “Plink” in the PC, and you go “Plunk.” Just like that. Bang, bang. “Do you have an ARC break?” No read on the meter. “Yeah, I have lots of ARC breaks. They’re awfully mean to me in the engine room. They’ve been shooting me down lately. And isn’t it terrible the way they write up...” “Good. What’s the missed withhold?” “Oh! Hm. Ha ha ha ha ha. Ha ha ha. Well, if you come down to that I, the other day poured eight tons of diesel oil into the bunker fuel tank, and haven’t told anybody.” “Good. Who nearly found out?” “Well, actually the whole ship. The people have been sort of looking at me since.” “Good. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Do you have a missed withhold? That’s clean. Good. Do you have an ARC break? No, that’s good. That’s fine. Now. Present time problem? No. Alright, any overts? Well, it reads.” “Oh I don’t know, I...” “Alright, has anybody ever told you, while they were auditing you, that you had committed overts you hadn’t committed?” “Oh yes, as a matter of fact I was doing this sec check and somebody said he turned on a rock slam, and then he found out the meter was disconnected, and so forth, and it was very upsetting. But I’d keep getting this read on overts, and so on.” “Good. Alright. That was a false read at that particular time. Good. Do you have an overt? Well that’s clean. Your needle is floating. Thank you. We’ll now proceed to rehab...” And you think I’ve been short handing it, but that’s about how long it takes with these difficult cases.

There are no difficult cases with standard tech. There aren’t any. Well, this PC was given reviews for two and a half years in Spokane, and the TA three years ago went up to six and a half, and it’s been there ever since, and at various places they mislisted the list, and the number of errors found in the auditing summary are 119 auditing flubs. Well is the case hopeless?

Case supervision. Do L4A to F/ N. Brrrrmp, bong, thump, bang, TA down, bzzt, bong. That’s it. And the reason why they don’t resolve is because the auditor’s sitting there, “Gee, I wonder what chart, what HCOB that was in. Let’s see, it was on a tape, I think it was on a tape, and something or other that the high TA shows an incidence of, I think it was, I think it shows a medical background. Let me see, what does a high TA show? Umm...” Has no place at Class VIII. If you have to think in order to know a basic fundamental data you’re not VIII, and you’re not going to get sessions. They won’t fly for

you boy. They won't fly!

The way you fly a PC, and the way you fly needles, is you know it. NOW!
NOW!

Somebody'll write me a bunch of balderdash today. I never insult a students' questions. That's perfectly alright. Ask all the questions you please. But I don't guarantee not to bring them up. All the questions I get are simply divergences from standard tech. The guy hasn't read the bulletins. You know. He hasn't read it. He doesn't understand it. If he did he wouldn't be asking me questions like this. It's all there. There aren't any questions left to ask. He asked me whether or not you list a service facsimile to the first blowdown or the second blowdown, or to what you do? Oh brothers please! Any listing is covered by the laws of listings The laws of listing have no variables. There are no variables in the laws of listing. You always list that way. There isn't any other way to list than the laws of listing. There are no other ways to list. Period! Full stop!

It just happens accidentally that in 5A you were hitting on the three primary points of a thetans' case, and it just so happens that the first blowdown is invariably the item. It happens on those three questions, because they are questions which are dead on. It so happens that those three questions are dead on. They will inevitably be. What you can't trust when you're case supervising is that the auditor caught the item that it did blow down on, and when Power goes wrong, when 5A goes wrong, it blew down on item one and he marked it as blowing down on item two. So when Power apparently goes wrong, and the guy comes back and so on, you get the list checked. And now it follows the full laws of listing. You may have to add to the list, you may have to suppress it, you may have to look for this and that and the other thing. It just so happens that an expert who doesn't get blowing downs on the wrong item inevitably and invariably finds that the item's the first item that blew down on the list. Because of the three key things about the list, and that is why it's called Power Plus. Those three listing questions, 1B, 1C and 1D are just dead center on a case and he doesn't get several blowdowns. He'll only get that one.

I saw a Power 5A list on a student the other day that about fried my hair. He got a blowdown and then went for a whole column. What was he doing? Why? Why? Why did he have to list? He had a blowdown. He wrote it down himself with his own little pencil. So would somebody please tell me, please tell my why anybody under the sun, moon and stars would continue a list beyond the first blowdown when it says in Power Plus in so many words that you... it is the first blowdown. Period! Well who the hell thought there was a whole bunch, a whole bunch of nonsense variables on this particular line?

The number of variables are zero in standard tech. So the invariability of standard tech is an invariable variable. And whenever you think you have a variable on your hands you have done something, or something has been done, which departed from standard tech, which now makes a variable possible.

Now let me show you now, the great invitation. The great invitation. A PC who is different is a complete invitation to the auditor and the case supervisor to do something screwy. And the only mistakes, the only, only, only mistakes you are going to make is accepting the invitation offered by the different case. And then you're going to make mistakes There aren't any different cases!

You go back down the line, and you look there over former reviews. This very resistant PC. Oh, very difficult. And there you see the blowdown on missed withhold. Only it was never pulled. And there you see it in another session. Missed withhold. R/ S. But nobody ever pulled it. And eventually this keeps up just that long, and you suddenly get a different PC. Doesn't matter much what you run on him, it's always something he doesn't respond. He isn't, he isn't responding to standard tech. Oh oh. And a clever case supervisor goes back and finds out where standard tech was violated and picks the case up at that point.

The formula of case supervision is to go back to find where the case was running well, and come forward of that, looking for violation of standard tech. And if they are too many, to refuse to get in a fire fight correcting the corrections, repairing the repairs; you can do this so—you can actually make up a list of, I've seen a list of two solid type written pages, single spaced, of items wrong from the last time the case was running well. And the case supervisor on this particular instance was advocating correcting every single one of those errors. It would have been a job that would have taken from now 'till Halifax.

I've forgotten exactly what the instructions were. I think it was something like, "Do L4A to F/ N, and do the next grade." And they did L4A to an F/ N and the person made the next grade and is flying.

Now it doesn't mean then that because a case has been goofed up—it's quite a tribute to Scientology that it has gone forward to the degree of goof that it has been goofed. The violations of standard tech; it's quite marvelous. It's just that you get about 200 times the result with standard tech. Yes, go back over it. So you've only got... you got three sessions. You got three review sessions, something like that, and each one has got a mislisted list in it. We'll correct it. Very easy to do. Three mis—listed lists, go back and find the right item on each list. Only takes about five minutes. Took something,... I mean per list. Took somebody else two or three hours, or a couple of intensives to make the list wrongly in the first place. But go back. Correct them. Give him his right items. Give him his right items, come up the line. He's probably only stuck in one of these lists. But you'll catch that one, but, just a little handful of lists, we'll go ahead and correct them.

5A, if somebody falls on his head after 5A it's usually, it's usually that something was very out. And you had a false auditors' report in that he didn't give the PC the items that really blew down. Another item blew down, or something of this sort. Or the PCs comm was violently cut. You know, something on the order of this trick, somebody is so screamingly anxious about the F/ N that he doesn't let the PC finish his cognition. Like say, Oh. Seattle. Yeah." He was going to say, "Seattle, yeah Yeah. Yeah. That's the place. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Christ, what a dumpy you know?" or, "What a wonderful town." something, you know? And the auditor saw that needle fly, and he didn't realize there was a comm lag between the needle, which is just below the level of the PCs reality, and the PCs cognition. So, the needle flew and he says, "That's it! Put down the cans. Good. Thank you. Thank... that's... woah." You know? "Wooh, wooh, we're supposed to do all this very fast."

Now then, you don't see this as the case supervisor very often. You can detect it to some degree, but you don't see it really. It's not there in your view, so the PC falls on his head after the session. Well something happened

to his comm. So you just correct that session. Very simple.

Now you can correct the session by asking for this or asking for that, but there's only one thing that can be wrong—two things I mean that can be wrong. It is either cut comm or wrong item. So, your standard case supervisor on something action like this it comes to you as somebody who has just been run on 5A now has a headache. And he's going around the review as for a headache. Or he gets himself an ethics record, or something of that character.

And so he goes around. Case supervisor, he's just had 5A. Now along with your accuracy, along with your accuracy in the field of basics must go a confidence in the gains of tech! And you can't go around saying, "Well it's not working out and it didn't work anyway." And "Yeah, yeb yee, doo. " Explain, explain, reasonable, reasonable, reasonable, "And probably 5A didn't work on this PC, and..." No! 5A would've worked on the PC unless something happened. So the PC, by auditors' report, apparently ran OK, but the PC a few days, couple of weeks later, gets himself a condition of liability from Oprey and Doprey, or some other charge. It's the business of the case supervisor at that moment to pick up this PC. Something is wrong with Power. Well the proper action is Ruds or green form to F/ N. If it didn't F/ N on the Ruds you go ahead and run the green form to an F/ N. And, rehab Power. So the guy will check it. Check it. And then when you get to the check of 5A you null the list. You don't just say, "Was that your item?" That's corny. You null a list this time. Because the probability is that the thing that blew down was not the thing he said. So you null a list meticulously.

And if the list now seems to be too short, or something of that sort, well you add to it, and you repair it just the way you would repair an ordinary normal list. Because there is something wrong with the auditing report. So the guy goes down and he repairs the list and so forth. And it's very unwise to get the auditor who ran the Power to correct the Power. Because you will get some kind of an action like this, you know. "Well I gave him the right item in the first place. Is Mary Jane your item? Yeah, it was, wasn't it? Yeah, oh good. Thank you. I thought it was."

There was just that little bit of criticism, do you see? That's why people, when they fall on their heads, go to Qual, not back to the HGC. So, the list is nulled. And you normally will find out that it was his item but comm was cut, or it's marked as a BD on the wrong item, or for some peculiar reason it didn't BD at all And the PC was thinking about the listing question or something and got a latent BD and didn't get the thing, even thought he said "Mama, papa, uncle George." He wasn't thinking about that, he was thinking about people I've known. "God, you know, wow, you know, wow, you know, people I've known." And we had somebody the other day, bless her, who didn't like to put bad people on a list. And the list in actual fact apparently blew down on somebody she thought of, but not the person she put down on the list. She was editing the list as she listed. Tricky, huh? Tricky in that case.

"On this list, has anything...", you know, you're not get the question reading, items don't read on the list. "On this list, question, bud—up—up—up—ow, has anything been suppressed?" Pow. What does that pwoon?" And then you get something like, "Well, I don't like to put bad names on a list." You see your variability's of what the PCs response is. You get this real straight. The variability of what the PCs response is hasn't anything to do with the

standardness of the tech. My god they will give you eighteen billion variations for every single, solid piece of standard tech! No, never Q and A with this amount of variation. Do you follow? They act to standard tech directly, but they give you such variable answers.

I'll give you an idea. "Do you have a present time problem? That read." "Yeah, well I, hm, a present time problem?" "Alright, is that a false read? You know, no read there. Anybody insist you had a problem you never had, you know? Hm. Alright. Good. Have you had a problem auditors didn't find?" "Well yes." Reads. "Good." "I was just thinking here, I've never been audited without a problems I've never been audited without a problem. I'll always have a problem. The business I'm in, jiminy—god!" F/ N. "Thank you very much."

You don't ask the next rud question of course, because it F/ Ned on Ruds. Now you get down to doing what you're supposed to be doing.

Well that's a variable answer. You're going to get... Look. There can be an infinity of wrongnesses. Absolute infinity. There can be an infinity of sillinesses. There can be an infinity of mistakes. Getting somebody to study mistakes only; he's always gonna run into a new mistake. Just think of the Hottentot repairing the radio. Or the Egyptian repairing the radio. Now how many mistakes could he make? It's an infinity.

Now let's take, let's take a bunch of green, red and blue chips of various sizes and shapes, and let's throw them down, and just scramble them up and throw them down on a black table. And every time you do this you're going to get a brand new pattern. And some of them are going to be good, and some are going to be bad. And so you say, "Look at the variation in which life is steeped." The hell it is, there's no variation here, you're taking a bunch of chips and throwing them on a black table. And that a bunch of random items thrown down randomly will give you a random answer. That's the law back of that. What's the variability? Crunch. There is no variability. Do you follow?

So there sits the auditor. And he's got to have his tech solid. Proper. No question at all. Because he's sitting there talking to a PC who's got 18,765,000 variables per square minute. But they're all varying on his exact basic principles. What you've got to understand is you're sitting there with a stable datum which he's running the locks of. See? You're just watching these locks. Now, if you don't know your tech you think these locks are the stable data.

There's nothing more horrible to happen to an auditor than to run a squirrel process and get a win. It's fatal Because he'll now go down the street and get the next PC, only the next PC didn't resolve on it. And I have actually seen some guy try for years to get another win on the same process.

Now the horrible part of it is, is the guy, in actual fact, probably didn't get a win on the process he continues to try. He got a win on something else. PC all of a sudden cognited, he's saying, he's saying, "How many mother—in—laws are there on the head of a pin?" Or something, some wise process, see? And he says this, how many mother—in—laws are there on a head of a pin?" See? And the PC says, "Oh, gee, that's a good question. It's truly... I feel wonderful. Thank you!" F/ N. Now the auditor, not knowing his basics, he thinks, "Christy That's quite a process." Well, that wasn't the process the PC went F/ N on. It was somebody who was willing to talk to as degraded a bum as that. Somebody was actually willing to sit down and ask him a question as

though he amounted to something. And he cognited on this, and went F/ N. You get the idea? The auditor goes around with this squirrel process, thinking and so on.

There are five or six brands of processes immediately jumped up and leaped into view around Elizabeth, New Jersey. One or two of them became very, very famous, and so on. They were in actual fact questions which I had asked a particular PC to pursue his particular problem, and were based on the standard datum that a PC makes a mental image picture which then pushes him, pushes his anchor points in. And all I was doing was asking questions what would get the guy to look. And these questions seemed terribly variable. And they seemed so wise, that they became processes. One of them became a whole line of therapy. Well, you think this over.

Well, the guy who was watching me ask the questions of the PC certainly didn't understand what the hell I was doing. If he'd understood what I was doing, why he was; I was trying to get the guy to look at the picture he was stuck in. Any question I asked was simply to get the guy to do that. Do you follow? So the standard action there was simply, well, let's get the guy to look at his pictures, and, and blow a few locks. That was all. That was all.

But they appeared to be very wise, and so forth, you see. They had variables, Guys could actually go out and say, "Golly. You ask the person this marvelous question. This marvelous question," and so forth. Like, "What time was it?" That would add to something. But whoever applied the process thought that I was asking about a clock or something. You know, what time of the day was it at the time that this thing happened, and so forth, and you know, get a big variable on the line, and then that could get all varied up in some other way.

In other words, these things squirrel up, because the individual does not understand the basic from which the question stems. Do you understand that? He hasn't got the principle from which the whole thing is advancing. He's not running from basic data. So, not running from basic data of course he makes a fantastic number of mistakes. And then, sooner or later, if he squirrels and doesn't do standard tech, he will sooner or later start getting loses on PCs, and then he sort of considers it an overt, and then he is apt to borrow some of their ideas of super—variability, and if he didn't know standard tech in the first place he will for sure depart from what little standard tech he had.

So an auditor auditing standard tech owes himself a hundred percent wins. And he'll get them... He'll get them. There's no monkey business about it.

Now the state of the PC is not what the auditor says, it's what the PCs state is. What is wrong with the PC is what is wrong with the PC, not what the auditor evaluates is wrong with the PC. These are all little basic laws. It isn't the auditor's opinion that makes the PC sick. So you read a lot of amateur C/ Ses. They really are a howl. You, you; at this stage of the game you've got this ahead of you. But you'll start laughing at yourself after a while at the tremendous opinion that you start forming of this, that and the other thing. And how complex these opinions are. And how much figure you invest into the whole thing. And you read my C/ Ses along this line, and they seem to dispose of the most complex things with the simplest actions you ever heard of. So that therefore, because the PC is so complex, and the solution so simple, therefore there must be something you missed. You get the idea? So there must be something more in this folder...

But what you're looking at is the fact that we have the basic data of life. These are the rules and laws that life lives. And that's all. You apply 'em, and of course any life responds to it. If you could talk to a spider, he'd go OT. So this, this is what, this is what's required of a Class VIII auditor. He has a grip on tech, the like of which nobody ever heard of. You ought to be able to rattle off the Auditors' Code, bbbrrrrrr. Boom. But not just rattle it off. PC comes in to session, feels a little dopey, you don't think twice. You say, "Have you had enough sleep?" See? You don't have to think about this, you know that. PC comes in, feels for the chair, and sits down, yawn. And you think immediately of the Auditors' Code, "You had enough sleep? Well good. Go get yourself some sleep and we'll audit you when you're good and rested. Thank you." Not, "Let me see, let me see, this is the..." This is three quarters of the way through the session. "Let me see. I wonder what could be wrong with this PC? He doesn't seem to be able to stay awake in the session. Is this dope—off? Boil off?" Figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure.

Now the alertness to these things is terrific. I noticed, used to notice, that I would catch, when we were doing long intensives and that sort of thing, I could catch an ARC break by the actual clock an hour and forty five minutes before the HGC auditor. That was the lag. Hour and forty five minutes before the auditor noticed the PC was ARC broken. Because the PC would get more and more and more and more ARC broke throughout that hour. But I could pick up the original ARC break. See? And I'd say, "Alright, there's one." And actually have clocked it. And at that time I had squawk—box systems where I could listen to every session, don't you see? So I had a lot of opportunity to do this. The auditor would miss on his comm cycle, and the PC would say or do something at that moment. That was the beginning of an ARC break that somewhere up the line, in the next hour or two was going to explode in the auditors' face. And what always amazed me was, is the auditor would sit there and wait for it to explode in his face. Certainly the PC must have looked strained, certainly the PC's voice must have gotten tighter, certainly the needle must have been not responding properly, the TA vanished out of the session, the skin tone of the PC went bad, the auditor wasn't getting anyplace with the process. Do you get it? It took him a long time to add up all these figures, see? Well, if you're red—hot, you recognize them in the first split half second. See?

Now the way you do it, it isn't that you have to be quick, it's that you have to know what you're doing. Violation of a comm cycle is liable to end up in an ARC break.

Now, rather than go to all the labor of having to recognize it, just don't violate the comm cycle. That's the best answer to that. Just deliver a flawless session. And a flawless session on communication is communication with the PC. Not a communication with your instructor in TRs. "Do birds fly? Thank you." The TRs are just there to let you get up to a point of where your grip on the TRs are such that you simply apply the TRs, brrrrrooom, boom, boom, boom, boom. You can talk that way, you don't have to think about it, it isn't wooden, it's very natural. And when you've got the TRs down pat, why at that particular time, bang, bang, bang, they just run off pat, that's all. You can always tell a brand new student. He's trying to do his TR0 and his TR1 at the same time and it all shows up in his tone of voice. And he hasn't got any more auditor presence than a rabbit. You just drill it up to a point of

where this comes natural. That's all. Poomp. PC originates, handle the origination. Bong: Nothing to it.

So, when it comes to adding and summing and looking up, what's the difference between a Class VIII auditor and a lower class auditor? Class VIII auditor knows his basics so well that he is never led into a trap by a PC. He never comm lags as to what is going wrong, he knows. He doesn't have to correct his comm cycle errors, they don't occur. He doesn't have to patch up cases, 'cause they weren't misrun in the first place. He doesn't have to repair the case supervision which he did on Tuesday because it was correct. And he has enough ethics presence when he is case supervising that an auditor who would do something else comes in with a rather pale complexion, if not bright green.

The auditor would be the first one to tell you he had goofed. Ethics presence is sufficient, so he wouldn't try to hide a goof, boy.

So, a Class VIII does it right in the first place, and can repair what other people have done wrong. He himself, in his auditing, invariably does it right in the first place. In his case supervising, he does it right in the first place. The cases he has to repair are the cases that have been done wrong by somebody else. Get the difference?

Now I don't want to intimidate you or give you a bad idea of what you've got to do. But the only thing we're demanding is 100% perfection. 100% grip on the data. 100% drill so that it just, bong, lead pipe cinch. 100% result. And that depends on a 100% grasp of the data. And a 100% application of it. And you get 100% results. Just like that. Bong. You can't have a 50% grasp on the data and get 100% results. The percentages would be quite incorrect. Right? Now Class VIII is very fast. It is fast, fast, fast, fast. I received a note here from Joe, a ship captain, and it said, "During last night's lecture I got the first inclination of what standard tech is. It's the difference between a cold war and a blitzkrieg. It's not just a better way of winning the cold war, it's a calculated assault with calculated victory." You don't go around, when you're first studying and when you're first doing Class VIII type of auditing, you may have some question about what the outcome of the session will be. You might have some question. But after you've been at it a very short time there's no question.

It'd be a matter of the wildest surprise if something weird happened in the session that made it go adrift, or it didn't come out right at the end. Maybe one session in 75, or something like this might go adrift. Something outside your zone of control suddenly moves in on it in some fashion.

You might find yourself auditing some PC who has a rather miserable auditing career, and it may take you a couple of sessions before you bring it up the line. But your confidence is such that you know it's going to come up the line. Through hell or high water it's going to come right somehow.

To give you an idea, my case supervision was running at about, I suppose about 90 at first, 90%. Little flubs of application and that sort of thing were pushing it astray. And I, myself, in handling it was handling cases that had really been goofed, boy. They'd really been goofed. And it moved up to about 95, and it moved up to about 99. It's riding along quite handsomely now at 100%, pocketa, pocketa, pocketa, pocketa. Now the only place that it is coming adrift is that there are some student auditors on my lines. And, that doesn't make me not handle the case. What it makes is, I have to case supervise it again, not to change it, but to tell them what to do to correct it

so they can finish my C/ S. See? That's the reason. They goof, and then I make them correct it so they can finish my original C/ S. And that may happen a time on the case, once or twice or something, and then the C/ S is done, it all comes out alright, and bongo.

Your neck is always out when you have an inexperienced auditor auditing for you. In the first place he gives you false reports, and he gives you false reports unknowingly and unwittingly. He doesn't have a clue what's going on, so he doesn't tell you what's going on.

The case supervisor who believes an auditors' summary is a fool. He's just a fool. That's all. They have some use. You continue to ask for them. Because it picks up the auditor observation and it can give you the auditors' attitude toward the PC and what the auditor thought happened. So they have value. But you don't take it up as a case supervisor. There's no action on your part for a case supervisor. Got nothing to do with your case supervision, beyond giving you the auditors attitude toward the PC, and what the auditor thought happened in the session.

You find out what happened in the session by reading the auditors' report. And if there's any variation in that auditors' report from what should have happened, you know very well that the PC didn't come out alright in the end, whether the summary report said that he did or didn't. It had nothing to do with it. And if there's a goof on that line that you as case supervisor can catch as you go through the session, as you read through, the auditors' report saying the PC came out alright has nothing to do with it. The truth of the matter is, you'll find the PC is back in review. Goof in the session, PC winds up in review or in ethics. Case supervisor, you watch your ethics and review file, compared to your cases. Which makes it very rat a tat tat indeed. There's nothing much to it, in other words.

The auditor who ran standard tech produced the standard result, or, the case winds up in review, or winds up in ethics. That's the case supervisors' point of view. Reversely, the case that winds up in review again, and the case that winds up in ethics was not standardly audited. No matter what the auditors' report said, something is wrong in that auditors' report. The auditor did not report something. Now you've got to do something to find out the data, whether or not it's to send it to the examiner, or so on. You, you, you're gonna find out more data.

Case supervision consists of the complete folder turned in to you with the examiners' note in it. You don't EVER talk to the auditor, you don't EVER talk to the PC. You never talk to the auditor, you never talk to the PC, you never case supervise without the whole folder in front of you. Laws, boy, those are laws! They're in concrete. Never talk to the auditor. Never talk to the PC. Never case supervise without the whole folder in front of you. Those are the basic laws of case supervision. And the only mistakes I've ever made on it. But boy, I'm talking from history. I've case supervised more damn cases than you can shake a stick at. And the only mistakes I have ever made is when I talked to the auditor, or talked to the PC, or case supervised without the folder in front of me. And those are the only times I've ever made a mistake. Quite marvelous. And so, if you don't disobey those rules you will be a bear cat as a case supervisor. Providing you are a Class VIII and know your data.

So the guy ran in to a hell of a mess in the session. He was trying to do the case supervision and he ran in to a hell of a mess in the session. His proper action is to close the session, how ever gracefully he can. Not have the PC

sitting there waiting. Close the session. That's it, and so on, with no continuation of the session mentioned. He just gradually says, "Is there anything you would care to say before we're closing down this session?" And he ends the session. He makes out his report. He takes his folder in, hands it on normal lines. It winds up in the hands of the case supervisor, who in a moment of dispassion reads the auditors' report.

Now the auditor was also expected, when he handed in his folder, to have included a summary report. And then it is administered. And the whole folder is inspected to see what is going on here. And then the action is taken that needs to be taken, written down, that needs to be taken with the case. It is put in writing in a separate sheet. Not scribbled across the corner of some green form. It's on a separate sheet of paper, of which the case supervisor keeps a carbon copy. And, he writes down what's supposed to happen now.

If he doesn't know and he can't figure it out, he sends the folder back with a request that the PC appear before the examiner. And when he gets the folder back then he has at least the comments and condition of the PC, that the PC says. Not just the auditors' side of it. Now he can do something about this. And then what he does about this is so standard that it couldn't be knocked over with an A—bomb. He accepts no invitations to squirrel. The auditor's going to give him some, because you will be supervising auditors who are Level 0 or something. He'll have vast ideas of what he ought to do about this, boy.

Now you write something down, and he doesn't think he can do this, or something like that. He doesn't change this as he goes in to session, oh no! He just says that is it, he doesn't go near the PC. He has the PC informed that the session is suspended for the moment. And he sends the folder back, and says, "My reputation is at stake. I either can't do, or I don't understand, or I don't agree with this C/ S. 'Cause after all, I'm the guy that's going to be hanged. If the PC comes out wrong I'm going to be hanged. Maybe you're going to be hanged, but I'm for sure going to be hanged. So therefore, I can't do it. Doesn't compare to the case."

Now that would be a big invitation for the auditor to have a talk with the case supervisor to... Violates one of the first principles. 'Cause the auditor's now gotta say, "Why?" If he can't do these processes then he had no business auditing the case, so you simply get another auditor. If he says this isn't the right C/ S then he's gotta have some reason why it isn't the right C/ S, and maybe he will disclose some new data that he before has not bothered to put down. Such as, the reason he can't run the CCHs is because the person is a complete paralytic, and is there lying on a stretcher. And that is case supervision how she is done. And the end product of all of this is standard tech, standard results, and pocketa, pocketa, pocketa.

Now the way to waste time is to try to save time by speeding up the admin lines. Any time you super—speed the case supervision, auditor, HGC, admin lines, any time you put a crush on these lines it will add to the time spent. Let's get it all done and crush through in the next hour because the PC has to catch a plane for Hoboken, and let's get it in, and a big invitation to go in and see the case supervisor to find out exactly what he's supposed to do about the whole thing. I can assure you, boy, you are now going to waste about session time, money, misery, failures, pfft! No. You save the time in an auditing session. In an auditing session you save your time. It is so damned fast, it happens so quick, the auditing is so swift when it is done right, that

you could poke around for weeks with admin time. Now the only time you would run in on fast administration would be an assist at an injury. Somebody just got through dropping the body and you're going to tell him to get back in his head and take over control of the body. That's a responsibility of any auditor. Rendering a proper assist, putting a tourniquet on the guy, something like that. See? An assist level action, well, that's not in the realm and remedy of, of auditing, unless it itself is done wrong. Because an assist can fail. I'll have to tell you about assists, because I find out there's very little information on them.

But, your admin time. You don't save time by saving the admin time. You waste time by saving the admin time. One rapidly done session which is expert and right on the button is worth a hundred hours of old time auditing, any day of the week. Furthermore, the case that is set up, that it's all correct, and you fire him right now, boy he is in session about twenty minutes, zooooom! And if you didn't set him up properly he will be in session and then be in review and be back on your lines and then he'll be back over there, and then he'll go to the examiner and then he goes to ethics, and then they've got the hearing, and then there's auditors, and so on, and some condition has to be assigned to him, and then he goes back and then he has to correct the correction now, so therefore the correction has to be, and that is a long, arduous proceeding, and they have to do various things, and, you get it?

So the essence of this is, it's the responsibility of the case supervisor to set the case up, and to set the auditor up, so it goes brroooooom! Now, if it's only going to take a half an hour, an hour and a half, or something like that to handle this case, what the hell are you trying to do to save twenty minutes on the administrative lines? Matter of fact, if there's any crush on these administrative lines the PCs in an awful rush in order to get fixed up, in order to get swafff, aff, aff, aff, I myself would say, "Well, you tell the PC I've sent a note to the examiner", who is also the case supervisors' relay to the PC is always the examiner, not the auditor. You don't say to the auditor, "Tell the PC..." Auditor's not a relay terminal for the case supervisor in that way. You write a note to the examiner, and you say, „Dear Examiner. We know the PC has to make his plane at 4: 00. Tell him to postpone his flight until next week. Signed, Case Supervisor." Got it?

And if anybody is in such a hell of a rush that he's, he has more importance in living than in being correctly audited, I can tell you he ain't going to live long. He who spendeth his time convincing people how important it is will spend a lot of his time in review. Just by the nature of things. "Yes, this fellow really has to be handled because he's entering college in fall, and fall happens to be yesterday and he was due at the college, and so forth, and he's got to get it handled so that he can do his entrance examinations, and so forth..." Anybody saw anything like this on an examiner line. The examiner should write all that down, you understand. Anytime I saw an examiners' report like that, and "He's got to be audited yesterday..." Who dee dee dee do do do do. Eh, well... let's see. "What organization was this man last audited in?" Let's see, let's get that answered. What organization, there isn't very much folder here. Alright, good. The answer comes back, "Hudson Bay post 62. Had his Power and 5A." So you say, "Good. Well you tell him, you tell him to make a deposit with the registrar and make an appointment because we've got to get his folder here, and that comes in by

dog team.”

And the other day, just to give you an example, somebody got in a hell of a hurry. While I was gone on a trip here, these little things happen. Somebody got in an awful hurry. Somebody got in a great hurry and they had to repair this guys' Power. Had to repair his 5A. And the folders were at Saint Hill. And Saint Hill is a considerable distance away. And so, they relisted 5A. They didn't have the original list. so it was relisted. Not on my say so, god forbid. And I picked this up in this short term when I was absent, and I said, “Well”, and I think you may run across the case supervision of it, “Well, we don't know.” It says, “This is pretty adventurous to relist 5A or try to correct it in the absence of the folder and the list. Pretty adventurous.” Some such thing. And I didn't bother to file it because my certainty on standard tech knew the guy was going to fall on his head within the next week. Sure enough, here comes in one from the examiner. “PC says he has a bad headache.” Naturally. Somebody double—listed 5A. Christ, how dumb can you get? But you see they did this because it would take, maybe, a couple of weeks to get his folder down here. You see? Effort to save time on the admin line then winds up in an adventurous emergency action. Well auditing doesn't run like ambulance chasing.

True enough you can let a case go and go and go, and it'll eventually fall apart. Now I'm at the same time not advocating that you just don't audit anybody for a couple of weeks while you go fishing. But any time you find yourself speeding it all up and having to do it in two seconds, and therefore having to do it not thoroughly, or having to actually call for the auditor to ask him the thing because you've really got to get this thing case supervised because the fellow is Big Joe from someplace, and he's got the be audited tomorrow, and you don't have the data. Bahl You're setting it up to fall on it's head. The essence is, you point him in the right direction, and you fire him and he goes so fast when he is correctly aimed and fired, and he goes so slow, and it is so horrible when he isn't, that any time you save by extraordinary actions on the administrative line is going to be lost by having the folder back, and having it back, and doing it some more, and having it back again, and doing it some more. So the essence of, the essence of standard tech is you know your data cold. You know exactly what you're doing. You make sure that the D of T has got that; D of T trains those auditors so they just go boom, boom, boom. You see? You're going to have to do pianola training. “At this moment you say thin thun.” You know?

And you've got that D of P so arranged that that D of P, he is just going to go over that case supervision with the auditor. “Now it's this, an it's this, and it's this. Now you go in, and you get in the rudiments, and mmmwma, and that's what is says. And then you...” So on and so on. “And this is a very rough PC, and he very often gives auditors a bad time. So you want to go in, friendly, everything, get him set down. Tell him what you want to do, and then give him this and tell him that, and so forth.” Now we got it all set. And it's something like setting up a rocket. Don't you see?

And then the auditor goes in, he's got it all set up, he strikes the match on the seat of the pants and lights the fuse. Got it? And the guy goes whhhhooooommmn! See? PC exits laughing.

Now I'll give you the other approach. Case supervisor, he doesn't know, “Uh, this PC has a long history of having been on the police force. Therefore he had a great many overts. Uh, let's see. I think what we had better do is run a

Joberg in order to handle this situation. And uh, then, if we get a Joberg done, um, so on. Well, just to make real sure we will run Grade II before we run ARC Straightwire. And that'll, that'll fix it up, because then we'll also catch his overts. Yeah, that's the way we'll do this case. Yes, yes, that's good. Alright."

And he sends it in, PC comes into session. The auditor, he's got the case supervision, but the D of P hasn't gone over it with him or anything like that. And the auditor goes into session and goes, "What the hell is this? A Joberg. A Joberg. Let's see. OK, OK, Joberg. I haven't got a form here. Where the hell's the forms here? Joberg. I think I don't know where the... Where's the, where's the... Joberg. What the hell is a Joberg? Oh, I remember what it was. I remember what it was. Uh, yeah. Well I can, I can do that, I can do that right off the cuff, see?"

So he gets the PC in session, he says, "Alright. Tell me about your sex life." And PC comes into session already with his tone arm at 4.5, see? "Tell me about your sex life. Alright. Very good. Yeah, you've had a lot of sexual overts, have you? Alright. Now let's check these things out, and so forth. You every stole anything, robbed anybody, and so on? Of course you've robbed somebody. We know that. Now let's see. Alright."

Session comes back, TA 5. "Oh well, I must have goofed that one. This PC must have some; I'm pretty sure this PC must have robbed a bank. Yeah, that's what we'll do. We'll put it down here, "See if the PC has robbed a bank, and then run the CCHs, except specialize in CCHs because he says somebody was a glad hander in the last session." And he sends it back. And the auditor says, "Well, I un, un, un, I... CCH1? To hell. I don't remember what that thing is. Oh, alright. Um. "TA at 5." And he says, "Well. How does auditing seem to you now? Good. How does it seem to you now? Good. Thank you. How does it seem to you now? Good. How does it seem to you now? Alright. Good. How does it seem to you? Now? Oh let's see, what question was I on. Yes." Pc's TA at 6.5, ran CCH1 without any results.

No kidding, I've actually case supervised almost under those conditions. Where, it didn't matter much what the D of P said the auditor did something else anyhow, but to be agreeable, why, he put it on the report form that he did it, or he'd tell the D of P and then usually the case supervision was tearing into the office and making a couple of sharp comments, and then going off and not doing what the guy said anyhow. Now you wonder what the hell goes on. Well in that much confusion Scientology still increased its' stats, still went up the line, people still did recover from things and miraculous things occurred. Marvelous. Absolutely marvelous attestation.

But those sessions could go on for week after week, year after year, and grind out one way or the other, and get someplace and somehow. Which is alright. Even without bad supervision. Even with the auditor actually knowing what the processes were. Running the processes too long. Doing this and that and the other thing. Running PCs not set up, session without Ruds and that sort of thing. People still got a hell of a lot of result.

Now, when we find out exactly what are the additives off the line, and you pull those off the line, and you get this new line of think. Case supervisor says, "Brrrrmmnp!" and "ZZZZPDPP and "Zipp". D of T takes it up with the auditor, makes sure that he knows how to do it. PC comes in to session, the PC has had rest, the PC has been fed, the PC is OK, all is alrightf and we got it. And the auditor strikes a match on the seat of his pants and lights the

fuse and booms There was two years of old auditing just went by in those twelve minutes. Got it?

And man, a pc'll hold onto those gains just as hard as they are accurately delivered. So you got your hands full of a handful of miracle. It happens so fast people will very often say it looks too simple. Yawn. Say, "That's what Lindberg said," or something like that you know? It's too simple.

Yes, it is terribly simple. And when you have done your Dianetics course, your Academy course, a Class VI and become a Class VII, and then had your Class VIII course a couple of years from now, and so forth, you will be able to do it that simply too.

Funny part of it is you can take an academy auditor and you can teach him to say, "I see a cat." "Sit down at the meter and say "I see a cat" and don't say anything else to the PC. And then when you've said "I see a cat", then when the PC answers that question, you watch this and you're watching for that needle to go woof. If the needle didn't do that, you close the session, you make your auditors' report, and you send it back to me. And if you say another god damn word, boy, hm hm hm ha. Right now I want to stay in ARC with you. Let's have this all on a beautiful, even plane of ARC so I don't have to bust your teeth in to shut you up in a session... Now I trust you completely, that's why we have this squawk box. Your auditing room is bugged. Your sessions are patrolled. We have utter trust. Complete trust. Say anything you please in a session as long as you say exactly what I tell you to say and not another damn thing."

And you will be able to do it actually, with Level 0's. What you would do actually is clear one rudiment at a time. One rudiment per session. It isn't worth while to do anything else. Now a Class VIII, you turn him loose with a whole session, see? We'll put the rudiments in this morning, and then, if the needle is still flying this afternoon you can go to the body of the session, but you'll have to send me the case supervisor folder first.

This PC could very often be in the org for two weeks, having received three sessions. Or having received five sessions, each one of which was only five minutes long. And the funny part of it is he would fly like a bird. Do you see? Now the length of the case supervision then, is proportional to the class of the auditor who is doing the auditing. So I can say to a Sea Org Class VIII now, "Do the usual rundown for OT Section 4. LRH." And he goes and does it. A hell of a complex damn thing. It's, "Fly the needle on Ruds or go to a green form and fly the needle on it. When you got that done get earlier, rehabs, practices, whatever you got to do. Get that cleaned up, make sure that rehabs. Rehab ARC Straightwire, secondaries, engrams, Now, zero, one, two, three, four. Rehab or run. If they don't rehab you do something with them to set them up. Skip Power. You never rehab Power in a clear. Rehab R6EW, rehab OT1, rehab Clearing Course and OT1, OT2. Prepscheck 3. Do a valence shifter and run confront." And that is Section 4 OT. Complete. Done by a Class VIII. And the total lapsed time that it takes to do that is variable. I haven't been reading the Section times. I don't know. Hour or two at the absolute outside.

But if all of a sudden he can't do one of these items, or one of these actions doesn't work, or so forth, even so he would be expected to pack the session up at that moment. Pack it up. Close it off and send it back for additional C/S. He has hit a bug.

He doesn't try to sit there and solve this bug. He's running standard tech

and there's something in the road of it. Now, the guy tried to rehab ARC straightwire and it wasn't about to rehab. And he checked over to see if it had been run and it apparently has been run. If it's been run it won't rehab and the TA rose on it. He could assume maybe it was too many times rehabbed, or something, or something. But he for sure had better send it back to the case supervisor. Something went adrift. And the case supervisor'll look it over, look over his session, and find probably the bug that he didn't see.

Or we may be dealing with a spook. And before this time we have had somebody who was an OT2 who hadn't ever been audited on ARC Straightwire. That hadn't ever been audited on engrams. Secondaries, engrams. OT1, 2, 3, 4, never had his service fac run. He'd been run on some version or another of Power. And somehow or another had fumble bumbled and false attested his way at R6EW, and fumble bumbled and attested his way falsely at this, and had told people that he was in actual fact a Class VI auditor when he'd never seen the inside of an Academy. How would you like that sitting in front of you as a hell of a withhold? It isn't likely anything would either run or rehab. But it'd certainly measure as a withhold. But something like that, so we could do an assessment on the thing, and we'd see all of a sudden the PC has never been clean on withholds. There was a read there of some kind or another, but it wasn't picked up. Something must be suppressed. So the case supervisor would recheck. And it'd all fall out in the wash.

Where the case doesn't run standard, where the case doesn't run standard, there's a lie. Because the totality of OT is the totality of truth. And the number of lies which a person has on the line is a direct index of his case state. So you'll get the lower level cases, they lie like hell all the time anyhow. So something has got out of line and we have to find what it is.

Anyway, regardless of that, I'm just giving you some of the limitations, some of the actions, and the exact precision with which you do case supervision. And you're going to think that you figure, figure, figure a lot on case supervision. You don't figure, figure, figure a lot on case supervision. You just know your standard tech better than any auditor you have auditing for you, even though they're Class VIIIs. And you always know your tech perfectly. And you never get invited into the cul—de—sac of running some unusual squirrel action, because the auditors' report seems to indicate that the case is different than all other cases. There are no different cases.

Now, when you can do it as a case supervisor you're not even looking at the PC. You're that remote. And the invitations are terrific, because the auditing is being done and recorded and reported to you out of your sight.

So there, in all other places you've got to hold the grip on standard tech. But to do it at all you've got to know your tech cold! Cold as ice. This is standard tech. This is VIII. VIII in its' auditing is one thing, in its case supervision is another. When you're a good auditor, you can case supervise. When you can't audit you can't case supervise. That's for sure.

OK? I trust a few of these succinct remarks will be of some value to you in future days.

Thank you very much.

STANDARD TECH DEFINED

A lecture given on 27 September 1968

And this, the last time I looked, was the twenty seventh... Thank you very much. Thank you. Very polite of you—The last time I looked this was the twenty seventh of September, AD eighteen, and this is lecture what number? (Four.) What do you know? Lecture four.

The reason I'm numbering these is so that nobody can come along and cut them all out. Probably the; expect it some years from now, that somebody will have figured it all out. It would be much better if we had the lectures on case supervision taken out, because if auditors are allowed insufficient latitude for their own imagination it cramps self determinism, ruins cases, but it cramps self determinism. And you can expect sometime in the future that the thing is not, well it actually isn't a good thing. The case supervisor, he actually has to have latitude when we're getting, you see, and the auditor should have tremendous latitude, because it'll give him too many case gains, and stuff like that, you know? Qual income is down. Ever since we started this standard tech Qual income has gone out the bottom. So, the best thing to do is to subtract lecture three, seven and nine, don't you see, from the lectures. You know.

Many ways of subtracting them, such as simply tearing them up. But somebody would at least know something was missing.

Now we have something of that order coming up on your bulletins. The truth of the matter is, is I'm going over bulletins at this particular time, so that all bulletins as you see then, as of this moment, are in actual fact being edited down into a standard tech package. But that doesn't change anything. And if anything is in any way changed it will be to the basis of bringing it to an earlier standardization. And it will simply be a correction of some out line.

We apparently have forty or fifty bulletins in the line up which have been written by other people than myself, and these occasionally contain errors. The bulletins which you've got are not in this category, I am sure.

But to give you some sort of an idea of it, we in actual fact had... There have been two changes in the standard processes, both changes to the original. I didn't... they'd been changed. One of those are the commands of ARC Straightwire, which are being issued to you directly and immediately, and the original commands of ARC Straightwire are those commands which crack neurotic cases. And somebody, with some enthusiasm, along the line someplace, cut off the last half of the command in each case. But that's a real case cracker the way it is originally. "Recall something that is really real to you" is the proper command, and it's never been otherwise. But people with enthusiasms edit this material, and every time it has been edited the material and workability has to a marked degree been lost. All of the listing tapes, although there were lots of tapes called listing tapes, on the Saint Hill Course all of the key listing tapes and the key listing bulletins were removed from the Saint Hill Course during the last two or three years. And that's why you guys don't know nothing about listing. You come to me here. I wouldn't give you a penny for what you know about listing. That's a fact. If you can't ratta tat tat, ratta tat tat off the laws of listing, popety popety pop, and know that those are the laws. Those are the laws. There aren't any other laws. There are no exception to these laws. These are the laws of listing. Those are the laws of listing. That is how it is done. It isn't done any other way. There are no exceptions of any kind whatsoever. Any list is listed that way. Do I

make my point? So don't ask me any more questions about listing or I'll bite your heads off.

Anyhow, asking me whether or not the lists of four are done in this way. Now. There is a thing which isn't a list, which is actually a repetitive process. It's what's been overrun. It doesn't go to an item. You're asking, in actual fact the PC, what has been overrun. And you rehab each read you get. It's a repetitive process. You write it down so you know what you're rehabbing. But as far as listing and nulling is concerned it's a non—nullled item. As far as listing and nulling is concerned there are no variables. And it's the one thing that the bulk of you who are studying this course don't know. You don't know that you're dealing with an invariable science. It has no variabilities. It is absolutely clank. You have to begin by finding this out. If you don't find this out you will never make a Class VIII auditor. It's a marvelous discovery.

You are in the process of discovering Scientology. That's right. Now let's take it up from the beginning. What does the word Scientology mean? If there seems to be a little bitterness in that... Scio is the word for truth. And scio turns in to scien, in that form, which means truth. And ology is the study of. Truth, study of. Now if you're studying truth how the hell can there be a variable?

Truth, by definition, is what is. There is a direct relationship to the amount of variable in a persons' life, and complications which are untruths and his state of case.

A wag lies by the words and music. Lying is a way of life. "How are you today?" "I feel fine." "You look great Mabel." "What a pretty hat you have, I've always liked it." You listen to some of these birds, they're so bad off because they've just been done in. But they aren't, haven't been done in, they have been doing something in. Don't you see, that is a level of truth. So that an OT comes up the line toward a truth. And the more truths there is in him the higher his case level. By direct proportion.

So a fellow comes in, he's lying in his teeth. Lie, lie, lie, alters alter, alter, vary, vary, vary, quibble, quibble, quibble, nya nya nya, booboo dee dee, boo boo. You have a direct, immediate index of his case level. He's nuts. And this goes down and expresses itself as delusion. The delusion of insanity. The delusion of a hop head. The delusion of a Callagan. Or a Robinson. "Oh my god the Scientologists are all after me!" Pfffft. My contempt.

These characters, we weren't after them. They practically had to take taxi cabs, airbuses, helicopters, walk through mud, struggle through storm, anything else, to get on our track. We didn't even hear of them. We didn't even know anything about them. We couldn't have cared less if we had. We aren't in any line of country they have anything to do with.

The guy who is stuck on the track someplace, the Martians are after him. Fighting shadows. Fighting things that haven't anything to do with him. Wars, world wars, whereby the Germans says the English are horrible, and the English say the Germans are horrible. And the Germans say the English are trying to conquer the world. And the English say the Germans are trying to conquer the world. And Germans say the English are slaughtering babies, and the English say the Germans are slaughtering babies. The amount of truth there is in connection with any war man has ever fought is undiscoverable with the worlds' most powerful microscope.

So in the gravest insanities you get the greatest untruth. So the road is a road of truth. At seven there was a step known as the incredibles. As you go

up the line you discover the incredibles. Things that happened to the individual which are true, but not believable. The incredibles. That is one of the points of auditing. Stripping out the incredibles off the time track.

Now you know how much you'd be believed if you walked into the barber shop and says, "Well, I put ten cents down on Sky Rover in the third race, and he paid off two million to one, and I made a couple of hundred thousand dollars, and my wife thought of the idea in a dream, and so that's why I did it. You know? Only it happens to be true. But you can't believe it because the odds are too great against it, see?"

I had trouble with this when I was a kid. I was everywhere and anywhere and into anything, and all over the planet at the time, when people were not traveling all over the planet. And I eventually got to a point where I couldn't talk about my adventures. I actually hit a level of untruth of minimizing what I had done and been. That's the reduction of incredibles. There are various ways by which something can be, or seem, untrue. Various ways.

So anyway, Scientology is well named. It is the road to truth. It is a study of the truth. And total truth is total power. And when the guy hasn't got any lies left in him he's OT. And all the mechanics of OT work out too. So the subject is very, very well named.

And that's what Scientology means. It's the study of truth, to which could be added the technology of achieving truth. And I have a list here, whereby several students don't know what standard tech is. Don't know what the word standard means. Haven't any idea. Now if somebody doesn't know that there is a subject called Scientology, which is a main line subject which has a certain number of hair line processes which make up a direct route, he needs an academy course. He shouldn't be here. Those are brutal words.

A science is a body of truths. A technology is a body of truths. Now somebody who can't confront action, or something like that, thinks a truth would be a datum of some kind or another. Well a truth can also be an action. And the road through all of the untruths of a person, from all the way south to all the way north has been mapped. It exists. It has been on a chart for years. There have been bulletins which announced its' processes. The doingness of those processes are exact, precise. There aren't two ways to do them. There is one way to do them. And that is what you are here learning. And if you can't learn that basic fundamental you might as well quit now.

You are not learning this wide subject of philosophy. You're not learning every student's got a chance to think his own opinion right now. You're not learning that right now. You're learning the technical application of exactly how it is done, exactly to whom it is done, exactly and precisely the steps and actions taken to an exact, precise results. And that's what you're learning. And you haven't anything to do with how many needles sit on the head of an angel.

Now case supervision, you were given some folders to case supervise. Then doing a case supervision of them, you decided what was wrong with the PC. Which is a direct violation of the Auditors' Code. Evaluative case supervision will be your downfall. It comes to this: He couldn't or didn't make this grade. Your job is to make sure he made the grade.

Now what's wrong with the PC is he hasn't made that grade. The major gains of the PC are always the next grade. You won't ever get any gains on a PC compared to making the grade. All your job is to start the PC in at the beginning of the assembly line and make sure that he's correctly run to the end of the assembly line. And that's your whole job. And when you do a case

supervision, don't ever let me hear you say again to the end of your career an evaluative statement about a PC. Because you don't know.

You do certain, basic, standard actions. Basic action. Standard action. And the case falls apart. You have to know your stable data, boy, you have to know your stable data so you can mutter it in your sleep.

You look into one of these folders. If you know your business you instantly will look at a list. The list was complete. The PC was given his item. The question read to begin with. Didn't dead horse. You have to know data like this. Dead horse question didn't read to begin with. Don't list a question unless it reads. Question didn't read, don't list it. Question read, no item found on the list. Pfff! It's either incomplete or it needs to be extended. It needs to be extended or the item's been suppressed. You find there's a little list, four things, which you do with a list. Very standard. Elementary. Elementary.

Now let's go into the definition of the word standard. I want to put you in a good frame of mind now. I'm not mad at you at all. There's no animosity.

Standard. The word standard as taken from Rodell's synonym finder. The word standard. And it says here it is "Universal, accepted, common, normal. Of recognized excellence or authority. Final, definitive, authoritative, conclusive, reliable, preferred, classic, timeless, accepted, orthodox, staple, official, cathedral, doctrinal, ultimate, canonical and authentic." That's the word, the synonyms of the word standard.

And now we have the Oxford Illustrated dictionary. And we will read here the definition of the word standard. I want to call to your attention that my messenger looked these up for me. The word standard. Standard. It's a distinctive flag. It's a banner with royal arms. It's a flag of cavalry regiment. It's a rallying principle. One of the meanings of standard is carrying a banner forward.

Now. It's a weight or measure to which others conform or by which the accuracy of others is judged. It's a legal proportion of weight, as in fine metal and alloy in gold and silver coin. It's a degree of excellence, which is the meaning which we have, required for a particular purpose. It's a thing recognized as model for imitation. Recognized as possessing the merit of authority. Degrees of proficiency. Class studying to reach this.

Let's take another dictionary. And this is the universal English dictionary. We're getting up in weight here. My messenger had a hard time lifting these off to look them up for you. Actually, our Sea Org messengers are very proud of themselves. They're moving up toward a ten thousand word vocabulary, which is exactly twenty times that of the average college student. Do you know the average college student knows five hundred words? It's true.

Once more, it's a banner, standard, a banner. Hearing a royal or national arms. Flown only by the sovereign. Flag of the cavalry regiment. Etcetera, etcetera of gold. Style, mode, type, accepted, recognized by convention, within a community, at a given time, as a criterion of what is best in speech, behavior, conduct, action, face, morality, to which we add technology. What is the best.

And now we will pick up a bigger dictionary. This is Websters' Third International dictionary. It is a couple of volumes, because they couldn't get all the words into one. And it's in India paper in microscopic print. And my messenger has very good eyesight to find it at all.

Standard. It's a rallying place, a flag to mark a rallying place, a pole or a

spear bearing some conspicuous object,... Man, we haven't even gotten down to anything else. A definite level or degree of quality that is proper and adequate for a specific purpose. The word standard. The word standard. It means a definite level or degree of quality that is proper and adequate for a specific purposes And that one you can star rate. Got it?

And now we will look up the word technology. I don't want anybody with any misunderstandings here. I haven't looked these up, my messenger looked these up for me. Technology is a scientific study of practical arts. It's practical arts collectively, terminology of a particular art or subject. Technique is manner of execution or performance. Manner of execution or performance.

I'm gonna get this big dictionary up here. And it says here, technique is a systematic and special method employed in carrying out some particular operation. Skill in practical acquaintance with the methods of some particular art, specialized procedure, operation and the like. That's a technique.

Now. Technology: Science of the mechanical industrial arts contrasted with the fine arts. Technologist as student is one who is versed in technology.

And, let's get this big one back here. I don't know whether I can find it on this page or not, it's so microscopic. There is technique, techno, technology. Is the terminology of a particular subject, it's the technical language. It's the science of application of knowledge to practical purpose. Applied science. The science of the application of knowledge to a practical purpose. Applied science. Have you got it? Now, there's no animosity connected with this at all. This is perfectly friendly. But Scientology has a very definite body of technical application, which is the only body of technical application in all of the data of Scientology. There are not two ways to do anything in Scientology.

In 1966 this was totally summated. And it is time that auditors ceased to be airy—fairy about it. Going up the line right now we have the fact that Scientology, applied as you are being trained to apply it, produces 100% result. And applied with the airyfairy, "I don't know what we're doing. duh duh duh duh, I have lots of opinions on this subject. I think I'd better case supervise; I think this guy must have missed withholds." After they got five items reading on the list, and it was four pages long, he threw the cans at the auditor. Obviously he has missed withholds.

Scientology, mis—applied, applied contrary to standard tech, produces back fires, that are not the pcs' fault. Standard tech is entirely under the control of the case supervisor and the auditor. The preclear, the pre—OT, is entirely under the control of the case supervisor and the auditor. Just so you know that well, the preclear doesn't "have missed withholds which is why the session failed." Be's entirely under the control of the case supervisor and the auditor. And if he didn't make it it is the fault of the case supervisor and the fault of the auditor. Nobody else!

There is no escape, safety valve. If he went out and got drunk and fell on his head between sessions, why the hell didn't you audit him fast enough so he didn't have a chance? It's time we took responsibility for the guy in the chair, because properly case supervised you get one zero zero per centum. One hundred cases out of one hundred cases. If you don't get it you're flubbing.

The old timer, he got pretty good. Dianetic auditing and so forth, they got about 50%. They got about a 50% improvement. As technology advanced, and as it was expertly applied, the percentage advanced. 22 1 / 2 % of all

cases will get well if you pat them on the head, if you show them a green door, if you put an ice cream cone in their hand, if you give them sugar pills, if you simply give them advice, 22 1/2 % of all the people that come in the line up will get well.

So the zero percentage is 22 1/2 . You gonna get 22 1/2 anyhow. Right, wrong, upside down or backwards, you're gonna get twenty two and a half. So, you get one of these 22 1/2 , you run a squirrel process and he says he got well so you think that squirrel process must have been... Bah, Nonsense. Now. You can push this up the line. And you want to know where the psychiatrist is, and so forth, he doesn't even get one percent. He's doing 22 1/2 percent damage. That's how you measure it. And auditor's a very bad auditor you get less than 22 1/2 percent. He expect that in any event.

Now. The skill and the excellence of the technology, and excellence of its' application, the standardness of it will push the percentage up. And through the years it went to higher percentages, and higher percentages, and higher percentages. And you, as a Class VIII, are looking at the per centium of one zero zero per centium. Any thing that falls below 100 percent is because somebody goofed, boy. The case supervisor or the auditor. Somebody goofed.

Now it may take you two or three sessions. It may take you a repair before you can execute the final action. You may have been fed a bum datum by the auditor and then, as case supervisor, called for a wrong action. And then you'll find this out fast enough because the guy didn't come out of it, so then you've got to go back and find out what it is. You send the preclear to the examiner, you get him run on a seven button assessment, the seven different types of things. You can get him run on a general assessment form, a green form, an L4A, various things for various purposes. You find out, you put it to rights, and then you get your 100. It isn't 100 percent one session. But if you go for two or three goofed up sessions followed by four or five repairs, which are goofed up repairs of goofed up sessions, and then you repair the repair of the repair, and so forth, you're not going to get your 100 percent.

But out of the cases which pass beneath your nose you had better, you had better, better, better, get one zero zero. Because the technology is there with which to achieve it. And if you don't know it's there we'll put you in an academy someplace to learn some of your basics. Because the road is a very simple road. And the most difficulty you are having right at this moment is asking these marvelously complicated questions of yourselves. You see a table sitting in the middle of the room. I am telling you it is a table, it is sitting in the middle of the room. And you say, "Let's see. Should it go to the antique side? How far is it? How long has it been sitting there? What are the ramifications and complications in the material of the table? Is the table really substantial? If an elephant sat down on the table, would it stand up?" I'm just trying to tell you, for god sakes, there's a table sitting in the middle of the room. There is a table sitting in the middle of the room. And that is the total is—ness of it.

I tell you that you do the Ruds to F/ N. Therefore, you start in with an ARC break, you got a present time problem, you check for missed withhold, and so somewhere along there she's gonna F/ N. If you know anything about your TRs at all you really can't miss. So it F/ Ns. Your rudiments are now done, so the PC is set up to be audited. Now you audit what the main body of

the session was supposed to be, which is some major action. You complete the major action to F/ N, and maybe one, two, three major actions. You complete them all. And you end off the session on an F/ N. And if your TRs are very good he'll come back into the next session still with an F/ N. If you cannot get an F/ N on your rudiments you, of course, do a G/ F, a green form, and you get an F/ N on that. And that is setting the case up. And looking at your folders you've been trying to get case gains out of green forms. Well sure, somebody feels better on a green form. You're trying to get case gains. Trying to solve cases. What the hell are you trying to solve cases for? They're no problem. They're a problem to C/ S, they're not a problem to an auditor. You do the usual and the case solves itself. It's too easy. It is too simple. And your complex figure—figure—figure—figure—figure, oh my god, figure—figure—figure—figure is just all over your god damned plate. And you're sitting there saying, "I wonder what the PCs thinking next, and so forth, and waff—waff—waff and doo doo doo thhthhhthh." Relax.

You start in with, "Oh I wonder what's this? Look at this! Christ! Look what's happened! Oh my god! I'd better do something about this." You've got a C/ S right in front of you, perhaps. Your C/ S. And it says PC—pow, PC—pow, PC—pow—pow—pow—pow—pow. You do it. And if your C/ S knows his business, or if you're the C/ S you already knew the TA was at six and a half. And you simply took it down, that's all. Now what; why would the TA be at six and a half? You go back to the folder, you'll find out fast enough. The guy went through five blow downs on listing one of the 5A processes. And the auditor gave him the last blowing down item. Power's supposed to be listed to the first blow down. If you list it to more than one blow down you're gonna be in trouble there. And the PC after the session might feel great for an hour, he might feel great for two hours. But sometime between then and the next two or three days he is going to feel like hell. You violate the rules of standard tech and the PC feels like hell. You follow the rules of standard tech and the PC feels good. And that's all there is to it.

Some day, if you get through this course alive, someday you will look back on your beginning think as completely ridiculous. You will be sitting there, knocking cases off left and right, pongety, pongety, pongety, pongety, bung, bang. Hundred percent, hundred percent, plongety—bing, plongety—bing, plongety—bing. "God damn that auditor. He slipped in that session... I'll write your C/ S, repair this wong, wong, bong bong." And there she goes. Hundred percent, hundred percent. Pocketa, pocketa, pocketa. And you look back at your earlier auditing career... I draw a curtain over your thoughts.

But, did you ever see somebody walk on a stage and play a pianer? Some fellow walks on a stage and he plays the piano. Mario Fenninger walks in, shoots his cuffs, sits down, bow—wow! You know that piano really goes, boy, that piano really goes. Now you can say it looks very simple to Mario Fenninger. That's right. He knows he's supposed to strike certain keys and he gets certain results. There isn't any other airy—fairly think about it. Only he knows where the keys are better'n any body else. And that's a Class VIII auditor. Same piano.

And you see some academy auditor. He comes in and, wonder where C is, and where, where, where's the lid to this thing? You know? Lid. Well, I got the lid open. Now let's see. What are these black and white things? I'll look it up in the instruction book over here. Black and white things... keys. Those are keys. Very good. Now you expect him to play Moonlight Sonata", huh?

It's a piano. But it isn't any where near as difficult as a piano to learn how to play. The biggest hump is learning that it's a very simple action. It's not a careless action. Terribly simple.

You go out and you see an expert marksman. And he throws the rifle up to his shoulder, booms Bulls' eye. Bulls' eye. You say, "Gee, that's easy." And you go out and you look for where the trigger is, and you look where the bolt is, where the magazine is, and you look down there to see if it's loaded, and you take it up and this damn strap's getting in your road somehow or another. My god, you're so damned introverted looking at the weapon you never get a chance to look at the target. And the reason most auditors never see what's going on in the PC is the auditor doesn't really even know how to handle an E—meter.

Be sits down. "I wonder if I've got the sensitivity right. I've got to... I've got to write this down." Never mastered the art of handling the tone arm of the meter with his theme while he's writing down the auditors' report. "And, let's see, what do I say next?" Same thing. He just doesn't know his tools well enough.

You take somebody walks in with a camera. Got a camera? Be's a ruddy amateur. If he's a ruddy amateur, if he looks at this camera, and he takes a good look at it, and he says, "Where's the lens? Where do I put the film in? What is this? What's this glass in front? Oh, that's the lens, yes." And, "I wonder what all these rings are? Well, I'll look it up in the instruction book here. Oh, that is the lens. Now let's see, how do I get this camera open to get some film in it?", and so on. Finally opens it up, finally gets some film in it, loaded some how or another. Then he's going around, "Where's the trigger, where's the trigger, let's see, where's the trigger? Now I'm going to take a picture." And god damn, he's so involved in trying to handle this piece of stuff that he is completely unfamiliar with, that, honest to Pete, the pictures he takes are a complete, stinking disgrace. He thinks he's doing good to be able to point it horizontal.

Now we take some guy, he's got a piece of camera, he's familiar with cameras. He can take this thing and he flips the back of it open, he throws the film in while talking to you about something or other. Sets it up and so forth. Now he looks around, and there's the picture. He hasn't got any attention on that camera, boy. There's the picture. So..., so here, powie. He can see over there, because his attention isn't introverted here. Standard tech then requires that one know his tools, know the laws of the game, know the correct action so instinctively and so instantaneously that he never has to think a thing to do it. His attention's on the PC. PC gives indicator sixteen, the auditor does what he's supposed to do. Just think. Well, what do you know?

Pc's talking about an ARC break but it isn't reading. Now, he knows his technology sufficiently well and he knows the PC talking about an ARC break that isn't reading, it's a missed withhold. ARC breaks that don't read are missed withhold. Standard datum. You don't say, "I think, you know, actually Ron said something about... when the thing didn't read." Nuts! See? It's bonkers. What, what's all this think and cross think, and wonder and so forth? If you hold up your hand and turn your hand over palm up, and then turn your hand over palm down, do you know what you'd had to do as a thetan? If you could think of the number of channels and muscles and nerve centers and things, and this, and so on which it took to turn your hand right

side up and upside down, you would go practically bonkers. And I assure you you wouldn't be able to do it. You ask somebody who is a ballerina. You can actually throw off a ballerina who is not quite on the ball, not quite. She puts a good show on, and so on, but she's not quite there. If you say, "How do you balance on your toe?" How do you balance on your toe? Now if she's on the ball she'd look at you and say, "Why, you balance on your toe of course, you idiot."

The great dancer is totally simple. You ask some artist, "How should you paint this picture? What should you do?" Well if he's sort of only painting reactively and he doesn't know his business he's knocked into a cocked hat instantly. Gets knocked right off of it. But if he really knows his business he just says, "Ho hum," and goes on with his work. "Why, why do you put green like that? Why do you put a stripe of green like that?", and so forth. And he'd look at you and say, "What? Looks better."

Now you ask some floaky mug, maybe an art teacher some place. And you say, "Now why do you put green across the picture?" "Well, this gives the collateral effect to extensive distance, and balances the color combination, because in actual fact the color wheel, if you see it over here, has complimentary color. You see it's green. And if you don't put green there then you'll get concavity of the lumbosis."

The maddest thing I ever saw in my life. I gave a lecture to a short story class one time. Been giving a lot of lectures to writers classes and things like this in universities and places. And, I walked up on the rostrum, and there were all the assembled students, and lying on the rostrum was one of my current magazine stories, lying open to my story, which was the lead story of the magazine. And the instructor had taken every single one of the sentences of the opening of the story and deep into the body of the story, and had marked each one of them for shadowing, suspense element, you know? And all according to a technology which I knew, but I hadn't thought of for years. And I was fascinated. I looked at this, and just for a moment wondered how it would be to be all thumbs, so you'd have to, while you were writing a story say, "We had better foreshadow some action."

Now. If Scientology's definition is the road to truth, then what are the progressive grade processes? They are those barriers in that order which keep a person from going forward to an ultimate truth. So if you looked at a normal PC you might see something on the order of where he is parked in diddy—wa—diddy. You ever hear of diddy—wa—diddy? That's actually ten miles on the other side of hell. And that's where the people in hell go on their night out. But anyway, he's over here in diddy—wa—diddy. Now he's going to walk all the way, the whole route. See? Now these grades are the gates across the road.

One, nobody knew the road. They didn't know he was down there. They didn't know any of the gates across the road. And standard tech simply takes this fellow, and it walks him right straight up the lines through these exact gates. And if you walk him through any other gates you're just detouring. There aren't any other barriers on the track. These are the shut gates on his road up the line. And they are the grade pro—ces—ses, and it isn't just an illusion. It is the fact. And because it is a fact, if you know your job expertly, you simply go along and open these gates for him, shove him through, go to the next gate, open it and shove him through, and open the next gate and shove him through.

Now there's eight thousand, seven hundred and fifty billion other things you could do with the case, none of which would put him any further along the road he's supposed to travel. But boy, would they be interesting. And any time else in man's history all they've done is they did find out there might be somebody in diddy—wa—diddy, and they just sent him a little closer to hell. Didn't even have the dream that there might be a road out. So how far up the line do you have to come to grasp this thing called standard tech? There is a guy, there's a dream of a road out. There is a road, there's a complete ocean of wrongnesses, but what has been isolated are the exact barriers to the exact road that takes him out. And he goes right up the line. Brrrrrrmm! Now along with that is the communication of the technology and the training technology of the person to teach him to do that. These are fantastic wins. They are so airy—fairy and so staryeyed, and so far beyond anything man ever envisioned. There all by itself it's a little bit hard to grasp. But you just accept it. It's a road out. There's a dream to get out, there's a road out, there're just exactly so many gates across the road, standard tech, one right after the other opens the gate, and standard tech, when the guy has gone over in the left field, right field, off the road, into the telegraph pole, something like that, also gives you the technology of taking him out and putting him back on the road. And there aren't eight ways to do it. And it doesn't require any opinions.

Let's say we've got a concrete path that goes from A to B. And we start walking down this concrete path. And all of a sudden somebody rushes up and says, "Actually you're supposed to walk over there in the gravel along the side of the edge of the mole, you know, and you swim for a little bit, and that's really how you get up to B." What kind of a jackass is it that would walk over to the mole and jump in? Well he'd have to be somebody who didn't have any idea there was any, any concrete walk there. Well the first thing you learn about standard tech is, one, there is a walk there.

Now one of the ways you learn this is subjectively. Now I don't want to invalidate anybody's case. I don't want to invalidate anybody's reviews. But this pile of crap I've got sitting here is how not to do it. Now also, there's an infinity of ways not to do its You can always have an infinity of wrongnesses around one rightness. And the rightnesses are very few. So if you learn the rightnesses well then the wrongnesses, to hell with it. Do you follow?

You can get an infinity of ways to do something wrong. Well work it out for yourself. Start counting up the number of ways to sink a rowboat. Those are all wrongnesses. Now the ways to row a rowboat, if it is a rowboat, not a sculling boat, you can stand up and row it, you can sit down and row it. You can row it with two men, you can row it with one man. But the right way to row a rowboat is to put the oars into the water and apply some energy to the handles, pick the oars out of the water and replace them into the position where they can be reinserted into the water to apply some energy.

Now somebody comes along and he says to you, "Yes, well how do you row a rowboat?" "Well, there's several ways you can row a rowboat, that's for sure. You can stand up and face the bow, you can sit down and face the stern, you can stand up and face the stern, you can put a man on the right oar and a man on the left oar, you can have two sets of oars." Sounds like a lot of variables. But let me point out that the oars on the right side and the oars on the left side of the boat are doing exactly the same thing, no matter what arrangement is made. If you've got a trireme, a bireme, it doesn't matter. If

you've got a life boat, if you've got a little fishing dory, you're doing the same thing in each particular case.

Now if you lose sight of the fact that the oar is supposed to go into the water, and push the water back, if you lose sight of that, you may have a great deal of theory, and a great many questions, but the boat won't go anywhere.

That's normally what happens to science. Somebody finds out about rowing a boat. And then for years and years and years guys add to it, and eventually the rowing of the boat no longer functions. And the boats don't row any more, and they have to invent an entirely new technology of getting through water.

You think I'm kidding. The movies, the movies show us in biremes, old men—o—war with double oar banks of Greek times, shows us, shows us all of these oars going, while somebody is going bong, bong on drums, or something at the back of the boat, in order to keep all the oars in turn. If you take a life boat out and every rower on the starboard side fails to exactly follow the motions of the aftermost starboard rower, who's called the stroke oar, and if the port aftermost rower, who is the port stroke, does not follow exactly the motions of the other stroke, the boat looks like a centipede with busted legs. Man has actually pretty well forgotten how to row boats. Mass rowing of boats. Big boats. Because they let the coxswain count. And you hear all your demonstration when your coxswain count the stroke. The coxswain can't count the stroke. Strokes are counted by the stroke oar. There wouldn't be any reason to hammer a drum because nobody's following a drum, they're following a stroke oar. So why, why would anybody pound the drum just for one oarsman? You could sit down along side of this oarsman and say, "OK. Stroke. Stroke." There's no reason to waste your lungs. As a matter of fact the entire rowing of the boat is going to be completely ruined. It looks like some wildly galloping centipede going along.

Now I know very well that they did it properly in Greek and Roman times, because they speak of the white wings out of the galleys. The white wings of the galleys. Now you'd immediately, in a sail period and so on, you'd think they meant, think they meant canvas, or sails, or something. They didn't. They meant those double banks of oars. Because it looks just like, it just looks like a big bird flying at you. The oars are flapping, see, on both sides. You see them go up and down. Looks like a flying bird that is sitting down in the water. They never rowed that evenly by calling a stroke or with drums.

And the other day I was looking through a book as to how you rowed a life boat. And it said the coxswain called the stroke. He doesn't. If he does, nobody can row the boat.

So look, if this fundamental piece of technology can be wrecked by the simple action of making the wrong person count cadence, or rhythm, do you see that a workable piece of technology is very easily unsettled and upset?

So the thing that keeps standard tech standard is following standard tech, not anybody else's advice. So somebody comes along and he says, "We got a brand new process which is riddlediddle—de—poggle—dings, and so on, and we've got this brand new meter which we attach to the toes of the PC and it makes him wiggle his ears." Well, I'll probably still be around. You'd better send it to me for a check up to make sure this case... I'll tell you something absolutely ghastly. In eighteen solid years of research I kept the door wide open to any research suggestion of any kind whatsoever. And from

the moment I wrote the last sentence of Dianetics the Modern Science Of Mental Health, right on up the line I would have been only too glad to have accepted a workable action. But every time I did it got us in trouble. It might have stayed with it a short period of time, it might have appeared workable a short period of time. But in the final analysis it got us in trouble.

I know how little things can change. And what you haven't watched is that Scientology and Dianetics were developed grade by grade. 1950, running of engrams. Running of engrams. Fascinating. Just before the running of engrams there was Straightwire. Then engram running developed heavily. Secondaries, secondaries were developed in their proper position and place. The whole subject evolved along this particular line. And do you know why, and what was the clue? And why these became the grades? And why these are run in that sequence? It's because they're the collection of those things which, if violated, prevent any advance of the case. If one of those things are out, then the case never goes OT. Simple. And it's in that sequence. And the width of the road is about one onethousandth of one micrometer. The variability is zero. The wins are one zero zero. There's a brand new approach. You're looking at a new world.

Now, somewhere up the line you get to start auditing this. And when you start auditing this you're gonna get so damned dizzy and power—happy somebody'll probably have to shoot you down with a shot gun, because a guy just goes completely wild. Normally speaking he goes wild on this. He, he does exactly right, he does exactly what he's supposed to do, the PC all of a sudden goes zzzooooooooommmmm, just like he's supposed to do, and he all of a sudden realizes he can do it. And you can't speak to him for days. And then the mistake he makes is he now thinks he can case supervise also. This is another field. It's based on the same principles, but you have to know. If you have to know it well to audit it you have to know it ten times as well to case supervise it.

Now, I, I know, I caught that, that there'd been one or two people in this class who were case supervisors at Saint Hill, and so forth, and you can put it down to my charity that you haven't been ground up for hamburger. Because what I see here, wow. I taught you better than this. There was a thing called standard tech. There has been a thing called standard tech since 1966, but nobody's caught the brass ring. So I'm putting that brass ring firmly in your paw. I'm not trying to make you guilty, I'm merely trying to give you one hundred percent win. One hundred percent. If you get less than hundred percent, you goofed! If you get less than one hundred percent as a case supervisor, you goofed! Less than a hundred percent as an auditor, you goofed. Some of the goofs are beyond your control. And sometimes you hit a real goof that you can't do anything about at all. And those are the goofs which you shouldn't goof on. You told the auditor to do so and so and so and so, and the auditor did something else! He just got a letter from yongo—bongo, and yongo—bongo, he said, "When I was studying yogi, I found out that if the preclear sat in an ibis position..." He really decided he'd try that, see, and he didn't follow your C/ S exactly, and you've got a loused up case. And then, because it's going to be a day or two between sessions, he goes and walks under a street car. And that cuts your percentage, doesn't it.

Cases that are well audited don't go to ethics. Cases that are badly audited wind up in ethics. All too often.

Now, when you're dealing a purity, when you're dealing with a purity of

technology, the weapon in your hands has such velocity, that it isn't the airy—fairy days where you couldn't cut below the reality of the PC and louse him up. There were years past where the technology as it went along did not plow under and overthrow the reality level of the PC. Well you're not dealing with it now. You're dealing with the pure dynamite.

Now an explosives expert has often been known to carry nitro glycerin in a flask in his hip pocket. All he had to do was back up suddenly into something and he would have fragmented all over the landscape. I've seen dynamite men sit on boxes of fuses, smoking. And yet here's this guy who is the nitro glycerin soup expert, the soup expert, and somebody else even looks like he's going to touch a bottle of soup and he practically throttles him. You walk in toward the dynamite powder house with a cigarette in your hands, and the guy who is smoking his pipe on the box gets up and kicks you the hell out of the yard. In other words, he knows enough about it, so he can ride it close to the edge. And he's also smart enough to know you'd better not let anybody else. Do you see? You're dealing, actually, with terrifically powerful technology. Used right, it just shoots a guy to the moon. Goofed up, pooey. And goofed up cases are too many.

Now it takes a supervisor who knows his business. You can run engrams on somebody, you can do this with somebody, you can do that with somebody, you can run various processes, you can run... If you can get an idea of a, of a highway running through the middle of a lot of blackness and a lot of little pathways, and all that sort of thing, you can run any of those little pathways. You can run any of those open fields. You can do anything out there that you want to. You can goof around, and flubble—dubble, and bobble—fobble, and, and so forth. PC isn't getting anyplace, you can't do him any damage to amount to anything. But you get on the main highway. It is such a straight highway. The actions in opening the gates are so positive, that when you goof that up the PC will goof up. Do you follow?

Now if there's a big question in your mind as to whether or not Scientology works you shouldn't be studying Class VIII. Because, one is expected to be a sufficiently expert auditor to produce some result, such as a touch assist. He should be able to do that, and achieve some result. But if one has got big questions about this and that, please recognize them for what they are. They're just confusion blowing off. There is just about as much question in running a rehab, or the mechanisms of rehab, there isn't any questions concerning it. There are no questions with regard to listing. There aren't any. You list. And you list it as long as it contains an item on it, and two on the list you extend the list and give the PC the item, and what the hell. I mean, this is something like saying a box of matches on the table is either full of matches or it's not full of matches. If it is not full of matches and the matches are dumped along side of it, and if the object is to restore it, you pick up the matches, put them in the box, and put the box together again. And you have a box of matches. I mean, it's open and shut data like that, I mean it isn't any wibble—wobble—wooble, it, it's just truth. See? So you start watching for these simplicities. But what does it take to be totally simple? It takes a total knowledge of the lot. Save such familiarity that you never even have to think to do it. Now how often would you have to field strip a rifle so that you could pick it up, put the cartridge into it and fire it, without even thinking? Well, there's a rifle... Clank, boom. Poom! How often would you have had to have field stripped that rifle? Probably dozens of

times.

Back in the days when medicine was medicine, and not Parke and Davis and other drug companies pushing their stock up, a medical doctor used to have to identify all of the bones of the human skeleton, blindfolded, by touch alone. Interesting exercise. Well what would be the point of such an exercise? Well, it's kind of pointless, you very seldom operate in the dark. But it sure as the devil gives you familiarity. You know what bone is where when you've done something like that.

Now, there're various actions and exercises which you can do, and you can action them and exercise them. But if you have any comm lag, if there is any comm lag between your think and the datum you're trying to get, you don't know standard tech well enough to do it. If there's any comm lag in you instantly thinking of the law of listing that you need to apply at that instant, if you had to think of it as a law of listing, as something that came off of a bulletin, you haven't got it yet. You understand? You have to... It's a—total. It's a total. You own it, you do it, and so forth. You look at the list, and it isn't, "I wonder where all of it...?" You look at this list, you say, "That list isn't correct." You just look at it, as I would with any of these, oh, I could do this at random. List just incorrect. Yes. Good. Yes. Yes. Didn't find any correct list. Well anyhow.

Imagine a case supervisor now who would have to have his whole bulletin file along side of him to have reference to go over and find any of the errors which had been made in the session, in order to order them corrected, in case... The trouble I have in case supervision is trying to read the auditors' writing. It's that degree of simplicity. I know my data. But you say, "Well of course you know the data. You wrote the data. Naturally you know the data. You developed the data." Well listen, god damn it, I've developed more data than you ever heard of. You know? I've just developed data by the wow! The total notes of Dianetics and Scientology, the total tapes of Dianetics and Scientology, are an ocean of data. Tremendous, fantastic scope. How is it that I know these central data so well? When I started doing CCHs, when I started doing model session, I set myself up just like you. And I drilled it 'till I knew it cold. I could write down the laws of listing again after a lapse of several years, even though the bulletin that recorded them originally had been removed from the lines, and I wrote them from memory, and I think it took me something on the order of about fifteen, twenty minutes. The slowdown was Alex Sabrisky's ability to keep up with my writing.

Now I know more phenomena than you can count, which are contrary to those laws of listing, which seem to be this, which off woff phenomena than that or is it the other way?, and so forth. How is it that I would know those laws of listing? Well, I had to keep check on things that didn't have variables. I eventually isolated those things and they're the things with no variables. So I had to write all those things down. I had to know those. I had to read them back. I had to remember these things. I had to know 'em. You think you're studying this subject, why hell. I've studied ninety five times the subject you ever studied. Alright, then how is it that out of this whole body of stuff I can pick so neatly this and that, and so as to do a case supervision about as fast as I can read it? It is knowing my data. Knowing which datum is the datum which applies at this particular point, and what datum has been violated and otherwise. And you've got the same data I've got in your study packs. Simple as that.

I don't do these folders from crystal balls, boy. I do these just, these folders against the most concise series of data you ever heard of. Srrrrrp—boom! We cracked a case today down the middle. Down the middle, cross—wise and diagonally. It was just about, he'd given us a bad time. We keep cracking 'em. Knowing the data. Knowing the exact, basic rules and laws.

Now there's something funny about all this. I know a lot of other subjects in which such data occurs. I can give you the datum of Freudian analysis. I'm a very good swami. I can read minds so as to tear your skull off. Good at it. Don't ever do these things. Still know the data in connection with it.

Why? Then out of this tremendous body of information are we stressing just these data? I've got us the widest possible selection. It's the evaluation of importance, knowing which point is valuable and what is trash. It is knowing where the main line lies and where it doesn't. I wouldn't give you spit for any datum in Freudian analysis. I wouldn't give you dog spit for it. In fact Freud and Broyer probably should have been stood up against the nearest brick wall and shot unpleasantly, with dull bullets.

You've always heard me be polite on that subject. I'm taking down my hair. I'm talking to a Class VIII student. What a lot of crap. You know who they really were? They were some guys who had found out how you could take the work of Charcot and Mesmer and persuade people to do things against their will under pain—drug hypnotism. And there isn't an analyst on the planet who ever does anything else in the... It's a method of shaking people down and bending their will. Brayer and Freud, in 1891, were agents Raiser Wilhelm Hogensooven. And they were dedicated to making politically—minded changes for him. A bunch of crap. A complete swindle. Just a hypnotist. So he invents the libido—dibido theory, and he goes poogly—poods and ids, and Greek mythology, and bah! There're certain principles involved in any savage and primitive think that you can use. Certain principles involved. There's certain magical principles. There's opening up somebody's memory, making him, forcing him or persuading him to remember something painful, and so forth. These are known to every medicine man, every swami there is. How is it they knew it and never used it, huh?

Right now, right now the beautiful technology, heh, of these characters is turned against Scientology, because the politicians you hear crying out against them have wives who have been violated by psychoanalysis. They are under the influence. There are thousands of zones where data could lie. There're billions of zones where, that you could consider truth. There's a whole universe out here full of crap and bucks And I show you one little, narrow line that goes straight through it, like a shock, and a few gates, which if you open them exactly correctly, somebody goes out like he is on a rocket ride. So if you ever mention to me again a question about something over in left field I'll have you spanked. This is a lousiest thing—what the hell is anybody doing wandering around over here in left field? Here's the main road. Let's get on it, let's find out what the principles on it are. I didn't mean to curse you that mildly. Here's the main highway. Now knock off the mucking about and get on it.

There aren't any questions about it, it just is. And it's a certain series of actions that you do. And they wind up at the other end in a total result. So do it. Boom! That's all there is to it, and as far as case supervision, your main trouble will be trying to convince the auditors auditing for you that

they'd better damn well do what you say on a case supervision folder, and not some other crappy thing. And then you will have to convince them because of your ferocity on this whole subject, you will have to convince them that they'd better damn well speak the truth by making a false report far worse than just a goof.

These problems are ahead of you. The first thing you must learn is that there is a road. You can learn it subjectively easy enough, or I could turn lose division five on you, left, right and center. Clean up all the flubs and bubs and so forth, and send you flying with the greatest of ease. If anything wrong with your case or bogged down, you'd wonder where the hell you; what, what you ever thought was gain before this? Well I'm not going to do that. I'm going to let you get win on each other in the org student course. We could make, make your cases zongobingo so fast it'd make your head swim. But then, we've got all the wins we want. You can have it too. And you can also be the effect end of the goofs.

So anyway, that is everything I have to say to you this evening. And I hope something I have said will assist you on your road to truth. Thank you.

THE STANDARD GREEN FORM AND RUDIMENTS

A lecture given on 28 September 1968

And this is what date? The twenty eighth of September 1968. Lecture number what? (Five) Glad you can still count. Thank you very much. Lecture number five of the standard tech Class VIII auditors' course.

The situation with regard to standard tech at this time is we have had a few mice. And I imagine down through the years there will be a few other mice. A bulletin gets altered, a tape gets pulled off the line, some vital action is shifted. Somebody comes tearing in with a brand new idea that seems to be absolutely vitally essential, and the first thing you know, why we have trouble of one kind or another. And tech fails. And it suddenly ceases to give the results which it should attain.

At that time morale goes down. "No, Scientology doesn't work." These are the danger points of the past and of the future. It is not unbeknownst to me to get proposals such as this through the mail line. It's a proposed HCO Bulletin. There are forty or fifty of these things which have been written and issued. And it does seem that a person, before he is permitted to have a Grade, should go to the examiner to find out if it was an ARC broken needle or if it was actually a release on the Grade he was supposed to be released on, and not an F/ N on something else.

Now I'll tell you, what does this stem from? Why? Why? Why would such a proposal come up? Standard tech is already out. It's already out with enthusiasm. What's out? The TRs are; would have to be so bonkers that the auditor was not able to attract the attention of the PC for the next Grade or action, and the PC chortling merrily, merrily to himself would be getting an F/ N from a former action. You see what could happen here?

Alright, we've just released this fellow on zero, and he says, "Ooh, gosh, you know, boy that was really some cognition." You know, needle's swinging. "Uh, it's really going great." And the auditor sits there and says, "Aw yaya, uh number one, it went away and it went by and ububuzub." And the PC thinking to himself, "Boy, that's really great, that communication process. Really great." And the auditor says, "Uh, why, that's a release. Uwuuwuwuw." And the pc'saying, "Boy, that, really. I can communicate, you know? „And the auditor says, Kenya you know, nyee," canned command, no TRs, no command, no impingement on the PC, can't operate his E—meter anyhow, doesn't even notice the PC isn't looking at him. "Uh, well it's raring' too', and so forth, and the needle's going on a swing and the PCs saying, "Gee, well what do you know about that? I really can talk to people, you know? n

The only other condition this could occur on is if it was a busted E—meter. Now in the first place, if it's an ARC broke needle, you're getting the PC sitting here like this. "Duh." And the auditor says, says, "Catfish, gollawong." And the PC says, "Awawang. Yeah. Oogh. Nya, oog, Log." And the auditor says, "Well I'm glad that's a floating needle", and so forth. The PC never would answer on any of his questions.

It could also occur on one of these kooky stage four needles. It goes up and does a little hitch and goes down. You ever heard of a stage four needle? I saw somebody just go "Uh!" What's a stage four needle? A stage four needle is a stage beyond three, which is dead. (Laughs) You can get a meter, you can get a meter on a PC and he sits down in session and goes up and hitches and falls, and it's doing about a two inch sweep. And it goes up and it goes,

it hiccups at the top, and it goes down, and you say, "Have you ever been shot?" And it does the same thing, and "What's your name?" And it'll do the same thing. And you kick him in the shins and it'll do the same thing. And there's absolutely no meter change of any kind whatsoever. It isn't hardly connected to anybody. Which is really the truth. It isn't connected to anybody. And it goes on and it does this weird dance. Well if a person doesn't know what one of those needles is as far as an ARC broke needle is, you can get a swinging needle. It isn't connected to anybody either. And the questions which you ask don't change it. In ordinary auditing an F/ N broadens,—narrows, responds just to that degree. You start overrunning it you'll see your F/ N is going narrower and narrower and narrower and narrower and it packs up.

PC, you get an F/ N and then the PC has the cognition, he actually states the cognition on which he gets an F/ N, and you see the F/ N widen up. In other words, an auditor'd have to be a complete dolt to need such an arbitrary on his lines.

Now this is based on the fact that somebody has trained some auditor in an academy on the TRs, something on this basis. "What is TR0?" "It's the TR in the book you... and I think I heard about it." "Good, fine. You passed. Now, what's TR1?" "That's the number of the other TR." "Good. What are the rest of the TRs?" "Oh, I know all them." And that would all... he could possibly know about TRs to require such a regulation.

One of the conditions of auditing is that you have the PC in session. He has to be aware of the auditor, and in communication, and answer up, and so forth. Well, if he wasn't doing any of these things, naturally you would have to send him to the examiner to find out if it was a real F/ N. But the situation would be so peculiar. But to stop everybody, everywhere from ever progressing in a session just because some supervisor hasn't been able to teach an auditor to audit, and just because there's been one PC last May who went all the way through the lines with a stage four needle and nobody ever noticed that he didn't know he had ever been audited, and didn't know he'd ever been in session, just to introduce that sort of an arbitrary would, of course, be completely nuts. Inspection before the fact is the standard line. If you're not having trouble on some line don't do anything about it. If you are having trouble on some line, do something about it. And it follows in auditing too. You're having trouble with the PC, well, you do something about it.

Now when I berate and start tearing you apart for wanting a nickel in the slot—type approach to auditing it is because you are asking for something which will make you a rotten auditor. If you don't know what you're doing, and if you don't know what the standard action would be for that, you ought to go back and study your TRs and a few other things.

It wouldn't be an occasion then to put a regulation in after the fact of not having trained somebody. Do you see? Now there are rote commands which are the standard processes. But you receive an order, something like, "Rehab former lifetime releases" Now what the hell do you want? What now; how could anybody under god's green Earth write down all the words that would have to fit in the ensuing action. They couldn't. It couldn't be done because it wouldn't fit all the cases. Because there are many different types of former lifetime releases or this lifetime releases, and, you see, what you're doing is rehabbing former releases. So you say "Rehab former releases." Well how would you go about finding these things? Auditor—that is your problem. And

if you can't solve that with the PC sitting in front of you, you ought to quit. Do you see what you're doing? You have to know what you're doing And then do it with great economy. And then if the session is running like an express train, what're you going to do? Inspect after the fact every couple seconds?

Now, I'll give you an idea, you know? "Do you have an ARC break? That reads." "Uh, oh, yeah. Uh, yeah, I was feeling pretty bad yesterday. I got a letter; very bad." "OK. Was it a break in A, R, C, U? U? That reads." "Yeah. I couldn't understand any part of it." "Good. C, D, E, I," using the words to somebody who isn't educated. "Curious." "Curious about what it was" "Curious about the understanding of it?" "Yeah, that's right. Hey yeah, that's, you know what? I thought it was the stuff in the letter, it wasn't in the letter. I never could dig it. I, I didn't dig it. Wow!" Skin tone looks good, good indicators, everything is fine, and the needle goes whum—whum. F/ N.

Now you're going to say, "Do you have an ARC break? Did that floating needle float on the ARC break cognition which you had?" Mm—mm. You're not going to say anything about it at all. You're going to say, "You're needle's floated. That's it. Thank you." Now. Your F/ N is now in on the rudiments, which are simply setting the PC up, then you simply swing into the session. Now because there're this many variables you would now have to say, "It didn't clean. See? So do you have an earlier ARC break of a similar nature?" Or, "Do you have an earlier, similar ARC break?" "Did you have one like that before?" Man, we're talking about communication. We're not talking about words. You have to know what you're after. You're after the ARC break similar to this which occurred before.

Now, it doesn't matter what language you say it in as long as it communicates to the PC, and you know what you want. Otherwise you're liable to get something kooky. You want similar, earlier ARC break. You got it? Now supposing you're auditing some guy. Supposing you're busy auditing some guy. And he doesn't know what the word ARC break is. Or, suppose he's got a complete mis—definition of the thing. He thinks an ARC break is an overt, or something he busted when he was a kid. You're going to have to know what you are asking for, so that you can communicate it as an auditor. As an auditor you are trying to communicate a thought or sense. Now why should anybody try to escape his responsibility on the whole subject to the degree of wanting a canned word by which to ask a perfectly ordinary routine question? If you know your business you don't have to have those.

Now on the Grade processes, yes, you had better know those words exact, exact, exact, because they're very carefully worked out. But again you can't administer a Grade process if you don't know what you're asking for.

It's your job as an auditor to, to, to deliver it to the PC. To receive the answer and know what the hell to do with it. And there isn't anybody under god's green Earth can give you a whole bunch of canned balderdash that does your job for you. Now I'll point something out to you. I have already done quite enough without also writing all the words you use. Now that is not a wide open invitation that every time you get yourself into a corner you suddenly shift processes. Now recognize the difference between a process and a question. There's a fantastic width between a process and a question.

I'm going to give you a kooky one I read in a folder. You can have an infinity of wrongnesses, but some of them are funnier than others. You say that this auditor said to the preclear, "Do you have a present time problem?" And the

preclear said, "Oh, yes." "Good. What postulate created that problem? Good. Now what counter postulate met that problem? Good. Now what postulate created that problem? „And the funny part of it is, that the TA sort of, went up, and the session all went to pieces, because I think the problem was that his chair was tippy, and it didn't have anything whatsoever to do with any problem. It had to do with the auditor didn't clear the environment in the first place. See, he's actually asking the; he had some canned idea. He got this from someplace, I don't know where, that you clear up problems by what postulate did you make, what counter postulate did you make. Now he of course is taking the definition of problem is a postulate, counter postulate. He tried to audit this by definition. But note that is was also in the wrong part of the session. He didn't notice that the PC was sitting there almost falling out of his chair, because one leg was busted. Now this is one hell of an awful, lousy level of awareness, if you want to even dignify it by calling it a level of awareness.

So the auditor's supposed to be there, he's supposed to be on the ball, and he's supposed to do what he's supposed to do in order to come down on a certain, exact line and keep the PC herded on to that line. So we know that it would be the most fatal to audit over an ARC break. You audit over an ARC break, it's an absolute law, it's nobody's opinion I assure you, you audit a PC over an ARC break he'll go eventually into the sad effect. Yet, at Saint Hill one time I saw a PC who had been walking around for three months with an ARC break that people had audited in every session over the top of. She was in grief, she was in a complete sad effect, she was an absolute text book case of sad effect. And there wasn't one single person there ever asked her if she had an ARC break of long duration. Until I noticed this character walking around, and I got an auditor by the scruff of the neck, and I said, "Pull the ARC break of long duration, would you please?" And he did so, and the case cheered up and everything was great.

You see, there're certain things that are meaningful. Like, an ARC break, audited over the top of, puts the PC into a sad effect. And there aren't any exceptions. And it is a rule. And it is a law. And any time the law is disobeyed, you cut your throat as an auditor, and the PCs throat. So you always pick up your ARC break as the first thing in the session. 'Cause it's completely fatal to audit somebody over the top of.

Now, the person who has the ARC break who says he doesn't have an ARC break has had somebody tell him he did have an ARC break when he didn't. He protested, and since that time ARC broke has read. And, an educated auditor asks him immediately for, "Did anybody ever tell you you had an ARC break when you didn't?" Cleans up the false read.

Or, this reverse thing can happen, more rarely. More rarely, but it can happen. He said, "Do you have an M C break?" Doesn't read, the auditor says, "That's clean." And the PC says, "The hell it is." So the auditor says, "On ARC breaks, has anything been suppressed?" And you get the suppress off. Now you say, "Do you have an ARC break?" And the PC says, "Yeah, that was my ARC break. People never taking up my ARC breaks." So, it now doesn't read, but the PC is cheerful about it. So it can be positive or negative. But your educated auditor, your educated auditor takes this up. This is something he takes up. He doesn't sit there like a damn bump on the log waiting for the next piece of telex tape to pass through his skull. Auditing is something that is understood. You only get into fire fights over PCs if you

don't know what you're doing. So we don't ever audit over an ARC break. And we never leave a false read on. And we never leave a false no—read on. We handle it.

Now, the next thing we take up is a present time problem. And a present time problem means present time problem, the problem the PC has now, a problem which he does have. You never get into any trouble about this or a definition. It comes up or it doesn't come up. And the reason we take up a present time problem is very elementary indeed, as you will not ever change a case that is audited over the top of a present time problem. You won't do him any harm, but you're never going to get any change. He doesn't change. And that is proved by graph after graph after graph after graph after graph, dozens, dozens, dozens, dozens, dozens, hundred of PCs. I finally traced it back and isolated exactly what it was that gave an unchanging graph. The presence of a present time problem. Work was done in '55, '56, Washington. No change.

So you going to audit this guy over a present time problem? Well then you're going to audit him to no change. Where you going to get an F/ N? You're not. Where're you going to get the TA doing anything? You're not. What you trying to do? Cut your throat?

Alright. Similarly, you asked him if he has a present time problem, and he says; you say that reads. And he says, "Oh, no, not again! God damn. Every time I get into session and I try to get auditing done, why that reads, and so on. I suppose I have got a present time problem." And you say, "Alright. Has anybody ever said that you had a present time problem when you didn't have one?" "Oh my god, yes! Bda—bda—da—da—bab—bda—bda—da—dabab. Bdee—dee, bdee—dee, bda—da, and so on and so on and so on, and I never can get into the body of the session because they all say there's a present time problem with the Ruds, and so forth, and all dba—ba—ba—pow—pow. Pow—pow—pow—pow—pow. Pow. F/ N. You say, "The needle floated. We're going to take up whatever we're going to take up."

Now the reverse can be true, more rarely, that you say, "Do you have a present time problem? That doesn't read." Funny, you see him look a little puzzled. Just but very often won't say, puzzled, it didn't read. Look a little bit baffled. And you could say, "Well, should it have read?" "Oh, yeah, gee, you know? I just have been served with a writ for federal income tax from the Eskimos", and so on. "And boy, it's a problem, because I don't know any Eskimos." Anyway, you say, "Alright. On the present time problem has anything been suppressed?" "Yeah, yeah I have to suppress it. If I don't suppress it I'll never get anything done." It doesn't clean up. "Is there an earlier time you suppressed a problem? Anything you care to say at this particular time? Do you want to tell me more about the Eskimos, or any damn thing you care to say?" It's itsa or earlier. Green form rule is invariable. It is itsa or earlier, or a listing process.

That's all you ever do on a green form. Itsa, earlier, or a listing process. And there're certain things on the green form which you list. Says environment. Alright. If there's something wrong with the environment do a remedy B. If he's connected to a suppressive person or a suppressive group, anything in that department that comes up on the green form, you do an S and D. Continuous present time overts comes up, you do the prevent process. You say, "What about all black? Doesn't that require some special process?" No, not necessarily. I don't care if the PC goes on being all black. If he wants to

be all black that's alright with me. Do you follow?

But the PC is; you didn't follow. The PC is worrying about his Grades. He's worrying about his field. He's worried about this or he's worried about that. So it'll clean up on itsa and earlier. "Yeah, yeah, everything I see is black. I don't ever see anything. I close my eyes and it's all black." And so on. "Did you ever notice this earlier?" "Yes. Yeah." "Alright, when was that?" "Oh, I don't know. Spokane." "What was going on then?" "Oh that's right. We ran this engram and everything went black. Huh. What do you know?" Needle goes voomp. F/ N.

What the hell are you doing something complicated for? It's itsa or earlier. That is the law of the green form. On certain points of the green form you do a list. So. Itsa or earlier. If it doesn't clean on itsa, it cleans on earlier.

Now I can see you putting together a beautiful, rote process. Knock it off! What you have to know is, itsa or earlier.

Now, how do you ask for itsa? Knock it off. "Do you have a present time problem?" "Oh yeah, my god. I'm about to lose my job and oh, wow, and so on, and then how will I meet my alimony payments because, oh, my god, you know, woo. Wow.~ "OR. Do you have a present time problem?" Read. "Is there an earlier, similar problem?" Didn't clean on itsa. So you gotta go earlier. And you can run it back, back, back, back, and all of a sudden you've got it. You got it back to basic. Then you have to know your mechanics, don't you? You have to know the composition of the mind. You have to know that you have to reach the basic point where the chain started in order to get total freedom on the total chain. You have to know that. You don't just know itsa or earlier, you have to know why. How come you run it earlier? Well, if it doesn't free late on the chain you; there's an earlier on the chain to make it free. If it does free late on the chain it hasn't got any basic under it. Or, it's a simply tripped off and released at that particular point. You've made him think the right thought that moved him off the mass.

Simple. Too simple. It is so simple that it is the most easily misunderstood thing anybody can think of. In the first place you're trying to teach somebody something about something they very well may have. A reactive bank. Now, when you say present time problem there are so many people that say, "Oh yes, I've got a present time problem," and they miss the rest of the sentence. And you're trying to teach them this, you restimulate 'em. A problem.

I brought up one here in yesterdays' lecture, and I said the incredible can hang up a track, and two students only learned this about it. That it applied to them. And I didn't tell them because it applied to them. And I couldn't care less that it applied to them. Do you understand? I taught them that because it applies to other cases. And I am talking to an auditor, not a case.

There is a rule about this. A very broad rule about this, that in later years has been violated. Auditors and students do not have cases. When we first found out they had cases and thought they had cases was about thirteen years ago. And it became illegal, while being a student and while being an auditor it is very, violently illegal to have a case. You don't have one at that time. That's it. Do you understand? Those are the facts of life. We had a gag here happen the other day. Somebody says, "You're late. Why did you arrive?" And the person said, "I need a review because I've got an ARC break." How can anybody get up to Class VI and not know that a student doesn't have a case? Students don't have cases.

So, when I'm trying to communicate to you I'm not talking about your bank. To hell with your bank. I am not talking out of my bank as philosophers and experts in this line have only done for the last four or five quadrillion years. So you can pay me the compliment of not listening through yours. It's very remarkable to have principles which came up way the hell and gone back on the track of Dianetics and Scientology, principles of the early years. They still hold good. They hold so good that they function at OT8. Fantastic The stuff which is being taught to the lowest grade auditor is valid all the way through to OT8. Fantastic! So when you're learning a simplicity of this character you are learning a simplicity of this character. Nobody's trying to solve your case. Nobody's even trying to give you a cognition. I'm just telling you what the hot dope is.

Those three things, those three things that are absolutely, completely impossible to audit over the top of, include the withhold. So you've got ARC break, PTP and withhold. You will never get away with it. And neither will the PC. Nothing.

How many ways can you pull a withhold? You can pull them the easy way, you can pull them the hard way. I have pulled withholds by moving my chair over in front of the door and said, "It's perfectly OR. I can sit here the rest of the night. I am going to hear it." But that was after I checked it over to make sure that it was a real withhold. That it wasn't a false read. That the symptoms and manifestations of the withhold were very, very present. And the PC wasn't going to tell me his withhold. Well I knew damn well there was no reason to proceed beyond that point. I would just be wasting my time, so I would just simply say, "Well, I can sit here the rest of the night until you tell me. There's another system which is highly workable. Alright. Good. We will sort this out on the meter. You're not going to give me the withhold, we'll sort this out on the meter. Have you murdered somebody? Good. Where did you bury the body? Rave you robbed a bank? Do you strangle children? Are you a rapist by prof..." "Oh no, god, nothing like that." "Alright, what is it like?" "Oh, well, I just so and so and so and so. Huh. "I'm short twenty five dollars today in my cashiers' till and can't find it. And I didn't want to tell anybody." In other words, you exaggerate the withhold. But that's after you've made sure that it is a withhold. There's no false read in connection of it. Connection with it. It is a withhold. It does read.

Now there is a slight danger about rock slams which turn on on withholds, occasionally, is you can get them off with invalidate while they're still hot. Now you can turn off a rock slam by putting in the button invalidate on it. It doesn't mean the person's innocent, you've just cooled off the rock slam. Now the person may be innocent, but when you put in invalidate then you also have to put in suppress. You can't just put in invalidate and have it cool off, without then also putting in suppress to find out was it just smush out.

A rock slam is basically an invalidation. Therefore, if you invalidate somebody hard enough on some subject he can turn on a rock slam. An invalidative question, asked with sufficient ferocity can itself turn on a rock slam. It can be done. But that isn't all the rock slams there are.

We had a criminal, I use the word advisedly because it wasn't a very big criminal, but nevertheless a criminal, just the other day, that had a rock slam. We cooled it off with invalidate. And then it didn't read. And she was supposed to have stolen a hundred dracma. It didn't read. It exonerated her. She even had two hundred dracma on her. And then, a few weeks later,

a thousand drama disappeared, and she had it. Too many coincidences. The rock slam, actually, was perfectly accurate. The person was a thief. But it did cool off with invalidate. So remember, if you cool a rock slam off with invalidate, you've also got to put suppress and not is and a few other things in, and make sure that you don't turn it back on again. Your job as an auditor is not to turn off rock slams or turn them on, it is to discover the truth. There's any gods' quantity of ways you can approach the whole subject of withhold. There have been many bulletins concerning it. An auditor, if he understands what a withhold is all about, is all about, he can handle withholds. Now a missed withhold is what is in the rudiments. So you have to not only detect that it exists, but you have to find where and when it was missed. And I see folder after folder where it says, "Do you have a missed withhold?", the auditor says. "Yeah, yep. I stole a pin from HASI." "Good. That cleans the question. We will now go to the body of the session." PC doesn't think anything, natters, ble—blop—bloop—jep. Doesn't even repeat the question, doesn't ask who nearly found out, nothing. Just missing. Do you follow?

So, this is, is kooky, kooky—Ruds. See? Now you wonder why you haven't, if you haven't flown the needle by the time you've got to missed withhold, and you wonder why it doesn't fly on missed withhold, it's just that the where and when, by whom it was missed has been omitted. You have to know the theory of a rudiment. It is not enough to know a rote.

Now we go down into other matters but frankly, from there on you're on safe ground. You're on safe ground. Nobody's gonna do anything very weird. Now the only violations of this is taking up the obvious ARC break. The guy was given a wrong item. He's ARC broken about it in the last session. PC is ARC broken after the session, the session consisted of listing for an item. He obviously has a wrong item. The longer you spend asking if he has an ARC break, the more of a fool you are. Obviously he's got an ARC break, because that is what, a wrong item causes an ARC break. You look in the folder, there are eighteen items reading on the list, and he's given an item that he didn't list, and the auditor gave him the item. Do you know that was the first trouble on lists? We always have trouble on lists. First trouble on lists was the auditor suggesting items to the PC. We've come further than that now. We've only come as far as it doesn't matter whether he's given a wrong item or not.

But this is important. The lads got an obvious ARC break, because you're repairing the last session which had a wrong item. You're repairing 5A and you find the third BD item was the one he was given. If you get a hold of this guy, wrrrr. Now you're going to put in Ruds to correct the item. Aw, don't be an ass. See, if you know your business, and you know you know your business, you know that a wrong item off a list is going to have produced an ARC broken PC. And if you ask for the ARC break he is seldom sufficiently technically oriented to know that that is the source of the ARC break. So of course you can't pull it. So you can box around for an hour and a half, auditing across the known ARC break, just busting him to pieces. So of course you handle the known ARC break. If it wasn't an ARC break, alright. So the PC comes into session, "Alright. In the last session we see we had a list here, it runs 118 pages. Oh, yeah, yes. We have this list, and how'd you feel about that?" "Oh god almighty, oohh." "Well, I wish to indicate to you the list was over listed. Alright. We're going to check this list now. Was it the

first item?" Bong! "Alright, that's good. That was the first item on the list. Your item is free fall. Thank you very much." OK. Good indicators come in. You now say, Rudiments." Do you follows

I saw a session, there is a session in the case folders there that is in a complete howl. The PC was sent in by C/ S to have a wrong item corrected, and the auditor asked for an ARC break. And it goes on for column after column, because the PC is insufficiently educated to know he's ARC broken because he's got a wrong item. It goes on and on. Well, they pull more ARC breaks without getting anywhere, because pulling ARC breaks over the existence of the ARC break can also be painful. It goes on for pages. Wound the PC right up in the rag bag.

So the rudiments, Now that doesn't in any way violate the rudiments. The guy walks into session saying, "Oh my god, what am I going to do? Oh my god, what am I going to do?" He sits down in the chair, "Oh my god, what am I going to do?" Picks up the cans, "My god, what am I going to do?" You would be a very, very foolish auditor if you didn't say, "Do you have a present time problem". Elementary. You don't Q and A on other things then the rudiments, however. PC comes into session and says, "Well, I suppose you think you're going to do something with me. Heheheh. Myanyayaya. You think you're an auditor do you?", and so forth. My response to that is, "There you go, there are the cans. Do you have a missed withhold?" Pongl Booml "Something wrong?" "Oh, no, I'm sweetness and light. As a matter of fact I did have a little withhold. I stole a pin once from HASI." "Good. Thank you very much. Do you have a withhold?" "Yeah, I ate your lunch." You know, something like that. Well, it'll be obvious. And having handled that one, naturally then you go back through your actions.

Now this is an auditor who knows his business. There is a folder that runs like this. "Do you have an ARC break?" "Yeah, they're doing us all in. Everybody's caving us in lately. We're sure getting shot down in flames," and so on. "I'm really ARC broken about it. Boy, what they're doing to us." And the auditor, like a god damned fool sat there for the next I don't know how long, continuing to ask for ARC breaks, and finally finished up the session asking for ARC breaks because he couldn't clean ARC breaks. Well it was very remarkable. He couldn't clean up ARC breaks because the PC didn't have one. The PC had a missed withhold, and was calling it an ARC break. And he'll notice in the old bulletins and so forth, says very often it occurs that when you have an ARC break it is really a missed withhold. The one thing I had a hard time teaching Class VI students way back when, was that they don't accept everything the PC says in violation of tech.

He says, "Oh, they're doing me in, and all that last auditor, he cut my throat from ear to ear. And that is all bad. Yes, I have a terrible ARC break, because everything... they're doing me in, you see. And they're really pretty nasty to me. And that's off pmfodf fddouf, gobbldy, gobbldy, gobbldy, gob." Critical, missed withhold. Pcs, inevitably because it's more socially acceptable, will call a missed withhold an ARC break.

So, if the ARC break doesn't clean he's got a missed withhold. Very simple. But it isn't something you wreck the PC with. All of this is... We're traveling now in auditing, and a couple of thousand miles an hour at least. We're not traveling with that old fan job, Piper Cub fan job, anymore. Don't you see? If you know your business, it's, "Nya, nya, nya." "Now good. Do you have a missed withhold?" Zoom. "Thank you very much. Now, do you have, that's

clean, do you have a missed withhold? That's clean. Good. Do you have an ARC break? No, that's good. PTP? That's fine. Alright." Didn't F/ N? Green form.

Now you've just asked these four questions, so are you a live being or a fool? Are you now going to ask those same questions again on the green form? All you're going to ask about is environment, you having trouble in your environment. And then you're going to bring it down to overts and motivators. Because you just got through covering them. Do you understand?

And you get down the line and you suddenly find out that this PC has had an overrun. And you straighten up the overrun. And the needle flies. Good. Now you can get on with what you were supposed to do in the first place. That's the way it goes. With speed. It isn't any fumble—bumble stumble—bumble. "I wonder whatts wrong with this PC?" If you ever think that thought as a case supervisor you're an ass. I can tell you what's wrong with a PC—he's humanoid. That question's answered, don't ever worry about it again.

On diagnosis, if you want to use such a word, the PC is as he is because he hasn't made the next Grade. Now let's set him up and correct any earlier errors, so that he can make his next Grade. We don't go into a figure—figure because he's got a pain in his side.

PC comes in, he says, "I have this awful pain in my side, oh terrible pain," so on. He's just a walking invitation, boy, for you to go kooky. He's issuing an engraved invitations to the examiner, and everybody else connected with it. The two things that can be wrong with him are, they auditing he's had needs correcting, or he should be on the next Grade. And that sure requires a hell of a lot of you as a case supervisor, doesn't it? Honest. Papa'll spank you if he ever catches you pulling this line. "Well he's got this awful pain in his side. I wonder what it is." I can tell you what it is. It's either the living he's had or the auditing he's had isn't sitting well on his reactive brisket. Which can be corrected... He should be doing the next grade. It's always the next grade. That's all the think you do. You can know more doggone things about PCs.

You can run a complete intelligence service on PCs, you know? They are this and that, and a woffa—woffa—woffle. Well it does you some good. Don't think that it doesn't. It does you some good. Because it tells you what you just solved. You don't have to know what you're trying to solve before you solve it.

This fellow was a hop head, bank robber. Spent the first five years of his life in a cast. His uh,... Do you see? Was a premedical school student and was expelled, uh so forth and etcetera, and etcetera. And for twenty two years studied yogi. See? And you've got this list, see. And you say, "Wow." See? And by the time you get him up to Grade IV he's flying, and you say, "Boy, look what I did." That's actually most of the use of it.

You can get this kind of a situation, where you know that the PC is Lithuanian and doesn't speak English, and has been audited by a Dane who didn't speak Lithuanian. Your problem as an auditor is to find, is to find a Lithuanian auditor. Your problem as C/ S is to find a Lithuanian auditor.

I've had that here the other day, had that here the other day. Managed it too. We were embarrassed one time, along side of a dock somebody'd been handing out hand outs, talking about Scientology. And some guy showed up and he wanted to be audited on his Grade processes. And he only spoke one

language. Actually, I think we did get him some auditing on his Grade processes. He just showed up out of the blue demanding his auditing. Couldn't speak English, nothing.

Recently, recently you talk about standard tech and the quality of auditors, and so on. We had an auditor who was absolutely the world's most experienced killer. This auditor was a Class VI, but had never audited anybody with any great degree of success, and had in the main neglected one certain an especial PC. And this PC had been especially, he wasn't a PC even. He had never been audited. He was the one who had given over all the money for all of her training, her Grades, everything. But she had never paid it back with a single Grade. So she was asking some favor of me, and I said, "Yes." And at that moment she was balled and chained on the whole subject, some of you are liable to take that literally, it was actually only forbidden to leave. And I said, 'You, for the first time are going to really learn what a Grade process is. And you're going to run every single one of those processes, and you're going to run them perfectly, and you're going to produce results. Because as of this minute you have no certs and awards of any kind whatsoever, and you get 'em back just as fast as you put that PC together. Each Grade he makes you get your cert back on that Grade.'" Took him all the way through to Power, the guy was absolutely flying, you couldn't recognize him at all. It was almost over her dead body that she'd do this. She didn't like him, I think.

But all of a sudden he made it all the way. She made it all the way. All came out right in the end. She wasn't auditing on her own determinism. (Laughs) That's how exact and good standard tech can be. It was quite remarkable. It was a remarkable feat. It's much more than I tell you in just this little thing. It was a win of years' duration. Years' duration. It's great.

Now what did she have to do? She had to do exactly nothing but exactly what I told her to do, and if she so much as wiggled her little finger, god help her. And even though she was unwilling to audit him, even though she didn't even like the guy, even though so on and so on, it all came right on up the line.

Therefore, the processes which you're using can easily, easily, easily bypass mere objection. You see, you're not dealing with 'Let us assume the ibis position. You are not dealing with 'If you take a vitamin a day the dogs will go away. ' You're not dealing with a bunch of old wives' tales. You're dealing with something that is as hot as a ninety foot circumference buzz saw. You got to learn how to run this buzz saw, 'cause it'll go right straight up the line. You don't monkey with this buzz saw. You do exactly what the buzz saw says. And if somebody under your direction doesn't do what the buzz, what you say, and does something else, well you just turn the buzz saw in to hLm a little bit sideways. You make it go. You make it go right. And it will go.

You can make it go right in the most impossible situations you ever heard of, as long as you keep the guy right on the main highway. You've got channels and edges on that road. He can't go into the ditch. You mustn't let him go into the ditch. There is an infinity of ditch to go into. There is only one road.

So therefore, the approaches to a session are simply the approaches I've been giving you. There aren't other approaches to the session. You really can't audit covertly. Wawafafaawagaaw. I can give you an infinity of other circumstances. These are the things which you handle with a session. And you don't go anyplace with a session unless you've got those things

handled.

Now the Grade processes you go up the line through have just about as much choice in wording as though they were branded four feet deep on a concrete wall. There is no variation. Not the faintest variation. Clearing the command, the exact command, the exact administration of the process, the exact end phenomena. It is a drill of tremendous precision. And that is what you're leading up to when you get those rudiments in, and so forth. You're leading to this moment, where the next Grade is to be done.

And then you've got him all set up, and you do just exactly that. You tell him what it is, you clear the command, you get; make sure that he knows the command, and polly—volly. And he goes on through. He doesn't miss.

And you fumble—bumble, "I wonder where the, where is the trim knob? Where's the directions for the E—meter? It's HCOB, let's see, the Grade Chart. What are the commands for Level 1?" and so on. "This meter's terribly... new meter... just take me a... I've seen it on the..." He won't go up the highway. Any fumble—bumble at all, any slightest, any slightest wiggle—wobble and indecision and have to think to get the datum, and, and so forth, it... There is goes. You haven't got it. I mean they're... Not it, you haven't got the session. You haven't got the preclear. He didn't go anyplace. You got it?

It's like a marksman. Marksman, he's trying to find the trigger on the rifle. "Where is the trigger? Where's the trigger?" You think he's ever going to hit any bulls eyes? No.

So, here you have the variability of the rudiments. The variabilities involved in setting up a case. The variabilities by which you can run a green form, or run an L4A, or an L1. And in each of those you just get the thing done, somehow. And the rule is uniformly, it sets itself right by itsa or it goes earlier.

You can, on such a thing as L1, indicate the BPC. Reads. You can indicate the BPC. But you would be a very foolish person indeed to be indicating the BPC on something you didn't know what the PC had just read on, 'cause it might be a false read. You always have to find out what it is, which is itsa. Now you could indicate the BPC in the matter. Now that, that would take it out of the line.

You can indicate the BPC very complexly. There's an old bulletin there that tells you how to indicate BPC, oh my god. It's perfectly OK to do it that way. But that's that body of auditing. Now those are the body of auditing of repair. Now you also have to know what the process was to know what you are repairing. See? Now that is working with the PC to set it right. And that is usually a backwards look, and you don't do review actions to get case gains! Only one thing to the contrary, and that's OT4. It is now a review action. Because the whole rundown, it can get so damn many gains for the guy, that there have to be done at OT4 before he starts OT5 that it's just a review action now. Only it's really not a review action, it's sort of a tech action.

But you start sending people to review, it's because they can't get on the next process. "All my life I've had this heavy feeling in my stomach." Well you send the guy to review. Why? Is anything wrong with his auditing? No. There's nothing wrong with his auditing. What's wrong with him is his stomach. Well does that mean Scientology won't handle things like this? Yes, Scientology'll handle things like this. It'll handle on the next Grade or two. Sometimes it handles on the next Grade, and then, then drifts sort of back, and then two or three Grades later, or sections later, all of a sudden he runs

into it head on, and it does solve then. For god's sakes. See?

But you're not auditing the significances and peculiarities of individuals. These are infinite in number. You have the main road. Why are you running up and down these little side paths? Any of the Grades handle anything, so to hell with it. I mean, walking up the Grade line will eventually handle anything. But anything. You don't have to have a process that handles this, and a process that handles that. Don't get yourself associated with a little doctor that has a little pill case. There are pink pills, green pills, orange pills and blue pills. Now if the individual has a toothache you give him a green pill, and so forth, waffa, waffa, waffa. Well you're not in that business. You're not in that business.

Well there are undoubtedly processes which might do him this and that and the other thing, you could straighten this and that and the other thing out. But the truth of the matter is, on your main line of auditing, on your main line of auditing, it's always a Grade action that handles the PC.

Now there are certain actions that run through the entirety. One, secondary running, engram running, and ARC breaks, also missed withholds and also PTPs, run all the way from a hundred lifetimes ago to OT8. Those processes still remain valid. Still remain valid. Well the faults I find with Scientologists is they very often will see somebody fall on his head, get run over by a truck, and do some kind of a light touch assist and say "That's that." And then wonder why the guy is limping. And then they sort of say, "Scientology doesn't work." Man, I've got a word for you. That auditor is afraid of work. Do you see?

An engram could be run at any time, but then, this isn't a review action, it comes under the heading of an assist. It's engram running as an assist.

Now you say, "Well god. If engram running can be done as an assist what couldn't you do?" Oh, yes, that's right. You can always run an engram, you can always run a secondary. I don't care where the grade is, but I got news for you. Know how to run it. Know how to run engrams.

The funniest thing, engrams don't run if you don't know how to run engrams. I get so disgusted looking at somebody who allegedly knows how to run engrams. Or, know how to run secondaries. This is an actual one. And he says, "Recall a moment of loss. Recall of moment of loss." And I looked at the thing and I said, "What the hell were you doing, what were you doing in this session? What were you doing? What, what the hell was going on? What, what, what, what is this? What's this?" "It was running a secondary." Suffering Godfrey, if that's gotten into the line up. Holy Christ. Now you see, the truth of the matter is that you can take a thing like a secondary, which is in present time, near present time, the individual's got all of his restimulators for it, and you can key it out to F/ N (snap), just like that. And then the person walks around the corner and meets Joe, who is associated with it, and it keys back in, just like that. And then you can, as an auditor, give the guy a slight recall of it and it keys out to F/ N, (snap) just like that. And he can go around another corner and he runs into a restimulator of it and it thump, back in, just like that. And you can just keep this up. Eventually it'll wear out. But I call to your attention that it is about the slowest possible method I know of, of running a secondary.

Now I have had to pick up two cases. Two cases who in actual fact were severely, severely bogged on an assist level of secondary and engram running, that auditors had stood right in front of them, sat down in the

auditing chair, asked them what it was all about, and the individual is all boggled up. It comes under the heading of secondary can make somebody so depressed that they feel physically ill. They feel old. It's a peculiarity.— They feel energy—less and old, and used up and so on. And you're in to audit this, see, you're trying to audit this. And you're trying to audit this. Oh, nothing flies, there isn't any reason to run anything on the thing. Why? Well the guy... she just lost her husband. He isn't even cold in the ground. And some damn fool auditor will say, "Do you recall your moment of loss", and so forth. "Yes, I guess I do." "Oh good, that F/ N'd." "Oh yes, I feel much better. Yes, I feel much better." She'll feel that much better for the next ten or fifteen minutes. Don't you see?

What you have to know is the mechanism of release. And an auditor that does this sort of thing's a damn fool.

Now a good auditor would say, "Now wait a minute. This character's, was doing all right, really fell on her head," you understand I'm talking to you about an exception from grade auditing. These are the things that can go the whole line, see? But what's messed up? Life's gotta be corrected. See? Some; it's gone this way in life. See? There's been a life intervention of magnitude that has driven this person off. And you can get the idea that if the cannon ball came along and blew off your PC's head, he wouldn't be able to make the next grade. He wouldn't be there to hold the cans. Well, I'd say at that exaggerated level it's the same thing. When a person was an innocent bystander, and all of a sudden, why they had this big secondary occur. Bombo. Big loss of some kind or another. And I've had a good auditor, a good auditor, if he was on the ball and he knew his business and so forth, he wouldn't ask questions about this, or something like that, he, he would know this and the C/ S would be informed she just lost her husband. And the C/ S would say, "Alright. Get in your Ruds and run the secondary of death." Only please, that would be "run the secondary of death." Run it. Run its The first moment he enters the incident, wWhat is the duration of the incident?", and so forth, "When did you first hear in the news of the subject?" You know? Bong. "What is the duration of the incident? Alright. Move through the incident..." And so on. Just like it says in the handbook. And you go through it and through it and through it and through it and through it, and you spill a few gallons and quarts of tears, and misemotion comes up. There's such a thing as a fear secondary. "I was terrified." the guy was terrified. He's been in a state of shock, he's dead white ever since. He can run a terror secondary. Perfectly easy to do this. But life has knocked him sideways, you can put him back on the line.

Alright, he didn't get up high enough to get his grades fast enough in order to keep life from knocking him in the head. And to this degree you can give him an assist, and straighten him out.

Another person was given an S and D, and I don't know what all, to straighten out a severe illness. I got a hold of the PC, found the pc'd been ill, asked the PC what's she been doing, told me at once. Ran him to the first moment of the incident, ran him through it, zoom, zoom, zoom, zoom. That was the end of the illness. And one of the, one of the lazy part of this problem, however, is do you know it can take nine hours to run a secondary? It can take ten or twelve hours to run a real engram? You only run it to F/ N, of course. But running it, it doesn't just key out. It erases. You are now dealing with the category of clearing. You're erasing the engram. You're

erasing the secondary. That's different.

Alright, I'll give you the circumstances. This is an assist—type action. The individual was doing all right, they were gaining on up the line, and they stepped under a truck. Now you've got to get him back on the main line again. How do you do that? Well, you can give them a contact assist, taking him to that place. If it is necessary, to where the accident happened and make him touch that place, and so forth, with the part of the body that was hurt, touch the object that hurt them, and work on it on a contact assist, just directly, one right after the other. Always the best type of assist is that contact assist, and the somatic runs out. You wait for the somatic to run out, and so on. It runs out when it runs out, and bang, that is it.

If you can't get him to that place, and so on, you run a touch assist. And the touch assist is run with "Feel that finger" and so on. And if the injury was very severe indeed, after you've done the touch assist a little bit later you come along and you run the engram. And that is a complete assist.

Now how come we're knocking off all of a sudden, this business of running the engram? 'Cause the person might, it might go past an F/ N? Now let me assure you, you'd have to be completely ignorant of the phenomena of an F/ N. An F/ N occurs when the person disconnects from the masses connected with something. He ceases to make them and ceases to be there, and he disconnects from them. Alright, so he gets an F/ N.

Now you can disconnect a person from his whole bank. Which is great. Which is great. And that is what is called a release. It's a release of this type, and a release of that type, and the central things you have to disconnect to bring him up the lines are the grade processes right to five. So find out what you're doing. You're just making him disconnect. That's all. The only grades that that is not true on are secondaries and engrams. You're erasing something there. Now, he's gaining on up the line, and only when he gets to clear do you find the final mechanism as far as he is concerned, and why he's doing it. What he's doing. That isn't the end of it. But his bank at that moment, or what he knows of in his bank, goes brrrrrooom! Erased, gone! Now it's the difference between this ashtray ceasing to exist, gone completely, and the ashtray simply being put off. A release is the ashtray being put away. A gone ashtray is an erased ashtray. A gone secondary is an erased secondary. So you can actually do this. You can key out a secondary, no longer thinks that kind of thing, you key out a secondary, and you can say, "Well. To key it out again would be an overrun." Oh, that's so true. To key it out before it had keyed in again would be an overrun. And to go on keying out something that has been keyed out would be an overrun. But do you know that you can key it out, turn right around and plunge him right straight into it again, and run it? Without the slightest consequences. The TA doesn't go up, nothing. The proof of the pudding of this whole thing is, what's the behavior of the meter.

Now this is the only time you can go by an F/ N. That is two different processes. One, you're releasing, and the other's going to clear it. So you could get a release on this engram and then erase it. Now it'd be much to your horror if you found out, actually at the moment of release he had also sort of blown it. He had done both actions at once, then you might be a little embarrassed. But I've never seen it happen. So you could get a release on a secondary. Alright, her husband's dead. Alright, good. Husband's dead. Now what are we gonna to do? We're gonna "recall a moment of loss. Good.

Floating needle." She's saying, "Oh, thank heaven. I feel so much better." And she goes home, and she opens up her drawer to get out her powder puff, and there's his watch. Gaal Well, your release did her some good, but she could come right back to you in session, and you could do the exact same thing as before, and get her to recall finding his watch, and it'd key out. And you go floating needle again. And then she could go home and open the closet and find his hat. And this could just keep up ad nauseas. She could keep keying it in and you could keep keying it out.

Do you see then, such things about, the fellow has had a wreck in this car, and he drives to work in it every morning. It's repaired and he goes on driving to work in it every morning. And the next thing you know he develops this horrible neuralgia on the side of his head. Well it's restimulated all the time. Now if he drove it long enough, and restimulated it hard enough, and was in it often enough, and went past the place frequently enough where he had the accident, it would run the engram. It wouldn't just key it out, it would actually "Well, the familiarity, and so on, and would just sort of run it out.

He is, he's running through it every time he goes about anything. So gone, you know, ooh. And then he sees a little picture go by. And then that kind of... He'll keep doing this. Do you see? Well, so you have to choose whether or not this is an assist action which is necessary by reason of the restimulators of the environment. So a person can only be released; now when he's released on communications he doesn't release from one engram. Let's look at this. He doesn't release from one secondary. He doesn't release from one specific action. He actually may very well be releasing from hundreds of trillions of years of such actions. All in an own little flicker of an eye.

Now the length of time it would take to key that back in, because he's not on those planets anymore, he's not even in that space and time. He's not even in that era anymore. So, it's a very valid release indeed. It'll take a, quite a while to key that one back in. Do you see?

So, he's having difficulties with problems, and all of a sudden he has a cognition that just roars on the whole track. It isn't even that he can think on the subject of the whole track, but, he suddenly has a change of mind, concerning the subject of problems. Christ, how long is it going to take to key that back in again? Man, you'd really have to bail this guy under to do that. Do you see? Now you see why the releases are valid, but why releasing a guy from a specific instance in an engram that has to do with injury and unconsciousness, or a secondary that has to do with loss, you see how these things differ? They differ. They differ considerably.

Now as a C/ S, you are going to have this sort of situation. This individual has had something happen to him in life, is driven off the line, and you're going to have to order that the engram of it be found and erased. And you would only err if the auditor erred. Now, one of the little bits and pieces that's missing off the line is that if a secondary on the second run through becomes more solid you have to send the PC with the same procedure to the earlier secondary. To an earlier secondary. And if that secondary, by the second pass through it, running the PC through it becomes more solid and begins to become more solid, you have to send him to an earlier secondary. The test is that is becomes more solid. And if you don't do that, and if you don't know that, you can wrap a PC around a telegraph pole. But I notice

that it is missing from the rundown on engram running by chains in this Dianetic auditors' course book at this time, and it is being reinserted into the book, and is the subject of, at this moment is the subject of HCOB 28 September 68, Class VIII. I'm carefully inspecting back bulletins to find out what's been missed. What's disappeared out on the line up. And that, for some reason or other's disappeared.

On the second pass through, if it gets more solid, you go to the earlier incident. Now that doesn't mean you go from a secondary to an earlier engram. It means you go from a secondary to an earlier secondary to an earlier secondary to an earlier secondary. On the engram line you go from an engram to an earlier engram to an earlier engram, and I've got news for you, this isn't just, this isn't just for, only for your little guy who's doing an assist. This is the only way you're going to solve some section threes. And section three is going to have to be audited just that way. So you better get hotter than pistols running engrams.

A "none on three" is a this lifetime injury which has impacted all the body—thetans into one chunk. And is handled by running that engram. Loosens them all up and away they go. Now you can run three. There is no case, there is no case, there never has been a case that has none on three, that had one on three, that had two on three, that had five on three. No such cases. There isn't any case that suddenly read the instructions and all of a sudden, whee, they all went away. And he didn't have to do anything after that. Bullshit.

So you have to know engram running. And you have to be a damn good engram runner. Because that engram is gonna run like a bitch. You're really gonna have to have session control to handle it. 'Cause all the time pc'll be telling you, "Well I don't know why you're doing this. It's just evaluation on the whole thing, because that really has nothing to do with me." He's just talking out of the basic incident all the way. He isn't protesting the auditor, he's talking out of the basic incident. And you roll it right on down the line and smasho, bingo, thud. There is an exact rundown which you will have. Oh, looks to me like you better get very familiar with this 'ole process known as running engrams. As far as running secondaries is concerned, you can have somebody around, and this ARC break is so thoroughly encysted in grief, and so forth, that you can key it out, and it keys in. You key it out and it keys in. You get tired of it after a while. Run the secondary. Where is it? What is it? A person comes into session every time with a howling ARC break, in grief, and all upset. Cleaned up, and got a review three days from now. Gonna do the same thing. Clean it all up. Goes F/ N. She feels great. A few days later, feels terrible, is all very sad. You look for a ARC break of long duration, you're liable to find yourself sitting there holding onto a secondary. Roll up your sleeves and audits Why be lazy? Run it. Establish what it is. Because it won't, it'll just keep releasing and coming back and releasing and coming back, and this becomes one of these weird cases that you really can't quite do anything with or for. Don't you see? Rockety—bockety. It's one of... it's one of the types that are very difficult to do anything for. They keep getting caught up in this present time situation. But if it were out of this lifetime I wouldn't bother with it. I'd leave that for seven, eight, way up the line, see? When they can handle such things.

But you find out, two years ago she was doing all right, the case was doing all right, and then all of a sudden she vwaff, waff, waff. And there's a period

there, and that has been handled before, and it's handled before, and it's somebody ran it before, and so forth. So you just roll up your sleeves and you run it. And that is the only real criticism I have of a modern auditor. You're perfectly willing to learn. I'm willing to take responsibility for the fact that some guys hooked things out of the line up, and so on. But the one thing I can't understand why you would omit from your repertoire, would be secondary and engram running for good. Good, solid, nothing but secondary and engram running. Running 'em to free needle of course, stopping them when you get the free needle. They're gone, they're erased, naturally. You run 'em through, you get the free needle, only that time that needle, damn it, will stay free. After you've freed up the needle four or five times on the same subject I should think you'd get the word. Run it! The person's gonna keep falling on their head.

The reason why you shouldn't, shouldn't drop it out of your repertoire, if you want advertising pieces. It's pieces on whom you have run a secondary or an engram that is close to pt. Because their before and after is extreme. And he's going around looking like he was an old lady about ninety years old, and creeping about, and so forth, and he's been digged in this way ever sncz the house burned down and she lost her all. And people know how this character looks like. Alright, you take this person, just run the secondary. If that one goes solid there's an earlier one with a loss. You have to run the earlier one. If that goes solid you run the earlier one. Follow the same rules, but you just go to that secondary, get the moment of it, get the duration of it, follow it through. Broom, broom, broom. Grind away, grind away, grind away, through and through and through, and spill and spill and tears and sorrow and shame, blame, regret, apathy. Through it, and through it, and... Some of these cases you wouldn't believe your eyes. You're sitting there; you're sitting there looking at somebody who looks like they're only about twenty years old. I've seen in a person running an engram, I've seen a person running an engram. A goiter, at least six inches in diameter, recede and completely vanish with all signs thereof, within a half an hour after the engram was finished. It isn't a for every time action. But there are miracles to be found on it. There are rather wonderful things that can happen.

So you start omitting this from your repertoire, you've got rocks in your head. So a Class VIII should know how to run an engram, because there are going to be some cases you run into that won't, just won't go anyplace unless you run an engram. And there's the other little interesting thing, is you won't be able to shove anybody up through the later OT sections unless you can run an engram. They're just gonna hang right there unless you're sharper than a pistol on running engrams. But running engrams is a lot of fun. When you have a good meter, and you have the technology of engram running as it was finally developed, it's a gas. Nothing to it. It's a ball. And it doesn't take as long as you'd think, but don't, don't be suddenly upset if it, the session, is twelve hours long.

You can break one of those sessions, but when you break the session you've got to get in all the Ruds, fly the needle again, before you start him back into it. See) You don't have breaks which go back to the same action. Every time you have this trouble with breaks, every time you have a break, every time you have a new session, you've got to fly the, you've got to fly the Ruds.

So, you have to know this sort of thing. Now, to show you how far out it can

get, and so on, I don't think people today really know how to do a touch assist. I don't know what happened to the touch assist, but I was fascinated to have a whole group of Scientologists not very long ago, absolutely amazed watching me with the most intense fascination. Watching me do a touch assist. Correct and by the book. They knew that you touch assist left and right, but they didn't know any of the fars or nears. They didn't know that you followed the nerve channels. It was quite interesting. Quite interesting. A touch assist is a highly complex action. It isn't just jabbing the guy in the ribs, saying something or other. And the action is elementary, actually. The area, the area that you're doing a touch assist from you approach on a gradient and recede from on a gradient. And if you have, for instance, an elbow injury or something like that, you would for sure go further from the head than the elbow eventually, but if you wanted to practically kill the guy, why you'd go immediately and directly to an area further down the arm than the elbow as the first touch.

Now a contact assist also has its' gradients. And you do it equally on both sides of the body, and it's just a feel my finger and so forth, but you have to also go down the nerve channels, 'cause there's where the current is locked up. And there are twelve nerves in the spine. And any injury that is severe in the body has to have the whole spine released on the subject. And it's far and near, gradient approaches, coming back, going forward.

So what, what, if we can forget an assist, or it can evaporate, a lot of things can evaporate on the lines. But your job is to hold standard. That's why I'm telling you these things. Your job is to hold it standard. Now I haven't told you all there is to know about a touch assist. But I will. I haven't told you all there is to know about engram running. But it is down, except for the one data I gave you. And as far as I'm concerned, the technology has stayed together pretty well. Pretty well. There aren't many pieces of it missing. Enough of it's missing to make some of you curious, and people have not held the standard well enough in its' application to put it where it should go. And now, assembling it all, putting it together, making a straight line proposition that is right down the middle of a highway with a wide open throttle, with everything we know about it, we're in a position to make it win. But it will keep winning just as long as you continue, as you continue to hold the standard.

Thank you very much.

and bla bla bla, and bla bla bla, and the next item, or the next bla bla bla, and bla bla bla, and the next item or the next question, and the tone arm going up, 4.25, 4.5, all the way up, "Well where could the floating needle have been?" It was when he took the PC off the cans. The PC looked it up in the dictionary and cognited. Because that is a point where it can go. It can go on the command, the clearing of the command. It can go on the first auditing question asked without it being answered. Or it can go on the first answer, second answer, and actually most often goes on the first answer on lists. The first item. And these god—awful painful lists which you see that go eighty nine pages, or something of this sort, are either listing a dead horse, or the item was the first item. So you don't let the PC off cans. Because those are the sequences of F/ N I've just given you. And it happens on a list, and it happens on a process, and it can happen at any time. It can happen at any time, any time. So don't let the PC off the cans for any reason under the sun, moon or stars.

Now I will tell you another kooky one. I'll give you another kooky circumstance with regard to all of this. And that is this. Electronics men think an E—meter works because hands sweat. And I haven't been around orgs to shoot the electronics men who say this, and as a net result of all of this they remain unshot, and they do talk. And in this great, advanced, modern society in which we live, they think that a galvanometer works because of hand sweat. Now the fellow, you can just see the fellow sweating and unsweating. He sweats a read, and he unsweats a read. And he sweats a read, and he unsweats a read. And he sweats a read, and he unsweats a read. And that is mirrored in the fact of "PC wiped his hands and tone arm rose." Now I imagine some low TA case figured this out, that if the PC wiped his hands and then you got a higher TA read, then immediately and directly, and instantly; it was the sweat which gave him the low TA read. I'll tell you what gives a low TA read. Three. B—thetans. That is a low TA. The whole of low TA. The whole subject of low TA is contained in that. "PC has attested three, tone arm 1.2." Now that is something which comes from male cows. When you see a TA dive, guy's got B—thetans. Now there'd be eight thousand, seven hundred and sixty five additional reasons why a person doesn't have a this, or doesn't have a that. And we could have an infinity of wrongnesses. There is no reason of my harping on certain sets of wrongnesses. I'm just showing you what goofy—nesses can come up.

Now listen very carefully. When the PC puts down the cans and moves his hands and arms, the body density mass of the B—thetan beeps up. So that when he goes back on the cans again, the TA is reading higher. I'm afraid you cannot avoid these horribly, factual facts! That a PC who gets a low TA is an unflat three.

Now we had an auditor here today very, very puzzled, very puzzled as to how his meter, beautifully trimmed at the beginning of session went out of trim during the session, at the end of session was found marvelously out of trim. And this he was being very mystified about. He doesn't know this fact. It takes a while for a meter and a can to warm up. So, the PC grabs hold of the cans, or the meter is turned on, and if you instantly trim it at that precise instant that it's turned on, you are turning on a cold circuit. And you're trimming a cold circuit. It takes a minute or two for the circuit to warm up and your trim will change. And this is not true of all E—meters. Some of them heat up faster than others. But it's a safe bet, that if you're going to do

a trim check on a meter, you do it at the end of session, not at the beginning of session. And what's your meter doing so far out of trim, do you carry—it around by the trim knob? My meters from one month's end to the next just stay where they're supposed to stay. So I don't know why other people's meters don't, unless they uses the trim knob to scratch their heads, or something.

But the point I'm making here, is there are certain data. Now when you see people trying to avoid this data they have, they feel the data is discreditable to themselves, or somebody to whom it is discreditable is trying to argue them out of it. Now you can have this kind of a fire fight develop up the line someplace, there is no such thing as a service facsimile. There is no such thing as a service facsimile. It's very amusing, because that will be the guy's service facsimile.

Now this is this bad. You can get somebody who is in a foul, foul condition in his life as far as casualties, accidents, that sort of thing is concerned, and he gets to three and he can't find any. He can't find any at all. And the idea's upsetting to him. Now if his grades are out and he has not come up well through his grades, his level of reality will not be adequate to embrace three, anyway. And so you have people going around, every now and then you will find somebody going around and saying, "Well, idea of body thetans, na na, ah ha ha ha ha ha, yeah, yeah." Not true.

Now, he considers it discreditable. He himself wants to invalidate it for some reason or another. So he starts spreading it about so as to discredit the information. And this blocks the way for an awful lot of people. So therefore, you've got to have a grip on your standard data which is sufficient to stand up to all of this cockeyed—ness. This is wild stuff that comes around. Crazy, crazy stuff.

There is one going in Los Angeles, I think it is, right this minute, that it won't be possible to become clear or OT. It's not possible to make these grades. Out of seventy people polled, twenty of them thought it was impossible and they wouldn't be able to make it, and they didn't have much reality on it. Who's been at work there? One of the first things you see is the invalidation of the state of clear.

Reality is a fascinating thing. Reality is proportional to the amount of charge off a case. If you took Clearing Course materials and handed 'em over to some wog he would look them over and scratch his head, maybe come down with a cold or something. If he tried to run them, if you tried to run them on him, your possibility of doing so is so microscopically remote, and most of 'em wouldn't even upset him. That's how far they are from clear. Because there is this stable datum—the amount of charge off a case is proportional to the reality. Also, proportional to the awareness.

So you have somebody walking down the street and there are four elephants, and these four elephants are walking down in squad formation, and each one of them's carrying green banners. And you say to this fellow, "What the hell. Four elephants walking down the middle of the streets" And he says, "What elephants?" Just that. Just, what elephants?

So, it is very fascinating. People are unaware to the degree that they haven't got much reality anyway. Now you let one of these monkeys come along and tell you what reality is. Do you follow? It's one of these incredible, nonsense propositions.

The whole subject of reality is mixed up in the subject of perception, the

subject of recognition, the subject of truth. You wonder how in the name of god the people of this planet could be lied to. 'Cause brother, can they be lied to. Look at the newspapers they buy. Now if you want to know how much truth is in the newspapers, all you have to do is read the report about Scientology. Now you know that's for the birds. What about the story at the right and left of the one about Scientology? Did you ever think of that? They're just as lying as the one about Scientology. See? The newspapers at this certain level of action here at this particular time are not particularly kicking back at us. They, as a matter of fact, their last report at least, they were doing very well indeed. But the level of truth, the level of truth isn't there. And yet these are the people who are keeping people informed. Well, think of the people who are keeping them informed, and think of the people who are quote, "being informed", unquote. See? Unreality.

One of your basic protests is unreality. But unreality is proportional to the amount of charge on the case. " these guys are pretty charged up, aren't they? So they're in a figurefigure, boggle—woggle, snuggle—luggled, hanging around. There's an old comic strip character, Joe Bliffelstick, something like that, and he always went around with a little rain cloud over his head, you know? That's the boy. That's your standard issue humanoid today. See? He's got too much storm going on right in his immediate vicinity to see very much out there.

Now the quality of the charge taken off the case is very important. If you take charge off on the main line of the grades, as they go up, why, it is basic charge which then blows a lot of side charge. Now if you just took charge off on mass, without any judgement as to whether or not it was main line, just take charge off, just get the E—meter to read. Put a person on the cans, get the E—meter to read. Probably at the end of fifty, sixty years of auditing, something like that, there'd be a great oddity would occur. His reality would come up to OT. Do you follow? Now what we've got is a way to go right through the fiddle of the charge line to remove those central charges which then discharge all the side charges. Now a PC usually feels better in some way or another, but an auditor who badly audits, that is who audits very poorly, can actually put as much charge on the case as he takes off. He can invalidate the case. The PC says "Why? You know, I feel better, I, I, didn't I have a floating needle, or something?" And the auditor says, "Ha ha ha ha. Case like yours, no sir!" Well you do the same thing. You say, "Who or what has unmocked you?" Or something. And, question didn't read. Person isn't PTS. Now you've given him the evaluation that he's suppressed. Because you're going to now list the list. So the list lists out to a dead horse, but the PC seems charged up.

Alright, I'll give you another example of it. The list is charged, it does read, and you give him the wrong item. Alright, when you give him the wrong item, you'll hang him with that little pocket of charge because that isn't the item. So it didn't discharge the list. So you've got the charge of the list hung up in the fact that he's now got a wrong item. So that after a listing action is done, or after a listing action session, if the TA is high it was a wrong item. That's; it's very elementary. TA's high, wrong item.

You're busy listing away, listing away madly on a case, getting up to your hundred and fifty fifth page, or something like this, and you notice the TA is starting up. Well you're putting charge on the case. Do you see that your tone arm, the tore arm, is, in actual fact, the measure of accumulation of

charge? The needle surges are just gradients of the tone arm. You can get a tone arm actually behaving like a needle. And a tone arm over a long period of time, does behave like a needle. A tone arm measures the amount of charge—up on the case at that particular time. When you get into the higher OT sections you will find something else very peculiar happens. You can find that your PC will lean on something, and drive his TA up. And you can do your nut as a review auditor, trying to get this TA down on some guy who is up around six, seven, eight levels, and his TA is up, boy. It's up. 4.75, or something like that. And you suddenly sort it out and you find out he's leaning on something. Well at that level he can lean on something so much harder than anybody ever thought of, that, of course, you are reading the side of a building. Or you are reading the density of the ridge he is making against his body. And you can fish it around, actually, to find out what he is doing, and all of a sudden, why, he says, "Well you; what am I doing? I, well, pushing on the ceiling." Slllll. Down she come.

Now you can actually reverse this when he is OT8. You can reverse this, and as far as a meter is concerned you can put him on the meter, have him connected with the body, and then have him lean on the wall. Just lean on the wall, not go through any energy body grips and so forth. After all, the guy isn't the body. Have him lean on the wall, and you'll watch your TA come right on up. Unlean off the wall and it goes down. In other words, at high levels your TA starts to behave like a needle. Which is quite, quite interesting. But your needle, you see, is just a sort of a, of a small, easily read TA. They are connected.

So, you put more charge on the case. Down at a lower level the guy isn't leaning on anything, but the guy's got a lot of body thetans, or something like that, and remember that from three down you are auditing somebody with body thetans. So very peculiar things can happen. And you can audit him incorrectly, do an incorrect action, and have the TA go up. You can incorrectly list him, you can overrun him, and so on. You've got something leaning against something. Something making more mass than it did before. So you haven't taken charge off the case, you've put charge on the case.

So if your TA is higher at session end than it was at the beginning, the case is more charged up at the end than it was at the beginning. Elementary.

Do you follow? I mean, these, these, these, this is, this is very easy. This is very easy. The auditor, through incorrect actions put more water in the bucket than he took out, and of course the tone arm measuring the amount of water in the bucket will, of course, measure more water in the bucket. It's, it's, it's just that elementary. It, it's not a very esoteric datum. We're dealing, in actual fact, with a creature who can make mass, and who does make mass. And the mass which he makes below three, or actually below seven, the mass he makes, and so on, is normally, bank mass. Now, if he is given an item which isn't his item, he then has been given something which he then grips, and which stays with him. And it's a very funny phenomenon that a wrong item will be remembered very, very easily by the PC.

Now there's a piece of rehabbing which is, at this stage of the game, being done wrong. I don't know why you guys keep asking for a service facsimile. I notice a lot of PCs can give you their service facsimile. What the hell's he doing remembering his service facsimile? Now it isn't true that because he can remember his service facsimile it wasn't his service facsimile, but you're asking a PC to do a rather considerable feat. You're asking him to remember

something that has probably been erased. And instead of rehabbing it, you're keying it back in again. So I don't know why you keep asking him for the wording. I saw a folder here the other day, it came in from an org. and it said it wasn't his service facsimile because he couldn't remember it. And it's probably the one valid service facsimile that's passed through the lines. It's whether or not it rehabs. Whether or not it goes F/ N. That, that's, that's the whole test. Does it go F/ N? Alright, that's it.

Now the other thing, the other thing which you must get very straight as far as E—meter reactions and processes and so on, that you must get very straight, is that where an item, or a process, brought about a state of release there is an F/ N there to rehab. And if it doesn't rehab he didn't go release at that point.

Well you say, "Well how many times can you rehab this things" I don't know. Infinity. So you say, "Alright, let's rehab this fellows' grades." And you could make this mistake as a C/ S, as a case supervisor. Say, "Let's rehab this fellows' grades. Tell him rehab the grades. ' And this auditor obediently tries to rehab ARC Straightwire. Tone arm rose, you give him hell because he rehabbed it wrong. Or you say it's been rehabbed too many times. I saw a remark in a case summary here today. There's a complete error. The person has been overrun on Ruds. Now a person couldn't be overrun on Ruds. Not possible to be overrun on Ruds. It is possible to overrun one particular ARC break, but it is not possible to overrun the whole subject of ARC breaks. So when you see this, you tried to rehab ARC Straightwire and it didn't rehab, and the tone arm went up, and you fish around trying to find the point of rehab, and it didn't exist, why naturally at that stage of the game you're going to get a rising tone arm. It's as easy as that. So what do you do about this? You say, "Well I couldn't possibly do this. It's obviously been overrun." Well you gotta make up your mind. It's either been overrun or not run at all.

One of the ways to do this is to run it. And you say, "God, that's adventurous." Yeah it is . Yes, but what the hell's this guy doing being a, being a grade three without his ARC Straightwire in? See? So you run it. Blows down, it F/ Ns. That's the first time it was ever run, I assure you. Supposing, as you tried to run it, it just really shot up. Well at that time you could indicate that it was overrun and try to fish around and find out what in the name of common sense happened to it. One of the things just would be to date the session in which it was supposed to have been rehabbed, supposed to have been run, and get the buttons in on that session. Because there might have been a crashing invalidation on the session, of something that swallowed up the F/ N in some weird fashion. It couldn't have been an F/ N which appeared below the invalidation. Don't get that sort of thing. There was an F/ N but the auditor wound up on the guy and told him that wasn't it, that it was no good, or something, and the guy can't remember this session because it was sort of painful. Something bad happened in the session. Well you could, you could rehabilitate the session and get the F/ N. So, obviously, obviously your right procedure would be, you're getting somebody, you wanna rehab ARC Straightwire. Well, the fellow might be protesting it being rehabbed, because this is the hundred and fifth time, and he's tired of the whole thing, so you got protest on it. Something like that doesn't rehab, see? It doesn't rehab. The tone arm starts up.

Well now it could be protested. Not over—rehabbed, but certainly protested the rehabbing of it. It could have been that the session is too painful in which

it was run. The later part of the session was very painful but the early part of the session was all right, something goofy like this. So one of the things would be to date the thing. Do just a standard dating on your meter. Date the session and get in some buttons on the session and see if anything happens. Then you're liable to get yourself an F/ N.

Now if that action didn't occur, this is, this is rather working very hard at it, see? And this is how to be very safe, but if that action didn't occur, it didn't ever F/ N. It didn't ever F/ N. That's it. Somebody was telling a lie.

But your tone arm, the tone arm only means overrun when it goes up on something you are running. A high tone arm means a generality of overruns in life. You can have a person with a high tone arm, that oh boys Does he got overruns in life. It's quite remarkable how many overruns there can be in life. And one of your standard actions is to get the life overruns off of the case. And boy, does that cool off TAs. Wow!

Now let me show you what kind of errors can creep in, just as, so you're safe guarded against your tech being shot to hell. Somebody says that you must only get life overruns in this lifetime because the PC liable to get back, and bad things are liable to happen, and whole track doesn't exist anyway. Somebody is trying to invalidate whole track, so he says you mustn't ever try to, try to get a hold of life overruns earlier than this lifetime because it's liable to get the PC upset. Well it's very, very interesting. There have been crude versions of engram running on the whole track. They apparently didn't have meters. Then commands, god knows what they were. But somebody on the whole track here and there has tried to run engrams. And they inevitably have overrun them. So you're liable to find an engram overrun of eighty one million years ago.

This guy says; you're running this process, "What has been overrun?", you're running this process, and the guy says; what's been overrun, and it occurs to him; engrams. Good. And you try; now you limited by asking what session, you see, and pin his attention up here in PT somewhere you know? In what foundation? You see, you could limit your question so that he could never rehab it. But it's obviously been overrun because it reads as overrun, but you can't get an F/ N. Well, now if you know the tools of your trade this won't baffle you.

Do you remember what I told you about the incredible? The PCs data, man, is not something that you, as a case supervisor or an auditor have a god damned thing to do with. Any time auditing may be run on the, only on those things which conform to current opinion, any time that phenomenon occurs, and it's liable to occur at any time because the, actually the first foundation, the Dianetic Foundation, really blew up on just this one point. The Board of Directors was so upset over the commotion past lives would cause that they tried to pass a resolution saying that no more research must be done into the field of past lives. Well, we had a parting of the ways.

Anyway, because obviously, to wrap up the subject one had to research what was there. Now let's get somebody researching under the Bide—a—wee College faculty. There's this guy with a high choke collar and very prim, tremendous number of missed withholds, second dynamic overts of various kinds, but a respectable citizen. And all of a sudden somebody says that he's going to do a little research in this line, or they're gonna practice this and that, why he permits Scientology to be run in that university only so long as nobody... Just fill in the missing lines. See? You could fill in; "As long as

nobody tries to pull missed withholds." See? "As long as we never go into past lives." "As long as the subject religion is not touched." "As long..." Do you get the idea? You could fill it in, see, so you get a limitation. Now that is limitation of the preclear's data. Auditing has nothing to do with data. It has to do with technique.

So the PC tells you there's eighteen elephants walking on the ceiling, boy, it's not up to you to correct him. He can take a snoot full of some outrageous drug or gasoline or something. And it's marvelous. We have people who have gone wing ding on gasoline. I, well, I guess they were in the valence of a car. (laughter) And he's trying to run out this incident, see? And this incident has pink elephants walking upside down on the ceiling. It has black bats flying in and out of his ears. Now psychiatry, when they found data like that, instantly and at once invalidated the person. And then they might put it down in their report, but their idea of making the thing come out straight was telling the person what the truth was. Now that is a whole failed line. It is totally failed. It is fighting its' last ditch fight as I speak to you now. It's going to go over Niagara Falls with no barrel, boy. Because, one of the tricks it uses is when it interferes with somebody or implants somebody, is to put an incredible perception in the implant so if the person says anything about it, it will sound so incredible he can then be pronounced insane. So you haven't got anything to do with the PCs data. What he tells you is what he tells you.

So you do a list. Now let's get what just exactly what I mean. We do a list. And we're doing this list and he puts down "Pink elephants", and "Who or what has suppressed you?", and he puts down "Pink elephants, catterwacks, martians, a dog biscuit", and there's this hellish fall. And he sits up and... (laughter) And the damned thing goes F/ N. You don't even have a chance to null the list. There it is. Of course you say "Dog biscuits and it reads, and you say "That's your item", and he says, "Yeah, that sure is." You say, "Alright. Dog biscuits. That's your item.

You see, one of the things that gets wrong with the time track is it has incredibles on it. And therefore, an incredible is something that won't as—is because it's not credible. The item is dog biscuits, he's been suppressed with dog biscuits. Some times you practically do your nut trying to figure out how the hell did he get loused up on the subject of dog biscuits. But actually, if you went back into it, inquired deeply, which you shouldn't do, but if you went back in to it; sometimes the PC explains this to you. It all sounds logical. But you're interested in the mechanics of it. Just the mechanics of it. Did it blow down? Was it the item on the list? Your action then is to verify and give it to the PC as his item. Those are the things which you're supposed to do. Not worry about whether or not it's dog biscuits.

Do you see? You're not interested in the, in, in, in this data. Do you get the, you get the different orientation on this thing? It has nothing to do with you. If you followed the exact mechanical steps necessary to resolve it, why there you are. You're interested in the reaction of the PC, not his data.

The PC says, "Oh yes, boy, do I have an ARC break, boy. Are they on to me," and so on, "They're all pretty bad, you know. They've been jumping all over me with wicked people, wicked people," and so on. "Well, that's good." By all means try to clean up this thing as an ARC break at the moment, and in the process of cleaning it up say, ask him casually, but not evaluatively if he has a withhold. And that reads, and you pull it. And then you check the ARC

break, and it all of a sudden doesn't read and the whole thing has cooled off. Reaction. The PC was critical, that means, always, invariably, missed withhold. See? It's that kind of thing you're interested in as an auditor. Not what the ARC break was about, but that he was ARC broken. Not what the missed withhold was about, but that he did have one. Do you get the differences?

Now the subject of each one of the grades, which is to say ARC breaks, withholds, problems, you name it, but the subject of any grade, the subject of any grade is timeless and endless. It can always be run forever. But not the commands of the grade.

Supposing we tried to run Pr Pr 1 AA every time the PC looked worried and had a problem. Man, we would really wrap him around a telegraph pole. He would become overrun on that process, right? He never becomes overrun on problems. You, you get the vast difference there? He never, he's never overrun on problems. He is overrun on a problems process. He can be overrun, for instance, on problems of comparable magnitude. Problems of comparable magnitude. Problems of comparable magnitude. Problems of comparable magnitude. And you, in trying to put in the Ruds, had better well, damn well not run any process at all. ARC break is ARCU, CDEI, which is just the trying to find out what the ARC break is. Itsa, or earlier itsa. You do rudiments by itsa or earlier incident itsa on. A totality. And they never become overrun. But if you insisted on running a problem of comparable magnitude for every time you found a PC with a PTP, you would very soon have this one wrapped around a telegraph pole. So the basic stable datum that you should know is that a process can be overrun, but the subject of grades, the subject of grades can never be overrun. For instance you can't overrun Pr Pry you, you can't overrun Pr Pr 6 with regard to this. You're asking the PC how life is. Well after all you're asking him some version of this as condition, aren't you? But you start asking him about conditions, vrooom, booms Do you see? You could ask him how life is. Alright. That also might seem to overrun Pr Pr 4 too, or Pr Pr 5, right? This could, this could, all of these. So the basic background subject of it. You can ask somebody what engram he is stuck in. Well you're trying to get a revivification on Pr Pr 6 and usually do get one, even though it flicks through like that. You could still find out what incident he's stuck in, but you don't have to run the process Pr Pr 6. Do you follow? So the subject of being stuck in incidents, inexhaustible.

Every once in a while you guys are talking about a stuck picture. The PC had a stuck picture. So the PC had a stuck pictures It's not very interesting. Pets have stuck pictures. Now supposing you run Pr Pr 6 every time the PC had a stuck picture. I don't know how much mass you would accumulate, but boy, you would soon have to move the PC with a crane and a truck.

Now supposing, after he's clear, he has a stuck picture. And you tried to run it with Power. Well in the first place it inevitably is somebody else's picture and he is not sufficiently permeating now into the other thetans around. The only thing you can run it out of is a body thetan. And you prematurely beef up Pr Pr 3. And that's why you mustn't even rehab Power. You can't run Power after he's clear. The guy went clear without running Power. God almighty, never run Power! Don't ever rehab Power after the guy's clear. But if the guy isn't clear, but just on the Clearing Course and he can't seem to make it, and he gets no reality on it, you go back and find out he hasn't been run on Power, well run Power. Because he isn't clear. It's elementary. In

actual fact there is not; it's not a very complicated subject, beyond this. The only Power that's available on a clear is that you would get out of a body thetan. And he is being run with his pictures Disowned, which wraps it all around a telegraph pole. You can run basic track, you can run R—6 out of body thetans because that's where most of them are stuck anyhow.

Alright. Now what, what's this amount to? What's this amount to? We just take this datum as a thoroughly stable thing. But the subject, the subject which you have to know on this, see, the subject of any grade... You can run basic track, you can run R—6 on a body thetan because that's where most of them are stuck anyhow.

Alright, now what, what's this amount to? What's this amount to? We just take this datum as a thoroughly, as a thoroughly stable thing. But the subject, the subject which you have to know on this thing, the subject of any grade can be run at any time, forever. Correct.

Along about OT8 you're gonna have a hell of a time trying to run one of them, but you couldn't any more overrun the guy on, than, it would neither run nor overrun. Do you see? But the process, the process, the technique, that process, can be overrun, because it is addressed to a specific point of contact with the mind and with life, and it snaps that, and if you overrun it, it puts it back again.

So engrams man, engrams can be run from wog to angel. Secondaries can be run all over the damn track at any grade you ever heard of. On any grade you could run an secondary. Straightwire, but not the commands of straightwire, but the whole idea of straightwire. What the hell do you think you're doing when you put in Ruds? "Do you have an ARC break?", you're asking the guy to recall. Do you see? You ran a straightwire all the way. Communication. What are you doing in an auditing session? His ARC breaks are mostly involved with the fact that his comm is cut or something like that. Problems. Although you've disconnected him from the large mass of problems and he now doesn't have all his vast number of problems that he had-, and the whole subject of problems is not overwhelming, he can still have a problem. You get the idea? It goes right on up the line. And what do you know, you can have a guy at five, he all of a sudden has a flea hit him in the teeth about his. A body thetan hits him. A body thetan with no home.

He wakes up one fine morning and finds out he has a whole bunch of R6 pictures. Where the hell did this come from? I thought I ran all that out. Yeah, he ran all that out. But he's not up to a point yet where he has turned off all of his attractiveness as a thetan. He hasn't yet found out that he's the one that grabs hold of body thetans. They really don't grab hold of him. They basically don't have enough reach. (laughter) But until a guy is so clear that you hit him on the left ear and it rings for hours; as a thetan, as a being, he's not got any little trick pieces of mass that are incredible and so he hasn't bothered to notice that he is mocking them up, all these little patch up points. "Poor old body thetan around with no home. Can't find a hospital address." Something like that. Caroms, hits the guy, and probably would leave, but finds himself stuck. So, you run, you could shoot a body thetan off, and by the way they react very well to negative, negative exteriorization commands. "Try not to be ten thousand feet above the city." (laughter)

But the net gain of all of this is that you undoubtedly could not run a body thetan out of a wog. You couldn't possibly. I don't think it could be done with a pistol. Because you see they're him, he to them. He is this composite

being. He is a being, but he is influenced by a lot of composite beings. He is not a cluster. Somebody has originated this thing, "I am a cluster", "you are a cluster". No, a guy is never a cluster, brother. He is himself with some body thetans plastered on him. But he's too, not enough charge off.

Now, when, if the guys get up to the Clearing Course you get another phenomena occurring. And it's an interesting phenomenon when you get up into Clearing Course. If you just let people audit the Clearing Course materials, a certain percentage of them will write in and tell you that there are these black objects, and they seem to be other beings, and they start flying off when they start auditing, and what are these things. The guy is already prematurely encountered 3. A certain number of cases will do this. Also, oddly enough, you could start a certain very small percentage of cases, and it's a very small percentage, at OT; you could start them out at Grade four, service facsimile. And they would go on up. But the percentage is too small to pay much attention to this.

Now if the person arrives at OT3 and he can't perceive these, you must recognize that there is insufficient charge off his case. Now what's the, what's the solution to that? Well, you've taken the charge off of the main grade line you've, you can rehab the main grade line. Make sure that it is run. You'll normally find out it hasn't been, it's been skimmed somehow or another. Or more charge has been put on than has taken off and then somebody turned in a false report, or something like this. Something weird happened. Or you can turn around at that stage of the game and run him on down through the actual reason they get all smashed together, which is accidents, impacts and injuries. Then you can start auditing him down that line and they, it'll loosen up, and all of a sudden it all comes straight.

But what is that? That's running an engram which is way down in the Dianetics area. Now the process of running an engram is the only one I know of that does not overrun. If the process of running an engram is to go to the beginning, date the thing, go to the beginning of the incident, what is it's duration, go through it to the end, tell me what's there, that won't overrun. It's not much of a, 'cause you see the subject matter to which it is introduced, and so forth. Now you go back and try to audit the engrams which have already been audited, you're not going to get anyplace because, you see, the reason why that one works that way is because engrams and secondaries are erased. They're not released. There's a difference of definition. They aren't something—the engrams, secondaries and bank masses and implants, and all the rest of this sort of thing—they just don't fly off or the guy just unpins them or ceases to mock them up and waits 'till tomorrow when they get keyed in and starts mocking them up again. See? That's a release phenomenon.

No, you erase it. There is a hole in the bank where that was, and it is not likely to key in again. So of course there isn't anything to overrun. You get the difference? So the one unlimited process there is, is engram running or secondary running. Totally unlimited. With this proviso. Don't try to run an incident which has already been erased. Because now you're going back and trying to put the incident there when it's not there, and the person is trying to put the incident there, and you can get, and it reacts to, the question "overrun". It will react to it. The engram has been overrun. You can get a read on this, 'cause it interprets that way to his head. The truth of the matter is, is "you are making me put it back there again" would be the right,

the actual action which is occurring on an overrun. So one chain, or one incident; the chain blew, see? Now you, "Care to run this chain?" He can't run the chain you're asking him something. He's got to put the chain there in order to run it again. That's overrun. That's the overrun. It isn't the command overrun. It's the fact that it's gone. And it really has gone. It hasn't released. He's, he's now got to put one there in order to have one. He hasn't got the skill to do it, and he becomes very upset and very baffled. His knowingness about what he's doing is not adequate to knowing that he is trying to put one there. Don't you see? But he really doesn't know how to put one there yet. And he can get all flabblebabbled up.

Every once in a while you'll, you will get a read on 3, overrun. Wise up, auditor. Wise up. That is one body thetan who is run one too many times through incident one. All you just dotis indicate it to him, he's been run through it after it was gone, and so forth, and he blows. And then on it suddenly he finds out that there's a lot more body thetans. 3 wasn't overrun. But the PC will read on 3 being overrun. One body thetan has been overrun on one engram, is what 3 overrun reads on your meter. "Has 3 been overrun?" (woosh) "Very good. Which body thetan was run too often through the incident?" Pull that one. (woosh) "That's good. Alright." Indicate that it has been over; he has been overrun on incident one, or incident two, as the case may be. Very good.

We had a case here the other day practically fall apart. Apparently the auditor/ PC, in doing 3, did nothing but overrun everybody that he had. He's one of these thorough cases. (laughter) And the review auditor running overruns, just the subject of overruns, in trying to rehab overruns, of course got up to a prep check on 3, and was busy rehabbing this and that. And my god, the case just fell to pieces. It went off in all directions. The guy simply plastered himself with overrun body thetans. By the same mechanism, he was asking them to go through the one, the two, three more times. But there wasn't anything there for the guy to go through. And then probably running them verbally. Verbalization. "Go to the beginning", or something like this, some generality that could stick kick every body thetan down the track. The guys are still trying to go to the beginning, there is nothing there, there now is no beginning, then they get very confused.

Guys that run OT3 verbalized anyhow are rather bonkers. You get the funny picture of the guy pulling an empty chair up across from his auditing desk and saying to the empty chair, "Do you have an incident one? That didn't read. Good. I'll go attest 3." It's actually run telepathically. And you don't have lots of commands, and so forth. If you get up to that point without being able to think a guy back to the where, the beginning of the incident and thinking him through the thing you ought to quit anyway.

So this is the way the; no, you, you shouldn't quit. You ought to get to work and finish your 3. Anyway. I'll make it very tactful.

Now do you differentiate between the idea of the subject and the process? These are two different things. So as the case supervisor, don't make the mistake of believing that the person has been on the subject. "Well this person has just had too many ARC breaks run." See, "Just don't run any more ARC breaks on this PC." That'd be the end of him, boy. You could say, "Don't again run list four, the main change in your life, and waffle, waffle, waffle, waffle, waffle, waffle. See? So that's... So how would you overrun an ARC break then? Well you would overrun, you don't overrun ARC

breaks, but you could overrun an ARC break. And you do it this way. "Do you have an ARC break? Good. That reads. What was it?" "So and so and so and so." "Alright. When was that?" "So and so and so and so." "Good. C, D, E, I, pardon me, A, R, C, U, C, D, E, I. Good." Indicate it to the PC. "Good. Do you have an ARC break?" "No, no." "Well, I have a read here." "No." "Well, do you have an ARC break? Yep, it read. What is the ARC break?" "Oh, I don't know." You're asking him to run the ARC break which he's just run, which then invalidates his ability to as is. And you hang it up, and the TA will go up. Alright, that's one way to do it. Another way to do it is, "Do you have an ARC break?" "Yes. My husband so on and so on. Yesterday, and itsa..." "Well, A, R, C, U. Alright. I'd like to indicate to you that it was understanding. It was break in under..." Floating needle. See? OK? And the auditor doesn't indicate that. And the PC said, "Yeah. That's..." Perfectly allowable for the PC to say "Yeah, that's a break in understanding." He's not; he didn't understand what the hell I was talking about." "Alright. Good." Floating needle. See? C, D, E, I." C reads. Also D. "You're curious about and desired understanding? Was that; that was the by—passed charge. Good."—" Uh, yes." "Good. Now how do you feel about that ARC break now?" "Well, let's see." Now he has to put it there, don't you see, in order to answer this question. And he gets a bonkers mess that would occur. See? It's gone, and now you're telling him it's still there, and is in essence, an auditor evaluation. So he, being an obedient PC, tries; you can handle his bank better than he. He just assumes that it must still be there, so he tries to put something there, but he can't find anything to put there, so the TA goes up and you leave him in a mystery. You play the same gag on him as, "Look at the elephant", only there isn't any elephant. You see? So he looks around, and then you, from altitude say, "Well you damn fool, can't you see this elephant? Can't you see this elephant anyplace, anyplacev Can't you see this elephant?" And the guy says, "I can't see any elephant." "Oh, well." (drums fingers on table) "Guess we'll have to send you to the psychiatrist. Well a guy in a protest like this will sort of, try to satisfy, "Oh, yeah, yeah. I, I, I can get the dim outline of an elephant. Yeah."

That's why the auditors' code is the auditors code. You say it read when it didn't read, you say it didn't read when it read. We just had a PC wrapped around a telegraph pole, he let himself go all the way through the session with a missed withhold. Well it didn't read when it went by, so I didn't say anything about it. And the auditor sat there and watched him get kind of gray faced, and so on as the session went on, and didn't say anything about it either. Yes he didn't get a read, but the PC had missed withhold reactions, and he didn't get in suppress on it.

Now you could be a damned fool, and every clean read that you see get in suppress on it. Do you see where, where rote auditing becomes impossible? You could, you could wind a session up to a whole bunch of inspections before the fact, and so on. So, you make up for this by being yourself acquainted totally, fully and utterly with the standard data you are handling. You don't have to stop and think that a critical PC has a missed withhold. You don't have to stop and think when you see somebody coming into session very sad and hang—dog, that he has an ARC break of long duration. You see these you'd know. You're not all fumblebumbling around, "I wonder how Scientology compares to Freudian god." Or, "Is Freud god? Was Freud a religion, yes. Freud was god. Yes. "Wonder how it compares to that... I

wonder how this has to do with my case..." And you haven't got any time to do that. No time at all, boy. PC comes into session, and he looks; his eyes are pretty heavy. And the auditor doesn't know his auditors' code right down through the middle, does not say "You get any sleep?" No, he's so busy trying to find out which is the trim button and which is the plug in, that he can't notice anything about the PC. PC looks sort of gaunt, the PC doesn't look well at the beginning of the session, looks sort of gaunt. The auditor doesn't in a conversational tone of voice ask him if he's had enough sleep, if he's had anything to eat. Are you physically ill? Doesn't ask himself anything like that. No he waits 'till he's gone an hour and a half deep in the session, the PCs fallen on his head, if he doesn't know his auditors code.

The auditors' code is the auditors' code. It isn't something that is put there for no reason. For instance, eat and sleep are the only two things PCs have ever spun on. Back in the bad old days of the Dianetics Foundations we used to get every loony PC that could walk down the line. They weren't even PCs. They'd just let them out of institutions, and they'd walk in and they'd get audited. And a common denominator of those who were spinny in session, or who spun and then had to be rescued in some way, and heroic actions; I, we made a common denominator. What was in common to every one of these PCs? They hadn't eaten and they hadn't slept. And you, as an auditor, go and let somebody who has had insufficient sleep, which you don't know too much about as a case, are sooner or later going to wrap somebody around a telegraph pole. And he's going to spin for three or four days in a screaming state, man. Sooner or later this horrible experience will occur. That's why the auditors' code is the auditors' code. It has data like this in it.

So when a guy goes into session, he sits down, "Oh, oh," yawns. "Good to sit down." "Eave you had any sleep?" "Well, come to think about it, no, I haven't slept for a couple of days." "Very good. Thank you very much. You go get some sleep and then we will have a session when you are sufficiently rested. And I'm very sorry that this has prevented you from finishing the cycle of action of a session at this time." Indicating the by—passed charge at the same time. So you don't have to take it up in the next session.

You say you know your data so well that you know the guy is going to have by—passed charge by not being able to complete the cycle of action. So you take care of that then. In other words, you know your business. It's right on your finger tips all the time. You don't have to think, "What if you were riding a bicycle, thinking every thought necessary to balance the bicycle and steer it at the same time." You'll go into a ditch, man. Well, you go into a ditch with auditing, just like that, if you don't know these things, pang, pang, pang, pang. These are the things you watch.

Now, you, all of you know, you know, you know this data, you know it colds You know your auditors code, banger See? You don't have to think. "Let me see, what did it say in the auditors' code when the..." "To hell with that. You shouldn't even be wandering around, "I wonder what Ron meant when he wrote that part of the auditors' code, it had something to do with it. Now let's see. There's something in the bit of it had something to do with that." No kidding. I've heard things like this. The veda. Oh, come now. Look at India. That's known as invidious comparison. The word invidious means disgraceful or bad. Anyway, standard tech is just main line tech. These are the subjects, you take them up. These are the only subjects you handle in standard tech. They are the subjects of the grades. There aren't fifty

processes and actions in the entirety of Scientology. Now that isn't asking anybody very much to know, and know them so cold that he says, "Well, gonna do a rehab. Brrrrrr", bow wow bub zee zee, barb barb ding ding. Pow, pow, pow. And the PC says, "So and so, exactly therefore, bow, bang . Floating needle. "Thank you very much."

What's he rehabbing? He's rehabbing something completely catastrophic. You look over the list and horrors that this case is such an irreparable, resistive case, and so on. Do you get the relationship, now, do you get the relationship? Do you get what data you have to have? What data you have to have. What understanding you have to have. The grip you have to have on it. Nobody's asking you to know very much. But boy, what you do know, maaaaaan! You sure had better have a grip that is like steel bands!

PC sits down in the session, and right that moment, just with one casual glance, you've got it sorted out. He isn't even talking yet. You know, you're going to get in the Ruds and fly the needle, and so forth. You ought to just know where it probably is. It's just as easy as that. And you say, "There he is. That's what's wrong with him." There's nothing mystic about it. The guy will have an ARC break, or a PTP, or a missed withhold, or an overt, motivator. Now you're starting to get faint. See) It's getting less and less likely. And then you've got a whole bunch of things that, if it didn't go; if it didn't fly on that, if it didn't fly on that, then you go through a green form 'till it flies. 'Cause the person's hung up on something. He's PTS, he's doing something. And you normally will find out on your green form line.

Now you know the guy's been audited. He's been audited badly. And so on. Well, it's a lead pipe cinch. You do the same thing that you would do in any other way. Fly the needle, and take the general assessment form or an L4A, something like this. Whatever it was that you picked up the tool. You pick up the tool, you know the tool would be there. But, you're far better off if all of your auditing is against case supervision. You were either the case supervisor or you were the auditor. When the auditor is both the case supervisor and the auditor, he's sticking his neck out four hundred and eighty five miles 'cause he's violating it. He knows both the auditor and the PC. And if he knows the auditor and the PC, variables can enter into the problem. Do you follow? He knows the auditor, he knows the PC. Hahl He's violated two basic principles of case supervision. You never talk to the auditor about the case, you never talk to the PC about his case. As close as you come to talking to the auditor is the auditing report. As close as you come to talking to the PC is the examiners' report. And I can tell you now that you're a fool not to have both before you. When you case supervise you should have before you the auditing report in its' entirety, and you should have before you as well, the examiners' report on the PC. You say, "Well how you going to get that?" Well the PC always goes through the examiner, of course. Well how could you set this up if you were in private practice, if you'd be asked this question. Well, I don't know, I guess you'd have to appoint the next door neighbor or your wife or something as the examiner, and you'd have to train up somebody else to audit if you're going to be the case supervisor. 'Cause I can guarantee that if you're also doing the case supervision as well as the auditing you will wrap it around a telegraph pole sooner or later. Sounds weird, doesn't it? But the auditor and the PC always influence the case supervisor whenever they're vis—a—vis with him, and personal chatter on the subject of the PCs case, and personal chatter with

regard to the auditor with regard to the PC case, are the only two points I have ever found that wrapped my case supervision around a telegraph pole. Now there's another way my case supervision can be misrouted and upset, and so on, is by the PC not going through the examiner. The PC leaves the auditing session and leaves review through the examiner. Now this has the liability that the examiner is liable to be a sourpuss, and the PC says, "Oh, greats Boy, just made it! Wows" You know? And the examiner says, "Hm. Take hold of the cans." "Boy, that's the greatest session I ever had in my lifer "Yeah, that's what they always say. Yeah, good." And that would actually be after the fact of the examination, wouldn't it? So you could mysteriously have the PC cave in by a down curve from the examiner. But that'd be the only point left. The main liability of the case supervisor, the main liability of a case supervisor is a false auditing report. And he should protect himself every way he possibly can from a false auditing report. But he shouldn't go around talking to the PC. He shouldn't go find the PC, and look the PC up, and all this sort of thing. 'Cause his opinion on the thing is the case supervisors' point of view. And you can figure all you want to about why it is. It's an empirical datum. One that has been derived from experience. I have already cast up the number of cases on which case supervision errors have been made. They have been made by a case supervisor having seen the PC, and talked to the PC about the session. The error of errors are talking to the auditor about the session. And in, when those two points have occurred in case supervision, case supervision has erred. They color its Perhaps it's a cold blooded proposition. But, the case supervisor can be given a false report. He can be given an evaluative report of one kind or another. "Oh, the PC was in marvelous conditions" Pc's barely able to crawl out of the auditing room. That's why you want the examiners.

Now what you want from the examiners, simply, is the tone arm, the state of the needle, and what the PC says. Not in response to some examiners' question. Some examiner's going to say to you, "Now what do you ask the PC?" And your answer to that is, "Shut up. Don't ask him nothing." There's a sign on the desk, and it says "Examiner". The mere fact that he's given the PC the cans and checking the meter, he's got the PCs folder there, you see. That's enough. The pctlI say something And the examiner writes it down, and then the examiner must always say, Thank you very much." And that is the limit of his communication, because if you let them talk they'll start auditing the PC. So you cut that talk to a minimum. You're liable to see little forms being made up someplace, "What gains have you had in this session?" "Well I got a floating needle on this, and I had a cognition on that, now I... And there's a little thing that I thought was a little bit point there, and I wasn't quite sure what happened there, and so on. But I did get a floating needle on this thing. But I wasn't quite sure about the thing, and so on. And here the floating needle is busy packing up. And the examiner is a sure invitation to overrun, if the examiner is liable, is allowed to talk. The examiner's liable to talk. So the examiner can't talk. A little tiny bit. I can just see it now. There will be a form there, an examiners' form. And it has questions on it. Like, "Was your auditor nice to you in the session? Did he invalidate your gains? Did you really make your grade?" And that can kill, because it's too fast, too fast after the session. Somebody who is still part of the organization and part of, apparently, part of the line up, and a blood brother to the auditor sort of. And the pegs line is actually challenging him.

He isn't challenging him. So, just the sign there, and it says "Examiner", and folder, meter, give him the cans. He comes out, he can say "hello", give him the cans when he comes out. "OK, ta ta. Thank you. Thank you very much." And he can point which direction he's supposed to go. That's the end.

Now, the case supervisor has an independent tone arm, needle state, PC statement. And he can add these things up. The auditor says at the end of the session, that the pays TA was at 2.75, and the examiner report, right on top of it says 3.75. There was no F/ N at the end of session. It is a false report. Saves you an awful lot of trouble. You simply make out your next one, and say "Correct so and so, and do not send them to...", whatever the auditors' name was. Some other auditor. "Correct session so and so. Something went wrong" And then you get better. Because a false report has a tendency to be followed by a false report.

So we're getting down to something now that's very interesting, is that really only an organization can process. Successfully, and over continued long period of time, only an organization can process. And the individual practitioner may make a lot of bucks. Here and there you have a phenomenon of a guy who is tremendously successful as in individual auditor. He seems to be doing just great as an individual auditor. You follow their curves, they fall on their heads in a couple of years. It's an organization action. It takes the organization backup. Franchises fall on their heads by not having enough staff to perform all the actions of the organization. And they actually are totally dependent on organizations to perform a great many services. I couldn't even begin to list how many services an organization has to perform.

Therefore, apparently, apparently the individual auditor makes a great deal of money, and so forth. But it's usually for a limited time. Got to be backed up. A franchise got to be backed up by an organization. And the franchise is seldom sufficiently organized to stand by itself if it weren't for an organization someplace.

So this is, this is the thing. Now I want to call to your attention that the era of medicine was long and hard won, and so on. That the era of psychiatry is brief. But these practitioners, organizing themselves on a union basis, doing this, doing that, but practicing individually, they really don't do well. And they're not going to do well professionally over a long period of time. Because, outfits like us can suddenly move in sideways.

Right now they, they're worried about us, frantic, because we're getting all the business. There's a lot of cream stuff coming out of that field. They don't get that anymore. They're worried. They're worried about their appropriations. So it's an organizational action.

Now let's look at this as an organization, function. You've got a case supervisor. There's an auditor. There's an examiner. There's somebody that schedules sessions, even though that is also the review chief. See? You're already dealing with a minimum number. Now you can run one god—awful number of sessions through this line up. But if the auditor has to do all of his admin, the auditor has to do all of his opinionation, the auditor has to do this, and do that, he won't hit a hundred. He won't hit a hundred, because one day he's tired, or one day he's this, or he slips, and he doesn't catch his slips. And he gets optimistic about it. And he gets opinions, and side data starts hitting him. He wobbles, because he's talking to a PC all the way down the line, you see? A case supervisor's always got to have another auditor to

send the PC to. When he gets a false report in, what the hell else he gonna do? So you see the minimum size and shape and design of such an activity. Now, the auditor's business is simply handling the PC. It shouldn't be on anything else. And his business in handling the PC is just running very standard actions on the PC, and nothing adventurous. Running the PC rapidly to the highest possible gain level that he possibly can. Shooting him through the line. It's really a very simple action. But it's one of these simplicities that you have to be very, very brilliant to grasp. I say brilliant to the degree that you have to be brilliant enough not to be complicated. It's actually a very simple activity. But it is just about as complex as the lines that a certain number of functions and actions which have to be taken handling the PC, there's just a certain number of functions and actions. You start leaving some of these organizational setups out in the handling of a PC and something'll go astray. Similarly in the tech itself, something goes astray if you start leaving thing out, like "We never run present time problems anymore. No, the PC was released on problems, so he can't possibly have a problem. We don't know why the case is not changing at OT2." Anyway, the false report is about the only enemy that a case supervisor has, just getting back to that subject. Because it makes him think that standard tech isn't working, and is a wide open invitation to do something else. The thing that isn't working is the auditors' report.

Normally you would have started out in your career, and continued to do nothing but the very standard actions, if you had not also seen false reports, standard reports, have PCs evaluating for you as to what you ought to be doing for their case, trying to please people, trying to do this, trying to do that, having case supervision work given to you with which you did not agree. All these other thing come along and they finally wind you up in a ball so you don't know what the hell you're doing. Now what you're doing here is I'm straightening you all out straight and as narrow, and I hope you stay that way.

Thank you very much.

CASE SUPERVISOR DO'S AND DON'TS THE TOTAL RATIONALE AND BACKGROUND OF AUDITING

A lecture given on 30 September 1968

Thank you very much. And what lecture number is this? (Seven) That's right. We can still count. And what is the date? Thirty of September 1968. Nobody in the Sea Org can ever remember a day, by the way. Our weeks go 'round and 'round and 'round, and we can always tell you the date, but seldom the day. We have to go look for an almanac.

Well very good. Where we got to the other evening on processing, processing in England. We have to give this in both accents, don't you see? Fortunately I don't have to give these lectures in French. A fellow came along side the ship today and asked me if he could come aboard for five minutes, in French. And I told him, "Je, no PC PC para se go tu." Very handy. That's the totality of my French. It means I don't speak French, and then it adds the colloquialism "at all".

Well anyway, we, we got up to the line where we had some processes, or processes, as distinct from the subject, right? And I feel very good today because I, I've actually had some good wins. The provisional VIII's were busy auditing in Sea Org Qual today, and they were going down the line with a tremendous pocketa—pocketa—pocketa, and making mince meat out of cases left, right and center. And doing a very beautiful job of it. I shouldn't have this, but in the Sea Org Qual there were no student folders to amount to anything. There was just one, I think. And the student got away with it, the standard line was just a pocketa—pocketa—pocketa.

Anyway, the goal line, running very nicely. Now there's a piece of a line, although I'm going to talk to you about processes, I'm going to talk to you about what you have to do to keep a line in. A case supervisor must not operate by talking to the auditor, or talking to the preclear. His folders, before they come to him, must go through an examiner and, after the session must go through an examiner. So there's an examiner bit, a form, an examiner form in the folder, before he does his C/ S. Every time. And there's an examiner form in the folder after the session. This way you cut down the misses.

Now today there was a fantastic number of cases. Very large number of cases audited. Probably the output of a Saint Hill HGC, London HGC, Los Angeles HGC, went through the hands. Big quantity. Went through the hands of Sea Org Qual today, done by two auditors. The difference between standard tech and hunt and punch, you know the hunt and punch on the typewriter. It makes a difference. And in three of these cases it was possible, because the examiner line was in, and in very nicely and smoothly. All the examiner ever does, you see, is just put the PC on the cans, or the pre—OT on the cans, record the needle, marks whether it's a before session or after session examiner form, records the state of the needle, the position of the TA, and what the PC says. And that's all. He writes that down.

Well, in three out of a very large stack of folders, the PC, in actual fact, had been audited over a OT2. In three of them. Which is caught by the examiner. Although the rudiments were flown, although the PCs indicators seemed to be in, although it all seemed well at the end of session, between the time of the student leaving the session, which must have been minutes at the very longest, and his reporting to the examiner, why his needle slowed down. And his TA went up a little bit, 'cause he was audited over a present time

problem. And then, from his comment, of course it was obvious that he was audited over a problem. He could also have been audited over other things, and his comment would have reflected this, don't you see? So, it is very simple. The PC says something like, "Oh, well, that was a great review session. That was a fine review session. Except of course it didn't handle what I came in to have handled." Or, he says something like this, you know? And you know at that moment that he has something he thinks should be handled. See? Which is some peculiar thing, he's got three legs or something, in his estimation. And it is simply a wide—open invitation to get a case supervisor or somebody, to fall on his head. See? Or for the auditor to fall on his head. But the usual is done, but in this particular instant, why the auditor was actually able to fly the needle on rudiments while the fellow was sitting there with a hidden standard, or a PTP, don't you see? All of which is very, very easy. This is very easy to detect. This, from his attitude, from the fact that the end of the session to the examiner something happened to the F/ N, do you (see) Something happened to the TA. It would also detect a false report on the part of the auditor. In this case there were no false reports involved. There was simply a, the PCs comment was, "Well, you know", to this effect, "it was a great session, and I feel much better, you know, but it didn't handle what I came in to have handled", or something of this sort, you see? And you just detect from these facts that something is out.

Now you know something is out, but you also have detected a slightly resistive PC. And what the hell is this? He goes in to sessions, he gets an F/ N but it doesn't hold. Aha. Aha, aha. Now it's explained why this fellow was three months on OT2, don't you see? Now it's explained why he has a review folder eight inches thick. See, it all goes together. See? And you got a review folder eight inches thick. He's got a, he's got something out. He has been audited over out Ruds, or he has been this, or he has been that. Well there's several things which a case supervisor can do at this moment. And which the auditor then does, several things. One, he can get an assessment of the seven types of cases. Now he can find out what is wrong. Now of course if the auditor is an eager beaver and goes and flies all of these, now he makes it difficult to run a chain, because it is past an F/ N already. You see what I mean? 'Cause all he's done is key out former therapy, see? Well that's gonna key in right away. But now he's put an F/ N in the road—An F/ N, to that degree, is in the road. What you want is a strike, or a B/ D. Do you see? Just want to assess this thing. You don't, you don't assess this conversationally. You merely make the statement and make the strike. The PCs itsa, it doesn't exist, don't you see?

Now you've got it. Now you've got it. You can put in an R—factor, say, "I'm going to do an assessment here to assist case supervision, and you don't have to say anything. I'm just going to go over this." Browbowbow, teyowbowbow, teyowbowbow, teyowbowDow, teyowbowbow, B/ D, mwumEwmEmpow pop. Very good. Thank you very much."

Now of course the second examiner report isn't going to tell you very much, because the PC says, "Well I came all the way over here just to get this fellow sittin' here and saying something to me." But he may be very obliging and get something out of it. But that isn't the point. You want to find what you are going to blast down on to make this cease to be a resistive case. And now you put together the standard action for that particular case. You don't just fly it with itsa. See? You do something.

Former therapies, man, let's get these things listed within an inch of their lives. Do you follow? Let's get these former therapies. Let's find out all about that. Let's find out therapies similar to them in the past. Let's find out the thing misunderstood in those earlier therapies. Let's get this out of the line up.

Alright, now. Physical illness, we've got to determine how ill. If he's quite ill, and so on, we're not going to audit him at all. We're not going to audit him, that's all, until we get some advises on the subject of his physical condition. Now it doesn't mean that if he's physically ill he has to be turned over inevitably and forever to the MO, the medical officer, you see. But it does mean, it does mean very definitely that this is an outness. And that we are auditing uphill, because a physical illness makes such a severe PTP that it physiologically has to get some point of resolution. Oddly enough, there are things you can do to knock out a physical illness. There are quite a few things that you can do to knock out a physical illness. Most of them are under the heading of secondaries and engram running. And now again we're not knocking about running an engram by saying, "Do you have an engram? Good. That's a floating needle. Thank you." Crap.

What happened to the auditor who could run engrams, you see? I'm sure this will go out, I'm sure this will go out time and time again, that somebody will come around and say, "Oh, we never run engrams by chains anymore. That's old hat." You might as well say, "Well, auditing is old hat." It's a hot, fast, precise operation .

Now you can solve physiological illness on the basis of engram running. Very simply, very easily. You actually can solve physiological illness. Not by auditing against the specific, but simply by running the chain which is offering itself to be audited. Not by doing a recall release of it. Let's get rid of this damn thing. See? There is, will be, some chain in restimulation. I'm not going into the vast difficulties of how you find this, and so forth, and I'm not laying you out a rote process. I'm trying to talk to you about the theory of what you do.

Well, what do you know? It's elementary, in actual fact, but the physical illness the fellow has is on the engram chain in which he is sitting.

Now as you look at this from a "diagnostic" point of view, it won't make any sense at all if you try to figure out what engram chain he's sitting in. He is sitting in the engram chain which is giving him the illness. This is too simple, don't you see? He's manifesting the chain he's sitting in. Now the point is, is his reality up to running it?

Now trying to run a chain of secondaries on somebody, just that action. Trying to run a chain of secondaries on somebody. Your liable to get into something that is quite hot. In order to put the PC down the track into this chain of secondaries it is, it just, he just flies out of it. The charge, it's too charged an area. Yet you can find a chain that the person is sitting in of secondaries. And he sort of goes down the track, and he'll come back us the track to the one that was too hot to handle. He inevitably is sitting in what is wrong with him. You see, one of these wild things.

Now I'll give you one of these terribly difficult case supervisor problems. You have difficulty with a case. In auditing the case somebody missed on 5A. A miss on 5A is quite catastrophic. You miss on 5A your guy will probably wind up in ethics, or blowing, and so forth, within about 48 hours. It's the most positive thing you ever hear of. You run 5A wrong, bongo. It's quite

something, because it's a very powerful process. You see? So you run a weak process wrong and it won't do very much to the PC, but you run a powerful process wrong and god help you.

Alright, fellow walks in, his 5A was out, but the examiner was clever enough to notice and put a small note on the end of the examination, because the examiner also, also can make some remark that the case supervise; the examiner doesn't say anything, he doesn't say anything to the PC, but he can tell the C/ S any damn thing he wants to, as a note on his report form. Like, "PC came in in a wheel chair." You know, of some interest. Sometimes you'll hear this resounding name, George Alouicious Gulch, and it really sounds like something, and so on. And it's a little kid, five years old. See? And so your case supervision is affected by this because you would tell the auditor to simplify the auditing command and you might even simplify the auditing command for the auditor. Do you follow? Just so it communicates. Oddly enough, though, we are auditing currently, I think an eight year old, and we're auditing him with the full business. He apparently understands it all. And the funny part of it is, before Level 0 was run he couldn't talk English. It's all very mysterious. People had to sort of pidgin English, you know, anything that was done. All of a sudden they ran 0, and, "Well, what ARC break, what major change occurred in your lifetime?" "Da—da—da—da, yoppity—bop—bop—bop, de—ya—ba—ba—ba." And the thing of this is, it's the most adult session you ever saw in your life. It's the funny, the early part of the folder, you see is, is kiddie—widdie makey de signie, you know? And the suddenly, Level 0, and beyond there. It's certain they ran an awfully good Level 0.

So anyway, the essence of the thing in this particular instance, fellow walked in. He had two wrong 5A items. So just as a bonus the case supervisor noticed that he had a very bad burn on his arm. So I simply told the auditor to run the engram chain of the burn on his arm. He'd just burned his arm, so obviously he was sitting in it. And in addition to wrong Power. So we corrected the Power, found the, ran the burn, and ran it in chain, and wound up to the case complication of what made him blow. See when 5A went out he apparently burned his arm also. So he got back to a sort of a service far thing. Ran the engram down the chain to a period of about six years ago which, possibly was when he started blowing. Interesting.

Alright, now he is sitting in the engram, which is affecting him physiologically. Now there's several ways to go about this sort of thing. If a fellow's on OT 3 what do you do? You run down his present life and he can't, couldn't find any, and had one body thetan or something stupid like that. And you just find the this lifetime injury. He's naturally mushed it all together. Find a this lifetime injury and TA or no TA, meter read or no meter read, to hell with it. Push him into it, make him run it. Run him on down the track and run an Incident 1. It'll go straight to Incident 1, and it'll go long fall, B/ D, long fall, B/ D, bow—bow—bow—bow. Now the PC, if he's very status happy or something, is liable to come out of this explaining how this has nothing to do with him, and that there wasn't anything there anyhow. And that there wasn't anything there anyhow, and so on his reality level isn't up to it. His grades, actually, were never run. You can just keep up this process, and all of a sudden his reality level, "Hey wait a minute. How can I keep running that same incident, only it's a different incident every time? And I only had one, and I've now run three. I don't get any pictures because when

I went clear I ceased to mock up pictures, but I got these pictures. Is there some possibility I am haunted?"

Now it'd be a lead pipe cinch to take care of this "physiological, psychosomatic illness" on somebody with an unflat 3. But I can expect, over the years that all sorts of oddities and peculiarities will become invented as they have in the immediate past, so that the method of finding body thetans consists of getting him to scan over his body. Scan over his body, scan over his body, and scan on the right side of his body, the left side of his body, top of his body, bottom of his body. And nothing reads, so he doesn't have any body thetans. I don't know who the hell invented that but it walked in sideways and became standard operating procedure. It isn't. It's for the birds.

Now as you run a PC on this, this is a review approach, to a bird who can't manage 3. You've got to be sure that his grades were actually run. Now that's, that's important. The rehab of his grades before you start anything like this. That brings his reality up. The amount of charge off is proportional to the reality of the PC. So get the charge off whenever you can, however you can. Run some chains of this particular character of one kind and another kind. And there it is. The PC is liable to keep on explaining to you how it's all physiological and he ought to be, have his head cut off in surgery, or something. Actually the bird is dramatizing R6, which is full of medical doctors. And they carve away on a body, and oh man. The body finally comes down to nothing but raw meat, and then a skeleton. And the doctors are all so pleased. You know, just like they look, you know? That is, actually, totally in R6. Part of the 35 and three quarter day implant. Which is all pictures. You normally don't get to this section of it, because I have moved you up to the beginning of it and it all goes pfffEt! You don't get a full dress rehearsal of this. If you did, god help you. It's a killer. You'd only get it by dropping into the middle of it. But every once in a while you have the body thetan of a space man standing up on top of a cliff and jumping down and jumping up again, or you have an odd picture, a woman's head in a pit with a little baby along side the head. These, these are R6 pictures. And there's just tons of them. There's actually thousands of them. And this type of odd picture shows up. Something like this. Well actually, you try to run this too much on a; well, the, the guy who hasn't been up through the grades doesn't have enough charge off to see 'em, anyhow. He can be the effect of them, but he doesn't have enough charge off to see 'em. Do you see? He can sort of have it all keyed in, but he's not really there, and he's not looking at the picture. So you normally can run these fellows perfectly safely.

Now if you really knew all there was to know about everything under the sun, moon and stars in the way of pictures in the bank; you don't have to be an expert this way fortunately. But you would recognize something about it. Actually you can recognize it very easily by dating it. The date of R6 is seventy five million years ago. So you just say this stuck picture's at seventy... It seems to you that it might be something at seventy five million years ago. If it is, why something'll happen, and if it isn't you wouldn't get a read on the meter, if it is, and it's some other date, why great. But that would be a little bit tricky to fool with because it's a thirty five and three quarter day engram. Duration. Actually the duration can be much longer in the matter of duress. So it's a bit touchy, but the probability is of it being in restimulation is very poor.

But the fellow can be the effect of it. For instance, there is cyclical illness which is dictated in the various R6 implants. A fellow was forced to get sick at the age of five, followed multiples of five, and he's supposed to get sick from this and from that, and from the other thing. Measles and, you know he's supposed to have and that's certain. They predict his health, in other words. When he's fifty he's supposed to something or other. What they're trying to do is make a body cave in. See?

Problem R6 was trying to solve was overpopulation. With some 250 billion inhabitants on this planet, the average through this federation was 178 billion, hundred and seventh eight billion beings per planet. They didn't eat very much, they weren't badly keyed in. But they reproduced too badly. And somebody thought he had this as a problem, so he tried to cut out the whole population. Naturally what he struck at was the second dynamic. So where you see aberrated second dynamic you're looking straight at R6. Aberrated second dynamic, you're looking at the PC having gone through R6, or body thetans through R6. Second dynamic exaggeration of a great aberration on, overindulgence of, so forth. You're just looking at R6.

Now, running engrams can run into this zone or area, but the probability of them doing so, a person who doesn't have enough charge off to do so, is very remote. Now the incident in common to all thetans, body thetans, all kinds of thetans as a thetatype thetan, is of course the Incident 1. And when you clip the 1 that separates them out from the mass every time. But sometimes up the line they get impacted together on some other type of incident. It can be quite deadly, actually, occasionally, because a cluster of them exerting pressure and so on can really knock somebodys' block off. But there's something else that isn't totally understood about this by auditors. And that is simply this—that is doesn't have to be a cluster to knock your block off. It can be just one. And then you get the phenomenon, run this little tiny body thetan, he turns out to be a great big body thetan. Very fascinating. But people who are below 3 of course have all the phenomena of body thetans.

Now if you were red hot in running engrams, however, you would move your PC on down the track into something he could run. So therefore, if you are very, very good, and you are very hot on the subject of engrams, engram running and so on, all you have to know is, that if it goes more solid you go earlier to a similar incident.

Now I show you how you can really goof on this going earlier to a similar incident. You can start taking him down a chain of head injuries, and he dives sideways into being spanked. And all of a sudden you're running a chain of spanks, and you get an F/ N on spanked, and say, "Well that finished the head injuries so therefore I..." Nuts. Head injuries aren't flat. You have to go back and pick up that. Then the other thing is the criterion of when to stop running an engram and go earlier is not new material. I don't know who sold people on this new material. That's just one of the junior indicators. New material shows up, it's a real engram and it's running. But that's a junior indicator. It's not going to hurt the PC if no new material shows up. You run the engram until the guy comes uptone or goes F/ N. It is whether or not, whether or not the thing goes solid.

Now look, if it's going solid, he's running it Disowned. It's a body thetans' incident that he's running. So you get the hell out of there, boy. And go earlier. And sooner or later you're going to pick up one of his own. You get

the idea? And all of a sudden the thing will go F/ N, because he separates out from the body thetan. Don't you see?

So this is the criteria on which you judge the running of engrams. Don't think that a person got body thetans just because he got to Section 3. He's had 'em the whole way.

Now this funny business can show up. The guy has been out of valence all the way from ARC Straightwire, straight on through to the end of OT2. And when you get him on 3, he can be sitting there, bright eyed, without a single, damned grade run. All the grades have been run on b—thetans. That's possible. It isn't general. But it is possible. So sometimes when you find somebody on 4 that you can't rehab anything on, it isn't necessarily true that it didn't F/ N at the time. There's no F/ N now because that guy isn't there anymore. Now you get this odd phenomena. What the hell do you do?

Well the Ruds were out, and a lot of other things must have been out to keep him driven out of valence during that period. But of course the person the Ruds were out on at that time probably isn't there anymore anyhow. So the best thing about it is, is to detect it and, you take your life in your hands. Is it gonna be an overrun? Or is it going to be the original run? But that which you cannot rehab to F/ N has not gone F/ N. That which you cannot rehab to F/ N has not gone F/ N. It, after all of your trials and everything, and running your session with Ruds very definitely in, all of this, all the way down the line, if you still can't get an F/ N, it never did have an F/ N.

But this is validity which occurs mainly after Section 3 is flat. The greatest validity of that remark is after Section 3 is flat. Now you get this crazy combination could theoretically occur. The grade was run on him, he hits 3, he goes out of valence, and you're trying to rehab it on a body thetan which he didn't get rid of, which... You get the crazy combinations? But in all such cases this is a matter of charge. In all such cases this is a matter of charge. It's a charged case, the case is too heavily charged in order to approach any part of a reality. And so he can't get a reality on body thetans, he can't do this, he can't do that. He will natter and talk about, "Well it seems real to him, and do you really mean valences? And you know there couldn't be such a thing as this, ' and so on.

Well he's not necessarily a cluster, but the probability is that he's out of valence. The probability is that he has had a very severe this lifetime injury which has driven him altogether into one piece. The action involved is great. I mean it, you pick up an incident to run it on this fellow when dropped a penny on his little finger, and that's not the kind of incident. You don't necessarily rule out operations. But how savage an operation? See? How much, how much stuff? How, how violent was this thing? How long was he under anaesthesia? You know? That's the sort of thing that you're asking. You want a severe engram. And an auditor who has a hard time confronting also has a hard time asking for a real smashers Very often. They sort of detour themselves, you know? They say to the fellow, "Now do you have a very severe injury on the track someplace or another?" And the fellow says, "Severe injury. Well yes. I did have. I had an automobile accident, and I once dropped a box on my toe." "Well, we'll take up this box on your toe." That auditor's sitting in an automobile accident of his own.

Automobile accidents are rather to be very serious to run because there's automobile train accidents like crazy in R6. They have lots of automobile accidents, and trains running through it, and more automobile accidents,

and helicopter crashes, and there's lots of accidents. So these things are liable to be hung up through R6. So you don't run this type of incident, therefore the available charge on the case is of vast importance to you as an auditor. How much charge can you find on the case and where? Do you follow?

Now you get so fascinated with F/ Ns that when a case is quite, very resistive, you want to find an area which will audit for a while without F/ Ning. See? I love a good—ol' nine hour run on an engram, see? Now let's, let's, we've, the PC, the PC has got an engram chain that goes down to having been a medico in ancient Egypt. And he's got all the overts on the line of killing PCs, or something of this sort, or killing anybody who came in, 'cause they did mental consultation. They weren't PCs they were p—deads. Pre—deads, boy. 'Cause they had the right to kill. So alright, what do we do? What do we do here? Well, let's run it. Let's get down that chain. Let's get down that chain. Let's release this area. But let's release it by erasure. See? Now maybe there's something earlier than where it'll eventually go F/ N, but we've gotten charge off the case. You understand? Charge off the case.

Now don't pull a gag like this. As the C/ S says, "Find," this is an important operation see, because it's a hung—up 3 is what you're solving here. Guy's all hung up in 3, he didn't find any, and he's got psycho somatic illnesses, and he sneezes and goes hu, Am, hm all the time, but he didn't find anything in 1, and so on and yea, yea. Alright, well you get something like this, don't you see? And the case supervisor says, "Find a this lifetime injury," by which he means an injury, not by dropping a pin on his fingernail, and he prefers an injury to an operation. Because an operation is liable to take him straight back into R6. An automobile accident's liable to take him back there too. And so on. So if it's just a good, wholesome injury, you know? somebody dropped a safe on his head or something like that. And we run this, and we don't much care at the moment it's happening. And we begin this operation the case which has the smallest amount of reality when we begin this operation, we don't much care if there's any needle or tone arm action to amount to anything. We're gonna run it, it's gonna get more solid 'cause we're running a b—thetan, see? And we're gonna run it and so on. And then soon as he detects it more solid just find an earlier, similar incident.

Now, you as an auditor can goof. You can go over into some other chain. Your own confront goes down and you say, "This is too damn gruesome." Blood spattering all over the place. And the PC is sitting there, sort of nattering. And you find an earlier, similar incident. Now you want a similar, similar incident, earlier. Now you can run this back life after life after life. Actually one of these is very likely to wind up 750 trillion years ago. Now we don't care where it goes. That's not your purpose. You just want the earlier, similar incident, see?

Now when you finally get this earlier, similar incident that blows to FiN it will blow him out of all of the b—thetan crisscross, see? It's a very neat operation. And then you right away run an Incident 1. Got it? And very possibly his reality will still be so damn bad that he will; you know, he sits there, the meter blows up, you know? Long falls, blow downs, la—ti—bow—see, all the rest of it. That's just great. And he'll come up to say, "Well that didn't do anything and, The terrible draft, that's all, just awfull bad, you know, and so on..." Yap yap yap yap yap. See. You don't care anything about that.

Let's find another type of accident. Or, just ask for another Incident 1. Do you see? If Incident 1 didn't F/ N that time ask for another Incident 1.

Now in this way, by finding these various chains and going down them, you are actually running an unlimited method of releasing charge off a case. It F/ Ns on a chain by erasure. Well you obviously can't do anything but plow him in if you run more on that particular chain.

Now by chain, similar incident; it's "Having safes dropped on his head. ' That is the chain, which can go into "Having objects dropped on his head. ' But that's the chain. It's a chain of "Objects dropped on his head."

Now objects blowing him up, or dropped on his foot, is another chain. Now you can erase that to F/ N too. Do you follow? So it's the number of Incident 1s that you can run in the final analysis, 'cause that's the key charge. And all of a sudden this fellow says, "Wait a minute."

Now you can do all kinds of goofy things. A lot of goofiness can come in. People can come in and say, "The right way to find a body thetan is to have the individual scan his hands, or wahwhehwo." Or, "A person with lots of body thetans has a needle which hiccups." Or something, you know? Poof, poof, poof, poof, poof. No, no, no, no, no. That's, it's just, don't buy any of those things. See? What I'm telling you here is the straight dope. You want to go down the chain that you start out on. Until you get down to some area that will run. Run it to F/ N, dive down the bank with the guy, and run an Incident 1. When you've got the Incident 1 run, and it didn't F/ N bongobingo, try to find another Incident 1. Run it. And another one and run it. And another one and run it. And just have yourself just a little old ball.

Now if you don't know this about engrams you might as well quit. It is the earliest incident of the engram which holds the remainder of the engram in place. So you can start late in the engram, and it doesn't give TA action or erase. You can start late in a secondary. Now I'll give you an idea of how do you start late in a secondary. You try to run the secondary out of the fellow of his house being foreclosed, and it's all taken away from him. And for some peculiar reason best known to man or beast it just doesn't run. It goes more solid faster than it should. Well, as an auditor you ought to have some psychiatric treatment. Because you've disobeyed the first law. The first law of anything is the first inkling of anything, the first incident, the first, the first, the first, the first part of the first. You get it? There's not only the first or the earlier, but the first part of the first, you understand? You want the instant he first had an inkling that he was going to lose his house. And you will find more lousy incidents running than you can shake a stick at. Another thing is, an incident that is running eventually doesn't change it's material, but comes uptone. So if you use the criteria that the material didn't change in the incident, and therefore the incident is un—erasable, I don't know where that came from either. That is just beyond the only... It's almost a casual statement in old Dianetic running. And that is simply this That the earlier the incident, the earlier the incident the more basic charge flies off the later incident. You see? That early charge, ooh boy, is that important, see? It's the quality of the charge, now. And the earlier the charge is the more quality it has. See? Although you can say any charge off will increase the cases' reality, that's true. But the earlier that charge is, and the more close it is to the standard aberrative factors of the thetan, and those are represented in the grades, you'll wake up someday to realize that the grades, the subject of the grades are the things that aberrate a thetan. And

they're put together in that order, because they are the things which can be contacted in that order. Do you see? It's very tricky. Those are all the things that aberrate a thetan.

Now. You can slide over into a chain of engrams, a new chain of engrams after you've got this. Let's get therapy engrams. All of a sudden we've got therapy engrams. My god, he's been operated on, chopped up, bisected and finally you get down to a basic in space opera where they used to take him apart and leave him on a bench for a week because he was bad, see? And this is the basic on being operated on, see? Something like that. You can soar right on down through these cases.

Now we're really talking about a resistive case. When we're talking about a case that won't run on 3. This guy is out of valence. This guy has his identity all mixed up. He's got his engrams all mixed up. His memory is somebody else's. He's got everything and anything Disowned. Right? So, to solve this, so as to get him to get rid of his body thetans, not to solve his total reality because that comes at 7, you saw down through this line of anything that would make a bunch of thetans group together. Get the theory, see? It's just a bunch of thetans are going to scrunch, see? So the thetans go scrunch together. What would make a bunch of thetans go scrunch? Well, psychiatric treatment. One of the nastiest chains I ever saw in my life. I picked up some, couple of psychiatrists on a planet which is remote from here, had gotten hold of a girl and messed her all up. And of course she was already a group of thetans. And then they fixed her up second dynamic—wise and every other damn way that you could possibly think of. And then put her in some kind of a tub, and gave her electric shocks in a tub. And there was a burning electrode in the tub. They had a ball. They had a ball. And when the girl kicked the bucket for some how or another, by some carrier method, I don't know how, got here. Only of course as a being cluster, which is no longer even possible to pick up or run a body. All this cluster could do was just make people sick. And it obsessively attacked people. And those things are around. Now, when you run the engram chain you will run down to a point where they became a cluster. And it'll go down some chain, all of a sudden you've got that, and you've got what we call a melazzo. The second you run the mutual engram, the whole key of it is the mutual engram to them, they, a lot of them just go bingo—bango, blithth, leaving some on whom you have to now run Incident 1 to make them blow. See? That's the common sequence of this thing.

Because these clusters can be so vicious and so hard on a body, one is apt to think that all pressures; this is another one that's been introduced sideways in. Boy, people have been so god damned busy thinking, it isn't even funny. It is fascinating, you know? I find more of these damn additives. You know? Like, if the person has pressure on his body he must have a cluster. It doesn't follow, brother, it doesn't follow. One thetan can give plenty of pressure on a body. And to give you some idea of how much, how much horrible action can be thrown into a body, or how much action or stress can be put on a body by a thetan, last year I busted my back, my arm and my knee. They healed up very rapidly. But it was all in doing things that were beyond the... my arm and my knee—They healed up very rapidly—But it was all in doing things that were beyond the ability of a body to stand, pick up or resist, see? I could resist 'em all right. You, you get the idea?

So the guy himself can bust himself up. And you'll have the experience up

around 7 some place of trying to investigate like mad, "What the hell is this horrible pressure on my shoulder? I must have another body thetan. I this, I that, a dadada, oh my god. Wows" You know? And find out that somebody someplace in your vicinity a day or two before simply made a loud noise, or something of this sort, and at that moment you protected the body from it, to move it over sideways, and you haven't let go of it yet, you idiot. It's, it's goof things like this.

Somebody was way up the line came down with a terrible lot of nasal trouble. And so on. And I've forgotten exactly what they told me, but it was just that. They hadn't owned their immediate environment yet, and it sort of backed up, and were at the present moment holding onto their, their nostrils. Holding onto their nostrils, and here you had a, here you had an advanced OT section person who was ill. Holding on to her nostril. She found this out herself and let go of her nostrils, and miraculously in about three seconds about a set of operations worth of sinusitis cleared up, see? The medicos would have had a ball with it.

So, don't think that a guy also can't do this very reactively down in the vicinity of 3 and 4, or down in the vicinity of service far, or down in the vicinity of bm—bm—bm. All that's really wrong with a thetan, you know, is a thetan concentrates his actions onto just one of a thetans abilities. So a thetan who's in good shame has got all of these abilities, but some guy starts specializing in only this fixed ability. He can't do anything else. He's weak as a cat in all other directions.

So that you get, I think it was Jung, to mention infamous names; well I don't know that Jung is infamous. Freud, Broyer, the rest of these guys, they're just bandits. But Jung, I think it was, had a poltergeist phenomena. All he had to do was sit down in the room and a bookcase or something would split down through the center, see? Well any thetan can split up bookcases, hell, I mean that's easy. But he didn't know he was doing it. And it caused a lot of trouble. In other words, he was totally reactive on the basis, and totally non—recognizing. Improvement in a case is mostly meant walking it up the line to advanced realities and awarenesses. He's going in the direction of truth.

Now. So the handling of a case, the handling of a case, whatever process or process you're involved with is to get charge off. And there is certain main line charge which you must get off, and those are the grades. And the fastest way to get that charge off, and the most valuable charge to get off are of course the exact grade processes. And once you've done those, that's it, boy. That's it.

Let's say you start in and run a chain of engrams, and this is the one variable. You run a chain of engrams, and then you come along and you try to run the chain of engrams, that's gonna be an overrun. Right away that's gonna be an overrun. Nothing but. Because you're on the same chain the guy erased to become an engram release. He got onto the same chain. Well you're not likely to get on to it very easily unless you coax the bird onto it, and you say, "That chain wasn't flat." And you get what the content of the engram was, and then try to run the engram again. Now you're liable to get into trouble.

Now the reason why engrams run so easily out of this lifetime, and so badly in this lifetime, is the fellow has very few back track associations. He has some, but he has very few back track associations with body thetans. So theoretically the further back track he gets the less thetans he's got. You get

out of this lifetime, why you maybe only got a half a dozen thetans, or something like that, that are carried along with the guy. Do you see? So that it's a little bit difficult to run an engram in this lifetime, so don't be surprised when your chains rather rapidly go out of this lifetime and your engrams suddenly run. Because you're running the guy's own engrams. Do you see?

But your best bet is to find one in this lifetime and try to get it run. Because that splits up this. But you can never the less separate him out from the mass and increase his reality. But you see what you're trying to do. See what the design of the bank is, is what I'm trying to show you here.

Now you start main line processes and let us say we have released the guy now on Pr Pr 4, source, with those commands and on that subject, and we start to run it again. We are in trouble, boy, we are in trouble, because we're right exactly where he went release, and it now constitutes an overrun, and that is now going to be a mess. Right? Now you ask me, "What in the name of common sense is an S and D, but the isolation of source?" Well isn't it funny, you can run quite a few S and Ds on somebody. You can run at least a W and an S and a U; S and D on them. And as a guy goes along and gets PTS from some other quarter you can run another S and D. One of your sins is running too many S and Ds and trying to run S and Ds on people that don't need S and Ds. Now that's the main sins. Running too many S and Ds, and running S and Ds on people who are not PTS. I mean, those are auditor, case supervisor sins. You show me a big, fat folder that's got forty two S and Ds in it and somebody was nuts, boy. All they were doing was hanging him up with wrong items, so of course he got more and more frantic about it, because they never did find the suppressive. So that was a misalignment of source. So they're giving him wrong sources. And these wrong sources will hang up. And he'll keep these mocked up very nicely. That's why you straighten out lists. A lot of work to straighten out lists. Quite a skilled operation, actually.

But, in the net gain of this, that is the subject of one of the Power processes. Every time you ask a fellow how he is you're running conditions. When you say to him, "How does it seem to you now?", and so forth, why you're running some, the subject certainly, of 5. This is the elementary actions. Do you follow? But you try to run the process itself, again, uhhhhh. Murder and sudden death.

Now, I have seen the remark in a review folder, and I hope I never see it again, "Mid Ruds have been overrun on the case." I've also seen the remark, "Ruds have been overrun on the case." Well this could mean only that the auditor didn't quit when he got an F/ N in that session on that chain of ARC breaks. That would be an overrun. But ARC breaks run all the way. They run all the way from the minus scale to OT8. The phenomena of ARC breaks. As long as you're in this universe, and as long as you're alive, the phenomena of ARC and U holds true. And you get up around OT8 someplace it doesn't matter much. But the net result here is that the case supervisor and the auditor, they have a problem. And that is the case which is resistive. You have find some charge to take off the case, without overrunning the case. And that's why when you take a resistive case assessment and you, the auditor, flies the needle on each one of the subjects and thinks he's doing something, he's just cut the case supervisors' throat. Or if he let's it be itsa'd he's just cutting the case supervisors' throat, because it's liable to F/ N.

Now you have the, the rather touchy business of instead of being able to dive in on this therapy chain and take off BD, BD, fall, BD, you know, bong—

bong, another incident, fall, BD, fall, fall, fall, you know, BD, long fall, BD, fall, another incident, you see? Instead of being able to do that you're already going past an F/ N. You're liable to get a protest on the thing. It isn't keyed in, it isn't available now. Do you get what the difference is? So actually to this degree you are prospecting for charge. So it's just great to fly the needle on everything. That's just great. Only as long as the case is running well.

Now let's take the case that he got his review, his case supervision was quite competent, his auditing was quite competent, and he goes to the examiner and his free needle has packed up between walking the way from the auditing session to the examiner. And he says it was a great review, but it didn't handle the pain in his left lumbosis. You know now you have a resistive case. That's what you know. Because the normal action, not the usual action 'cause these are all usual actions, the normal action that you would take with a case didn't fly it. The needle F/ Ned and so forth, but on those things there's something sitting around some place that isn't released.

Now your problem is when this happens on lower grades you've got all the phenomena of 3 to kick the PC in the head. Naturally he's got problems. Naturally he's got, not necessarily problems, but he's got all kinds of oddities. Do you follow? So our problem here, now what do we do? Well, you do a resistive case assessment to find some area of charge. And then you set it up for the auditor to discharge that area. And when he gets that area discharged he's gonna get some change in this case.

We have to know what area the case is really hung up in. Now a case which is out Ruds, let me give you some idea. A case which is out Ruds, Christ we can put in Ruds cleeeear back to the beginning of the universe. And we can put in ARC breaks until hell won't have it. Oh yes. One of the ways you trigger this, you see, is to ask him for serious ARC breaks. Similar serious ARC breaks. He isn't gonna F/ N on that right away. And he'll look this over. One of the ways of doing this is some version of, well it's just, it's itsa. He's gonna do it by itsa, you're going to go earlier. So you're doing these little scales all the way, see? You're doing these little scales. Well you bleed them for charge. You always do A—R—C—U, C—D—E—I. And now if you really want to start bleeding down on ARC breaks or something, you ask for one that ordinarily doesn't come up. That's a side panel. Incomplete cycles of action. If you were to find a PC who said in an ARC break, he's a rather resistive PC, see, and you found that he had a hell of a time with reality. Hard to get a case change out of him. And he says, he says something like this. "Hell, they didn't let me finish it." Oh well, you just start running incomplete cycles of action and tracing back earlier incomplete cycles of action, and earlier cycles of action, and they're all ARC breaks. And do your scale on them too. Of course the ARC break is actually the incomplete cycle of action, because that causes an ARC break.

Now also overruns cause an ARC break, so what has been overrun tends to cure ARC breaks. Now if you run "What has been overrun", while being alert for ARC breaks, you can get more charge off. You can play it against itself.

Now if you're very clever when somebody says, "Prep check 3," or something like this as a case supervisor, your ears are right straight up and very alert to catch any ARC break that shows up. You see? "On Section 3 has anything been suppressed?" "Ba—baba—ba—ba—bam—bam—bam." "Was there an ARC break there?" "Yes." Starts to run just a little bit too long, don't you see? And so forth. Well catch the ARC break.

Now if it flies on an ARC break can you finish the prep check? Well unfortunately no. But on prep checks on 3 you're peculiarly liable to get off into an ARC break chains And it's one that you should know. It's a standard datum. Everything I'm giving you is a standard datum. The rundown, then, of rudiments, the rundown of secondaries, and the rundown, these are chains, chains, chains, and the rundowns of engrams, can be done on any case below 3. They can be done on any case above 3. So therefore, these are very fruitful areas where you look for charge. You got it?

You want to increase a pcs' reality, you just generally remove charge from the case. If you want to increase his reality, in removing charge from a case, you remove the highest quality charge you can get. Do you follow?

So, the processes, then, are a little ladder that goes up this, which have exact rungs. And then there's this sort of bigger rope that you can climb up on both sides. Now one of these little rungs, they handle that whole subject. They key out that whole subject. The guy feels great on this whole subject, see? But there is still all kinds of this on the case.

Now if you understand this, if you understand what you're doing, you understand the mechanics of this thing, you won't get wrapped around a telegraph pole by somebody telling you something stupid or silly. It is always better to audit against an understanding of what the devil you're handling. And that's why I like to teach you not against rote. There is rote. There is rote in standard tech the like of which you never heard of. But I want to tell you what is going on. You don't have to figure it. This is why, what rote there is, is there. Now if it's itsa, and earlier incident itsa, and with ARC breaks, a scale that you can assess each time, you've got a totally unlimited process. And similarly on green forms you are very soon going to, if you run too many green forms on somebody, you're very soon going to have done too many S and Ds. You're going to have done too many remedy Bs. There is what's the trouble with a green form. You can do as many green forms as you like, as long as you don't do too many lists on them. 'Cause those lists, that very soon runs into an overrun. because listing is a sort of a process. And it has a limitation.

But if all items of the green form were simply itsa'ed, or earlier run with itsa, and the ARC break with the ARCU, CDEI, if earlier, runs. See, itsa or earlier itsa. It's itsa or earlier itsa. Itsa or earlier itsa. "Any earlier, similar incident?" I don't care what, what came up on the green form. See? Horse chestnuts. We don't care. Good. Horse chestnuts, horse chestnuts, horse chestnuts. Good. Is there any earlier, similar horse chestnuts? See? That's your, that's your bible.

Therefore, I don't like to give you a whole bunch of canned questions about what you say on a green form. You can ask the PC about this subject, and it doesn't become a rote process. And therefore it doesn't have an opportunity to get overrun. Do you follow? So you're asking about this subject. The subject is what is important.

Now, when you run a green form and then you try to run five or six process—type questions, or Qs and As, big additives of this particular character, you wrap the PC around a telegraph pole. So the only thing you are asking him for, the only, only, only thing you are asking for on a green form, is the subject of the green form and earlier, similar thing on the subject of the green form. Horse chestnuts? Itsa, itsa, itsa, no F/ N. Earlier horse chestnuts? Itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, no F/ N. Earlier chestnuts. Earlier, earlier, F/ N.

Now your only liability in this particular instance, the thing didn't read in the first place. So you have to be alert at every turn for one, a false read, and two, a suppressed read. They're both 'he sides of this coin. I'll give you an actual example. The other day a fellow went into session and didn't like the auditor, and asked for a missed withhold. It didn't read, so as long as it didn't read he didn't say anything.—The idiot. And the auditor said, "That's clean", and went on by the thing. And PC, at the end of the session, fell on his head. Naturally.

Now exactly what was wrong there? Was a missed withhold suppressed? But, by looking at it. You don't have to ask suppressed every time. But by looking at the PC you see there's something there. Learn to look at the PC. You say, "Horse chestnuts?" And, PC, "Yeah? No, no horse chestnuts." "You say on horse chestnuts, has that horse chestnuts been suppressed?" Bwooom! See? "Mmmm." "Alright, good. Tell me about that. Anything." And all of a sudden you've got a chain that has never come up in view, and tells you why the green forms never succeed on this PC. The subject is suppressed.

Now the other reason the green forms don't succeed on PCs when they don't... There are two other reasons. One is because somebody overruns the lists that were called for on the green form. The other one is that the thing has falsely been reading for time immemorial. He had, he was out in lower Walla Walla, and some auditor had a new E—meter he didn't know how to run. And he'd heard that you're supposed to ask for missed withholds, or withholds, and he asked for withholds the same time he hit the tone arm with his thumb. And the fellow said, "Well you've got a withhold. It read." And the PC says, "Uuuuuuoo dooo." He had to think about it. "Well, what was that. What is it. There must be one there." So the question goes live, and five, six, seven, eight years later the question is still live. And the PC is around the bend trying to answer this thing that never read in the first place. You got it? That's true of any read. All you know as a Class VIII when an E—meter reads is that the E—meter read. The chances are it read in response to what you asked the PC. The chances are in favor of that. But that's all you know about it. Now if there's anything the least bit odd about the pcs' response, anything the least bit off, you check that read. You check for false reads. And you're sitting there and the PC has been going natter, natter, natter. "Do you have a present time problem?" "Oh, yes. Everyone is so mean to me. And they've stolen my shoes lately. And oh, natter, natter, natter, natter." "Do you have a missed withhold? That's clean." Oh, Christ, learn how to audit. That's what I always think when I see one of these damned things. For Christy sake learn how to audit. You know? Critical PC, missed withhold.

Now that it didn't read doesn't mean anything. Because you might not have made an impingement on the PC to the..... You know? He might not even have heard you. It might be suppressed. Now if the PC gives the manifestations of a missed withhold, and the missed withhold question doesn't read, you ask suppressed. Naturally. You've got to work with reads. You're not a phonograph record. At Class VIII all you know is that the meter read. On something. It read on a passing car, it read on the moon going into another phase. The chances are it read on what you said. But the chances are simply slightly in favor of that. Do you follow?

Now the other thing is, is when the meter doesn't read. What you know is that the meter didn't read. And the chances are in favor that that is OR. But

it is not anything you can take for granted. And if the manifestations, this PC comes into session, "Oh yes, ah ah ah I ha hai." (Crying) And you say, "Do you have an ARC break? That's clean. Thank you very much." Oh boy, you're not going any place from there on, boy. I don't know what you're doing behind the wheel of a car, but you're not drivin'. The chances are very greatly in favor of having an ARC break. It's not inevitable. Maybe she's just like that. But well, you say, "Do you have an ARC break? It didn't get a read. Has anything been suppressed? On ARC breaks has anything been suppressed?" I don't care how you say it. You want to get the suppress off the ARC break, if there is a suppress on it. And it goes zoomp. "OR. Do you have an ARC break? That reads."

Now you can get into this kind of a fire fight. "Do you have an ARC break? Has anything been suppressed? Do you have an ARC break? That reads." And it's a protest read. So the PC says, "Oh, I don't think so." "Alright, has anything been protested?" Didn't read. "Anything been suppressed?" Read. "Do you have an ARC break?" Read. "I'm afraid you'll have to answer the question." What you've done is prove that the meter read. Do you see? So in moments of doubt you either prove it read or prove it didn't read. See?

You are the guy driving the meter. And it is a very, very remarkable instrument. There is a meter, and I think it sells for 595 pesetas or dollars. I think the dollar has dropped below the peseta now, anyhow. Well, after all, MacNamara did his best. And in his best he got us a war with Viet Nam, and ran the country into deep debt. And as a reward he was made the head of the World Bank. Anyway, did you know that? I think the most remarkable things happen on this planet. It's just time we got busy, you know. How anybody could sit around and watch this one. The guy runs the country into debt by spending three—quarters of its' income on a military activity that didn't have anything to do with the price of fish, and as a reward they make him the head of the World Bank, which is the one loaning the money to the country in order to pay for the war. You didn't notice that going on? All these things happen all the time. So, it's actually time you got busy, see?

So what you know in driving this thing is that it's a damn good instrument. The 595 kerputnicks medical meter that is sold currently, reads only on body motion and passing cars. I know. I've taken one, I've tested one, I've tried to run somebody on it. I tried to do something with it. And it does nothing but run body motion. It is a very remarkable meter. Very, very, very remarkable. Because the thing reads more on the think than it does on the body. And it reads so little on the body that it doesn't even get in your road. It's a very remarkable meter. By the way, the name of it is very proper. It's really an electro psychometer. And psych in the dictionary means soul. And anybody who calls anything else an electro psychometer would be telling a lie if he used it on a body or on disease. (Do you get the point) It's an electrical means of measuring the spirit. That's exactly what its' name says. Electra psychometer. It's called for short E—meter. Somebody has come along and put on the recent labels of it, electrometer. They're trying to shorten the name down. But the proper name is an E—meter, or an electro psychometer. Now. It's a very remarkable instrument. But like all instruments it won't operate without being operated. And you, as an auditor, have got to have confidence in the instrument, confidence in what it says, and you've got to know what it says. And it says there was a charge there of some kind. Now the charge could have been restimulated by the environment, or the charge

by the environment suddenly impinging on the PC. He had a bite by a fly in his left ankle. Or, it is by your question. And some fidgety PC that's leaping all over the place all the time, it could be a body motion. I don't let my PCs leap all over the place. I don't know why you let yours. My PCs always sit very still. Quite remarkable. I've never had a PC move in a session to amount to anything. And I thought oh wow, I was holding them. Anyway, if a PC keeps knocking the hands together give him a one hand electrode. He clever. You don't have to strap him up.

But the point is you know the meter read. The tone arm's quite reliable on anything. Very reliable. There is a slight thing that a meter will have to warm up sometimes during a session. But the tone arm is very, very, very reliable. What it's doing, actually, is measuring the density of the mass in association with the thetan, is really what it's doing. It's the amount of resistance in the mass which is connected to the thetan. So actually you can lean on a wall and get the tone arm reading on the wall. Quite interesting. A tone arm doesn't just read on the body. It reads on what the thetan is connected to with regard to it.

Actually, if you... The male and female figures there have been worked out carefully, and it might be of interest to you that they are taken from the United State Army ohms resistance on dead bodies. And the first work that was done on this, they went around battle fields for something, or in morgues or some place, measuring dead bodies. And so, they worked out a pattern of how you went about this. So I extended their work a little bit and got these positions. But dead bodies go from five to twelve, five hundred.

So when you have that read you are then only reading on the body. And you're not now reading on the thetan. When it flies you have lost a connector. Do you see? And it's the live—ness is the float of the thetan, but the tone arm position is the density of the body, not the density of the thetan.

Now, when the tone arm position is high it is because there's a lot of thetan impinged on the body. There could be a lot of thetans impinged on the body, which we learn in 3, or a lot of thetan. When you're going to start going above 3 they sometimes start driving you out of your mind. Every time you go on the meter you're about 4.5 or something stupid like this. And then you find out finally what you're leaning on. But the main point here is that you're dealing with a highly reliable instrument. The efforts to curtail or to injure the distribution of the Emeter or forbid its use or something like this are quite cunningly slanted. And because the E—meter is very important. Fortunately almost anybody can build one. If you know the exact circuit. And you don't let somebody depart too far from that circuit, why they're very easily manufactured.

And they give you, they give you the done. But you have to know what dope you've got. If the read is above three it is not a body read, it has to be thetan or mental mass to push it up there. And that can be composed of one or more beings. And oddly enough when overruns occur anywhere along the line, why the tone arm goes up. And that is what causes the thing. The guy has been too long at it. The guy did it once too often. And that is the basic reason for the height of a TA.

Now if you go too frantic on this subject, why you'll have a bad time. I've seen C/ Ses and auditors go absolutely frantic. They've got to get the TA down in the next two minutes. There is no reason to get it down in the next

two minutes, two or three session are perfectly adequate for somebody. But all you do is keep clicking charge off, and overruns, and so on. There is a fast way to get it down. It's just the indications of overruns. Indications of list. Indications of BPC. But it doesn't always stay down. It then goes up. This is the lick and a promise. Locate the BPC on the thing, and something like that, and you start blowing the meter down. But the main thing that you are interested in is getting it down so that it rides in a normal range. Well how do you get it there? Well now, to get it down you've got to have someplace to take charge off the case. Correct? Well the way you take charge off the case to find overruns and rehab 'em. Now you take one of these fat folders that comes from the Ching Wong Tao Organization, and because they couldn't get all the books translated into Chinese or something, they don't know some of the hot dope. And they've been listing folders and they've got folders which are six inches thick. And so on. You actually could start taking charge off to get a tone arm down just by going back and finding the over lists, and calling them to view and indicating them and finding the item, and so on, and so on. It'll do things for the case too. It isn't necessarily what's got the tone arm up. Don't bet on the idea that you have to find out what the tone arm is up on in order to take the tone arm down. You can drive yourself nutty this way too. "What is making this tone arm go up? What is this thing? What is this thing? What is this magic thing that we are looking for? Oh, there must be some clue to this. It must be some specific overrun, some place." Hell, I wouldn't try my wits on it. I'd just find an early overrun that would shoot the later one.

"Do you ever get tired of doing something? Good. Is there an earlier time?" Now I'll show you a real one. It's the velocity of the question. This is not necessarily something you'd with off on a PC, but I'm just showing you mechanics. You could say to this PC, you could say, "Did you ever get...?", and they'd choose something, see? Serious ARC break, this thing here. "On the whole track, on the whole track did you ever kill anybody?" Well, you best believe, you know? "Naturally." "Well, good. Now we're going to find the chain of killing people." How far back do you thing that's going to go before it F/ Ns?

Now I'll give you an even worse one. And this you shouldn't use, it's out of 7. "Trace back moments of guilt to basic." Don't use that. But you can take something like the person's feeling guilty. Now you could make a little, a little list you make up, see? Then that doesn't shoot the whole thing to glory. That's why you make up these little lists. See? It catches, some side panel, if you're gonna run down. But there's charge on it, see? You make up this little list. And you're going to have a murder, a battle, anything you could think of, see? With five or six words, you know? Armies, wars, see, something like that. Then you assess what reads. And wars read. "Good. We're gonna go down the war chain." It read so it must be charged. We already have...

Now where do we pick up the clue of this is from the itsa of former sessions. We get a track of this. This fellow says, this fellow says, "I'm just... Heing drafted fills me with horror." That's just in passing, itsa. See? Well, there's certainly something about armies, soldiers, battles. See? There's going to be something someplace. And he gives you a whole chain you could run. See? Now we didn't evaluate for him because he said it. See, we found this in his itsa, see? We've heard it in his itsa, so we take this, and then we expand this out so that is catches more area. And we find what part of that area it reads,

and then we don't fly it with a glimpse, we run its See? Christ, change PCs left and right.

Now let's take one like, this girl has got a very bad ARC breaks she says, when actually it's a moment of a loss. Somebody has, has left her, and doesn't love her anymore. And this reads as an ARC break, and so on. Well you can run it as an ARC break by specifying what the ARC break chain is about. Which is love. Now where the hell do you supposed that would wind you up? Now They've told you the ARC break's about love. So you just start running earlier ARC breaks on the subject of love. This is a very heavy subject, because it's right along side of affinity. And you can run a awful lot of chains Do you follow?

You're now in the business of finding things to audit. But you don't bother ever to do this unless you've got a guy; you could do it for practice; but you don't bother to do this unless you've got a guy who isn't running well. Then you get the assessment, resistive cases, you find the zone or area in which he is apparently hung up, or that's hot, and then you find something associated with that that you can run a lot of charge off of. And you go right on down the bank on this. And you blow it, and you're gonna change your guy. You see how it's done? That's the formula. Therefore you can do this as a C/ S, unless you've got auditors, of course, that just take the list and fly the needle on the whole list. And you can get a lot of charge off the case.

Now you get a Motif charge off the case on something the guy is hung up on, his psycho somatics disappear, and so on. See? Now the guy is not in hospital, his sickness is a PTP to him to some degree, but it turns out it's physically ill. He's physically ill. Alright. If he is physically ill you have to make up your mind what you're going to do about this physical illness. Now is it something that has to be treated? And can be treated? Or should be treated, in order to knock it out? Do you see? Well there's a funny, a funny thing about this. You can get this treated, and you usually better damn well had, but at the same time you'll find out it very often doesn't get well until you audit it. I've seen, I've seen penicillin hang up for six weeks until the chain was run the made the guy sick. Now because he was on penicillin he didn't kick the bucket, do you see, and it did do a lot for him. And it tended to straighten him out, but he would up with a wheeze, or something. Don't you see?

Now after you've done something for the acute state of this illness, or it's been treated in some fashion or another, now you can go in and run the engram on it.

Now you'll go on down that chain. What kind of sickness? What sickness chain are you going down on? Now the trick about it is he's physically ill, and if you start auditing down an illness chain you're liable to miss it completely. Because it isn't that he is physically ill, it's the fact that he's suffering from bullets in the back, you know? He's got arthritis. And he's suffering from bullets in the back. And so on.

Well, the trick of assessment in action there, would be to find really what is this guy ill from. Well it's to find out what is he sitting in. And what is he sitting in? Now there'd be several ways of discovering what he was sitting in. And what do you know? You could list it. You don't list it to F/ N. You've got one of these crazy lists. You can make a list of what kind of an engram is it. It'll obey the laws of listing, if you want it to obey the laws of listing, but there are a whole bunch of questions which don't follow the laws of listing

because they're not list questions. What has been overrun? It doesn't go to one item. It's not a one item list, because it's not trying to locate source of anything.

So you can say to the fellow, you can say to the fellow something on the order of, "What are you, what are you afraid of?" Now you could list that to one item, but you could simply ask him, "Well, have you ever been afraid of that before?" And run a whole series of secondaries. And so help me Pete, the illness it liable to fall right out in your lap on that chain of secondaries.

Now when you've run some secondaries another type of engram outflows and flies on secondaries, so that you've got something else that's got to go down. Do you get the idea?

Now that you can audit so fast we've got to figure out ways so that you can audit slow. Do you see how it's done? And do you see why?

Now, what I've given you is actually in this lecture, the total rationale and background of auditing. There isn't anything much lies along side of it. And unless you add a bunch of weird, odd facts coming in, such as, that in order to find out whether or not a person has body thetans you should scan the thing up and down. Nuts. The way you find out if somebody has body thetans is can you run an Incident 1? That's simple. Now if you can run an Incident 1, but he's just mocking it up, well that becomes an overrun, so you better rehab it. But, if you're running an Incident 1 which another thetan, Incident 1, and that gets overrun, you rehab that too. You're not in any danger, but this is how you find out if there are body thetans. Because that is the mutual incident. The mutual incident of all thetans is Incident 1. Quite a trick to find it. Anyway, I hope the information which I have given you will assist you to study the exact rote actions which you take, because this is the rationale which makes the rote actions rote.

Thank you very much.

CERTAINTY OF STANDARD TECH

A lecture given on 1 October 1968 And what number lecture is this? (Eight) Now we know somebody missed one. Eighth lecture, one October 1968, AD18. The substance of these lectures should not, of course, be delivered with total ferocity, because up the line someplace the Saint Hill course will teach its' teachings, and academies will teach theirs, and somebody will pay attention to the information which is contained on that. And someday in the future the Class VIII course will contain auditors who can audit. And that would be very nice. I now find out that most of the data concerning listing is actually still extant on the Saint Sill tapes. This was a great mystery. It's merely that people hadn't studied them. Now, in view of the fact that clay table demonstration has gone out very thoroughly over the past year or two, we can expect, well people did a demonstration. A corny demonstration I heard about today. The little blob's the auditor, and a little blob was the PC, and the ARC break was a busted line between the auditor and the PC. My contempt. You're dealing with a bank, and the bank is in the PC. What is the mechanism? What is the mechanism in that bank that occurs? The most deadly sins of auditing are, of course, auditing without any comprehension of the laws of listing. These are, that is a deadly sin. It can wrap a PC around a telegraph pole. And I mean those laws of listing which were put out in a bulletin in 1968. And any one of those not followed can wrap a PC around a telegraph pole. It is very serious. It is sufficiently serious that five PCs audited in a row on an auditor who did not know the laws of listing, and so on, and who didn't know these faces, had trouble, each one of them, with ethics. Almost immediately, within some forty eight hours. And it goes something like this. Out tech results in out ethics, then out ethics has to be put in heavily in order to hold the line to get tech back in. If tech were perfect ethics would be unnecessary. So you see that an auditor who doesn't know his business opens the door to ethics. And the degree that tech has gone out is a direct measure of the amount of ethics which has to be put in. Direct. This has been the subject of actual test. Now it may not occur to somebody that I am telling you facts. I am not telling you my ideas. Because I say it is true is no reason it's true. Because I'm telling you what it is, is because it is true. And anybody who has an opinion that differs with Ron's, anybody in the world can have an opinion that differs with mine. But you see, I'm not telling you opinions. Now when I give you the data of Scientology and the unraveling of the problems of the mind, I am not giving you my opinions. I am giving you facts! And they don't compare with your opinions. Your opinions haven't got anything to do with it, and my opinions don't have anything to do with it. You understand me? Out tech normally stems from some kook who gets an opinion. And he thinks freedom of think has something to do with truth. He can think all he pleases, he can have all the opinions in the world, but when he goes into an org and indulges in one of these god damned opinions that throws tech out, shooting is too good for him. An opinion of this character, "Well, if you get a floating needle on engrams then you can never run any more engrams." That opinion was bought once into Saint Hill. Big discussions on the subject. Would you please tell me how you could ever run 3 if it was true? So all you have to do is think it through. Know your business and think it through. And you will be able to differentiate the opinion from the fact. Now if clay table demonstration can go out in the year 1968, it can go out in the year 1975. Other things can go

out. But it is not possible to predict what will go out. Because there can be an infinity of wrongnesses around any rightness. There is actually no predicting under the sun, moon or stars what any academy or Saint Hill student will suddenly assume. Because aberration is a bunch of stuck lies. So some teaching comes through, the truth comes through, it misses this guy to the degree that it restimulates some fixed idea. Now I'll tell you how fixed an idea can go bad. Somebody has been taught for two or three thousand years that man is basically evil. You tell him man is basically good. He considers that a belief, or a religious teaching and wa ha he beze... your idea. To put it lightly, because he's crazy. Now you can prove that man is basically good for this reason. overts read as overts. Not because he's been taught that it was bad to do it. He doesn't get well unless he gets his overts off. When we process a person he becomes better, more ethical. His ability rises. Now look, if he was basically evil he would get worse, more stupid. Do you follow? So all you have to do is think the think through. On the face of it it proves itself. There would be no reason under the gods' green earth to process him at all if he were evil. Because all you would do would be to run out all the things that taught him to be good. And you would wind up with somebody who was stupid, vicious, couldn't do anything, did nothing but loaf. Yes, but processing demonstrates the complete reverse. Somebody's around feeling tired, feeling tired. And he can't work and all that. Well that can't be a native state, because when you process it he gets ambitious and works. But you haven't educated him, or taught him to get ambitious at work, you simply ran out his blunted purposes, his betrayed intentions. He had some good intention, he was trying to do something and he got kicked in the teeth too often. And then he gets tired. So that auditing, is in actual fact, a subtracting process. And the final product of auditing demonstrates that man's basically good. Now in Christian countries men are taught that man is basically evil. So, you say this to this character you're trying to teach. "Man is basically good, auditing is a subtractive process and takes away the evil deeds and out of valences and into evil valences." And so forth. "And the fellow gets better and he gets more moral, and he gets more perceptive, and he gets more able, and he has more energy, and so forth." He knows you're... it's impossible if it's a subtractive process. Now let's watch this guy in an auditing session. He punishes the PC. He knows the only way you could make anybody better is to punish them. And his PC becomes worse, more tired, less able, the IQ goes down. Now this is a direct example of a fixed idea getting in the road of truth and auditing. So that's why I say an auditor has no case. A student has no case. We are now above the level. We can talk about, "It isn't true if it isn't true for you" to an academy student, because that's true. That's the closest touch he's got to this reality. But I'm not teaching an academy student right now. And you have no business receiving it at that level. These are the facts. This is the hot dope. They're not based on my opinions. I might have entirely different opinions, and often have had, but I have enough self discipline not to pass them on to you. There's a lot of things I could believe in. Lots. For instance there are things that I would like to be doing that are, oh my god. When I look at some of these politicians... The worst valences I've ever been in contact with rise to the fore. But I don't allow that to color the job. I have a job to do. You have a job to do. I'm going to let you in on something. I didn't even get R6ed. I'm not from this planet. Now. If I can take it on that it'd be a very good thing to clean up this planet,

you who were here can damn well share the responsibility and not say it's all up to Ron. That's an interesting thought, isn't it? Right away somebody comes along and tries to hang me as responsible for all the aberrations of the human race because I'm trying to do something for it. Well you can expect such a thing to be passed on to you. But you find out in the long run, if you do your job, do it cleanly, stick to the truth, stick to facts, do those things which exactly work and go on forward, you come out right in the end. It's the only way you ever come out right. When you compromise with your own reality, when you deny your own basic goodness, when you indulge in your own stuck ideas, you don't come out right. So somewhere up the track somebody listening to this tape, he was trained by a cracker jack academy supervisor, his Saint Hill course was right on the groove, they didn't flub clay table. They did a great job of it all the way across the lines. This guy really knows his business. He knows his business backwards and forwards. He's moved through 7, he really knows how to do Power, and he comes to 8. And he hears this tape. Well the only thing I wish to advise him, that if he doesn't keep doing his job and keep the data straight, it can get as bad as it has gotten. You see, the road out is the only road there is. The road in and down is a total stop and stays stuck forever. It isn't a road, it's a hole. Therefore, I enjoin upon you the job of listening to the straight data, teaching the straight data, using the straight data, and keening the road out open. And when these wild opinions come in sideways, to knock them out and kick them aside, with the contempt they deserve. Holding the line, holding the road open is not an easy job. Every suppressive that comes along the line has to invalidate it. He has to discredit it. He goes into a dramatization of discrediting, because he himself is terrified. What if some other being got stronger? It's all he can think of. What is some other being got stronger? He in his egocentric nonsense thinks that the other being would become more evil, and therefore destroy him with more enthusiasm. But why does he think that? 'Cause he knows damn well he deserves it. And once more on this subject, how does he know so well he deserves it? So, when I give you this data I am not giving you a very broad area of opinion. I'm giving you exactly what works, I am giving it to you exactly as it works. And these are the data which you have to know how to do. It's the data which are stressed on the Class VIII course. You will not find any data outside that perimeter. Not even worth paying any attention to. Now somewhere up the line, probably somebody will invent something else besides LSD that is now exported with such enthusiasm by psychiatrists, to make them drum up business. More than one way to drum up business. The psychiatrist you know, is just a dramatizing mad man. By definition. There are psychiatrists in R6, and certain people go into valences and become this thing and do it. And they attain their public presence by the fact that people know the symbol in R6 and so accept them without too much objection. They're out of valence in R6. Now when you get pushed sideways, this and that, it's because you think some new data has come out. Now I tell you exactly how, exactly how a case becomes unsolvable, and exactly why an auditor squirrels. And I've told you something about this before, but this is exactly why and how. Standard tech is missed by about four or five miles. Missed. And then because the case has been missed the auditor sits there looking, or the case supervisor sits there looking for an unusual solution, because the case now seems unusual. All unusual cases are cases that have been mishandled under the heading of

standard tech. They have already been mishandled by departure from standard tech, and then appear to be unsolvable, and then appear to need some new solution. And the auditor, or the case supervisor, seeing this odd phenomenon sitting there of apparently an unresolving case, then dream up something new, or think they have to go into some other area, and practice yogi exercises or drill holes in his head, or something of this sort. Do you see how that happens? But I assure you of this, and this is the stable data, this datum right here. Standard tech has already been missed! There's a miss in standard tech. All unusual cases come about through a miss in standard tech. The resolution of all such cases is to find out where standard tech became unstandard. Do you see? So here's this case, he's a wide—open invitation to the auditor and the case supervisor to squirrel, because he appears to be so unstandard. “Bu—yu—yu—yu-, he's not solving. We did everything we're supposed to do and nothing hasn't happened. So we have to do something else. Now let's dream up some new...” Now the danger of this is these new ideas usually come from stuck and fixed ideas. And they don't apply to the case, they only apply to the guy who thought them up. So much so that the late Volney Matheson developed a drill. And he found out the cases that were being audited unsuccessfully, way back when, when he was fooling around with this, with meters and so on, he found out what had been audited on the preclear, and then put the auditor on the cans and found out that was what was wrong with the auditor. You see, these failed cases, the auditor was trying to audit his case out of the PC. Hell, that's the introduction of fixed ideas. You go back over a case like this. A standard flub. And honest to Pete it is sitting there, so big and so wide, that you wonder how in the name of god anybody could miss it. They could just about as well miss a ten thousand watt search light in the middle of a dark night. It is right there! I'll give you an example. Give you an example. Unsolvable case came up. Absolutely unsolvable. My god, you couldn't do anything with this case. Well the reason you couldn't do anything with him, he had been two days overrun on ARC Straightwire past an F/ N. And then this couldn't be rehabbed because he was in the middle of a secondary. But every effort to rehab the ARC Straightwire F/ N collided with the secondary which he had already skidded in to, because it's the next, next step up. And the PC, through overrun and so forth, he just slid into the next step up. And all the time the auditor was trying to rehab the ARC Straightwire the guy was trying to run the secondary. Which made an interesting looking session. Auditor trying to do one thing, the PC doing something else, you know? Well you would have said, “By golly, that's enough, that's enough, enough certainly, to have thrown any case out the window right there.” Yeah, yeah, yeah. The case became unsolvable. But going back through earlier green forms on the case an R/ S was found on missed withholds, an R/ S was found on connected to a suppressive group. And neither one had been handled or touched by the auditor. Now how the hell could an auditor go right past the green form, see a great, big R/ S turn on on a missed withhold, and never inquire what it was? Not only that, but another auditor had come along later doing a green form, and had gotten a blow down on missed withholds, and had gotten a blow down on connected to a suppressive group. And had never inquired what they were. In addition to that, in the sea check the guy had walked into the organization so damn high on LSD that his eyeballs were Archimedes spirals going 'round and 'round. And that was in the sea check. So what

happened? He sat the case down, pulled the missed withhold. It was an over your dead body sort of a, of an action. Got what suppressive group it was. The fellow knew. And then rehabbed a fantastic amount of overrun and weird release on drugs. I don't know the length of the session, I think the total session maybe took forty five minutes. So here where standard tech had already been passed by we had an unsolvable case that was just sitting there. Anybody who really didn't know his business would have immediately accepted this invitation to do something wild, weird and wonderful. Here was this fellow with his tone arm stuck way up in the roof, unresolvable, couldn't be audited, nattering, wouldn't go near Qual, hardly could be forced into an auditing chair, reporting to the M. O., spent thirty six hours or so in a hospital where the doctors could find nothing wrong with him. These are all unusual solutions. His unusual solution to his case was to stay away from Qual. Qual's unusual solution was to send him to the hospital. People were asking for some brand new technique to come up and hit it. And what was it? It was a case overrun on drugs with a missed withhold, and connected to a suppressive group. Also, which didn't have to be resolved to solve the case, he was also wanted by his draft board. And was running out on it as a known present time problem, which didn't come up in auditing. So you see standard tech only had to be about three quarters in to resolve the case. Case resolved beautifully. Now when I see a folder which is about a foot thick with mislisted lists I know there is enough there to wrap it around a telegraph pole. When I see a tremendous number of sessions which didn't F/ N, and when I also haven't got the case folder for the entirety of the auditing, and the case has been overrun on a lot of early processes, I could feel very, very sad about the whole thing. Because it's almost an Herculean job to untangle it. The goofs have added on top of goofs have added on top of goofs. Now you're going to see this in case supervision. In Class VIII you not only have to be a whiz bang auditor, you also have to be a case supervisor. And there are two distinct skills: To audit, you only know how to audit, but to case supervise, you have to know exactly what is wrong with the case in order to order what auditor. Another trick. Entirely separate tricks. And if you think you have to know it to audit, brother, what you have to know to case supervise. You have to know your data. You have to know standard tech data main line. Because in one of these things you hand it over to only a slightly experienced auditor who starts goofing it. Instead of repairing the list, he's never heard of the laws of listing. He attests that he has, he can parrot something, but he doesn't know why you do a list, and he doesn't know this, and he doesn't know that. And you ask him to repair a list. Oh my god. Aaah! He doesn't know enough about listing himself to repair a mislisted list. So you get back a case folder where the case is more messed up. You said the right thing. You said "Straighten out this list." And you gave it back, you gave it to this auditor, and this auditor, he never heard of listing. You thought he did, but he somehow or another managed to sleep through it all. And you get the folder back worse off. He, he didn't even repair the existing list, he added a nine page list to an already complete list. And the case is worse off than before. So, you say, "Well we will be hopeful about this", and we direct what it is, and we get the guy grooved in on exactly what he's supposed to do. And we give it back to him, or to another auditor, and when we get the folder back he's decided that it was really not lists that was worrying this fellow, but the fact that the man hates auditors. So he has run,

"From where could you hate an auditor?" Do you see? Ant the case is now worse off, and you as case supervisor get the thing back. You will actually have to decide now, that you are in a fire fight of some kind or another, and it's over auditors' dead body. And so you have to have a method of cutting their throats. Well the proper order is, "Do an L1 with the prefix on lists. And just clean up each read as it goes through." In other words, you're not going to let anybody look at a list again. You're going to pick up the ARC breaks which are in restimulation on the subject of lists and let it go at that, because that's all you can do. So your case supervision is limited by the skill of the auditor who's doing the auditing for you. You sometimes have to pull your shots. You know, for instance, that this case needs to be, to get the full four rundown, or something like that, there's something out with the full rundown, and you've got an auditor there that you know damn well he can't do it. Well, so therefore you have to figure out something he can do that will still straighten out the case. And that's the only variability you get in case supervision. Your case supervisor orders may be beyond the ability of the auditor to execute. That is usually demonstrated, you never really pull your shots on case supervision. You say exactly what he's supposed to be doing, exactly. It's when you get into these wild fire fights, or correcting a correction. So you give case supervision and then they goof it. So you have to now correct the correction. Well, you can only do that a couple of times without all of a sudden having such a glorious mess on your hands that you had better take some more direct route. Obviously beyond the skill of the auditor to do, even though it's a very standard action. You say the case, because he feels very sad, is in an ARC break of long duration. That's a standard statement. Sad case, ARC break long duration. Boom, boom. Little data add up at once. And you give it back to the auditor. And the auditor gets in some kind of a fire fight with the PC. See? And he puts in an R—factor. Well I had a folder today. The auditor managed to get into a fire fight with the PC over an R—factor. God, I don't know how he did that. That must have been a masterpiece. How could you get into a fire fight? The auditor must have said something very weird. Instead of saying, "We're going to do an assessment on the case, this isn't what it was, but instead of saying, "I'm going to assess a list on your case," and so forth, "We're going to find out what type of resistive case you are." Must have, because he had protest on resistive case. So he must have mentioned it. 'Course he was a good auditor, he wouldn't evaluate! Na" Now, some auditor you give an, you give a case supervision, you say, "This girl is leading a highly illegal sort of a second dynamic existence. So therefore we're going to pull missed withholds." You have gotten it on your intelligence lines that this is the case with this case, don't you see? Or you've gotten it from something or other, or the case natters in session. All these various indicators. Or the case is just chewing up more husbands than she can get married to, it's a sort of assembly line, you know? So you figure there must be some kind of an irregularity on the second dynamic, so obviously because the case is mad at men, or something like this... You've got indicators, indicators, indicators, see? And you say, "Case is living a rather irregular second dynamic existence. Pull the missed withholds." Then this auditor, he shows the case the... We don't have any, we don't have any control over this, you see, as case supervisor, but we sure can find out what happened, 'cause the session won't come off unless it's totally false reported. And the PC, when they go to the examiner, isn't going

to do anything, if the session didn't come off, why it's going to show up on the examiner line. And if it doesn't show up on the examiner line I guarantee it'll show up on the ethics line later. You got two spots of control here. Shows up at the examiners or it shows up at the ethics. It'll also show in no further sign ups. See? So these spots, if you were really doing a case supervisor job, your admin would be to find out who is in ethics. Who's in ethics trouble? What PCs have just gone through here that ethics orders have been issued on? And another one would be, from the registrar, of who hasn't signed up for the next grade. So you'd want a leaving interview. Now I can tell you the tech is out if over fifty percent of the PCs going through an HGC do not show up for a leaving interview. Now you can jump on routing, and you can jump on this and you can say, "How the hell did that get out?" The truth of the matter is, PCs must be avoiding it. So tech must be out. Now it would be very interesting then, to take such people that didn't show up at the registrars' office when they left the organization, and to check them back against your folders. And then you will find out that Aloicious Q. Zilch, HGC auditor, lies, lies, lies. If the TA is at seven, he writes two, F/ N. The lies are never slight. And so you hang him and get on about your business. A case supervisors' neck is always out. The false auditing reports. So therefore there are various checkpoints by which the false report shows up. But the basis of this is, and must be, that the case supervisor has a certainty on standard tech. See, he must know that standard tech, applied standardly, works. If he's wondering, "Does this work", or "Something that doesn't work", or "Should I go back to yogi? I used to have such fun sitting in an ibis position. ' He can't police it down like that. Now we had one today, case supervision. I gave a little list to be audited. A little list. One, two, three, four items. And this was what, by understanding, with the PC having trouble with any one of these items, or with any one of these items charged. And one of them blew down and F/ Ned. It was just the list. Blew down and F/ Ned. Well I could tell this because the folder was, I don't know, eight or nine feet thick. That's an exaggeration. It was only about six inches thick. But, wow! Now we say, "Well golly, if the guy, if the guy blew down and F/ Ned, he's got something wild. Absolutely wild! What terrible auditing he had all the way along the line. Well it's obviously what was wrong with the case, well it's passed an F/ N and there isn't any thing you can do about it." Oh yeah? Oh no, as case supervisor that told me that the person had withholds from that item, so in the next session we're going to pull the missed withholds. Because it was a list of people who were trying to help him. So I set up a list of people who were trying to help this person, and one of them blew down, and he said, "Oh they were absolutely terrible," so I know then, at once, that's a critical opinion. So we pull the missed withhold. Elementary. It's not even very clever. It's very standard. I want to find out where, where is this character sitting? This guy been audited over PTPs, missed withhold, ARC breaks, what? See? Well by ordering a prep check on a certain number of items after assessment, I could tell from the answers where he's been sitting. I was denied the information because on one of the items he blew down. And went F/ N. And that was the end of that, of course. You didn't prep check beyond that. There's still missed withholds sitting there. So now we're going to get in suppress on missed withholds, and pull the missed withholds, and the case'll sail. Missed withholds don't read in a session. But they must be there. They must be there 'cause the folder's too thick. See what I mean?

Case has critical opinions, folder too thick, blows down on people trying to help him. Must have missed withhold. Person isn't sad, so it isn't an ARC break. His case roly—coasters, so it isn't a PTP. Change, oh there's change there. The only one's left is missed withholds. Now that would be combined with overts, so when it comes back and "No the person doesn't have any missed withholds", that's great. I'm going to have overts. And we will get around to this, sooner or later. And the case will no longer go to review. The case supervisor is in the business of ending off review cycles. He is never in the business of starting them. A case supervisor who has too many people going to review, after he has had them supervised in the HGC must be working with the damndest crew of bums as auditors anybody ever heard of, or himself must be driven up the wall by inventiveness. Something must be very out. But what you keep your paws on is standard tech. Don't let that slip, see? That's the thing which mustn't slip. Pcs slip, auditors slip, reporting of cases slips, see? Various things slip, but not standard tech. That doesn't slip. Now unless you know that well subjectively, and so on, it will slip. Because you just have it on my say so. So therefore the progress is, that the auditor should be able to get horrendous wins with standard tech. And boy, when he's really got it in the groove. Sits down across from that ole' PC, and he says, "Rattata—tat", and the meter says rattly—bang, F/ N. Ratta—ta—tat, booms He just sits there. An auditor who can audit this by the way gets so cocky and insufferable he can't be lived with. He does. And that is a frailty, because when you get hotter than a pistol as an auditor you then automatically assume you can case supervise. And that's another skill. That's really calling your shots. And when case supervision, you're saying the number three ball in the right corner pocket. And the auditor, he doesn't even pick up a cue. He thinks it's hit with a base ball bat. So you've entered this piece of randomness on your auditing lines, and it tends to sort of begin to shake you a little bit. But if you know what can be done, then you know what he ought to be doing. And I assure you that standard tech, correctly applied, applied standardly, gets one zero, zero par cientum. Variations, goof balled, mucked up application, and so forth, are all that reduce it. So it's your business to get it applied. Your foe is the introduction of somebody who knows best. The bird is sitting there auditing the PC, and the PC comes up with a wide open invitation to squirrel. And the auditor, the knuckle head, departs from the C/ S and squirrels. Now you've got a patch up of the session. (Sighs) Because if this auditor squirreled once, he's liable to squirrel twice. So you have to start nailing it in with ethics presence. And then, the next thing you know, you get the session folder back and he's not squirrel this time, boy he's blown his cool from here to the north pole. Gone. He's just in a lot of pieces. If you were to research into this you would find out that inadvertently you've put him to auditing his ex—girlfriend. Or that she looks just like his mother. Something is goofed up here of some kind or another. Something has entered into it which has no business in the line of any kind whatsoever. When you get into one of these fire fights whereby you're trying to get a case supervisor instructions actually done, and the auditor is doing other things. But every now and then you get an auditor who will be obliging and write down that he did what he didn't do. And he's the only guy who can hang you. You can't straighten that out. As a case supervisor you've got to go in through the lines, you've got to go in to order restraining, you've got to go into all kinds of side lines that you really have

no business in. Case supervisors' neck is out a mile on a false auditing report. So therefore he must be absolutely merciless when he receives one. It's the only thing that can—a wreck him. If he can get the facts, and if he can read the auditing report... That's another thing. It's an actual fact, if I'm auditing for blood, as Qual here can tell you. When I can't read the auditing report it goes back with some asperity and velocity. I won't have anything to do... By the way this is a very good rule. Don't have anything to do with an auditing report you can't read. Don't have anything to do with it. If you get into it, you will be over mastered, sometimes by your curiosity to know what happened to Zilch. Sort of like One Man Stanley continued story, you know? You want to know what happens to Zilch. So you try to make out this. And he had a new auditor today, and this auditor writes a script which is just a continuous series of ee's. And this auditor writes a script which is just a continuous series of ee's. And you can't read it. And the second you discover that to be the fact you take, if you are really on the groove, and you're really clever, you really know your business, you turn it around, without trying to make it out, and send it back for printing in a different colored pen over every indecipherable word. Make him rewrite the whole thing. And then, you assign him projects in penmanship until he can write so that he can be read. You never go it by halves, because I'll tell you why. You're gonna eventually start winding up with headaches as a case supervisor. You got misunderstands all over the place. You're trying to find out what the hell did the PC say, what, what is that? Looks like ee's. Is it leave, have, boo boo, catterwamp? And you sometimes read these out as they would actually look. And you get "butter wump mum hip". And you keep doing this, you're gonna wind up with an antipathy toward an auditing report. An auditor, actually part of his training, should be to write rapidly, legibly. Anybody can learn how to do it. Doesn't even take much practice. Few days ago I ordered an auditor to learn how to write. And I'll be a son of a gun. Session came up, next session that person did a few days later, came up, the auditor was writing. I'm sure the session wasn't slowed up. Only took him a few days to learn how to write. But a case supervisor should never accept an indecipherable folder, because he starts laying mysteries into his line. He'll start making mistakes. And this is, what's more I tell you. He doesn't do his job fast. See? He does his job right now, and so forth. But that is to say he doesn't do his jOD on the basis that the PC has got to be audited 'cause he's leaving for SDokane. Just out of pure cussedness don't do the folder. "What about that cc that's got to leave for SDokane? Be's got to catch a four o'clock plane. We've got to give him a session. He's got his reservations, and so forth!" As case supervisor you should say, "Bubber out, bub." Let him catch the plane next Saturday. Because I want him to go back to Spokane right, not rushed. What frame of mind must this guy be in during the auditing session? Sitting on the edge of the chair, watching his clock, "Let's see. It's a review. Awawaww." In the first place, standard sessions are very rapid. And very, very, very rapid. And there's no percentage in pointing the guy wrong, as I've told you before. No percentage in it whatsoever. Just make sure you're pointing it right. Don't think twice about, you look at this and you wonder, "What the hell? What, what's this? What's this? I don't know. This case isn't acting right." And send it back to the auditor to get an assessment done. Send it back to the examiner to get the case looked at. Folder looks a little bit funny to you. Looks a little bit weird. Something a

little bit weird about it. Send it back to the examiner for another examination. Don't take chances with it, because that's not where you save your time. Time is saved in the case supervision being correct. And in the auditing being expert. Do you see? And you'll learn eventually, so that your lines smooth out, you do them very rapidly. But when in doubt, the only time you miss, is when you get in a rush. Or you talk, you get in such a rush you send for the auditor. Cuts your throat, boy. Want to sail stock? He thinks he's standing there looking a condition of doubt in the teeth, maybe. He'll tell you anything. It's a fact. And then, of course you're just seeing the PC from his viewpoint. And he, perhaps is offended. He has tried to help the PC, and the PC wasn't helped in some fashion or another. So he's offended. So he blames you. The fact that he forgot to start the session and plug in his meter, he ignores. So in the final analysis your grip on standard tech must be so standard that you expect standard results and settle for nothing less. And you solve the problems that you run into in auditing on that basis. Now you could get into some situation where a guy is in an upper OT... This would be the toughest situation I would know of. The guy is in an upper OT Section classification as you walk on the scene as case supervisor. And his TA is at 5, and he has apparently had all known remedies. He's been run on "What has been overrun". He has been rehabbed on anything and everything you could think of. And he, his TA is up there. And that, something like that will be your first invitation to squirrel. Because, here's, here's the facts. Somewhere in that line of all this has been done is a false report. It hasn't... I found one the other day. Case was way high, "What has been overrun" has been run on the case. Ba—ba—ba, ba—ba. I went back. I found the session of "What has been overrun". Do you know what the auditor did? The auditor listed a list of what has been overrun, indicated no reading items on it, although many of them read, and then didn't rehab any of the things that were overrun. The right way to do this list, is, it's, it is not a list. It is simply an auditing question for which you are writing down the answers in order to do something with them. So he write down the first thing and it had a fall. Alright. Now at that moment you take that item, which he has just put down, and you run it back to the time it was released, and before it was overrun. And you may not get an F/ N on that one. You now give the next item. The PC gives you the next item, and there's no read on that, so you neglect it. The PC gives you the next item, you get a long fall. Good. You take that subject, you run it back, you rehab it. Good. Now, you got the next subject. He's talking about all kinds of things, you know? Bookkeeping's been overrun. Well you run it back to when it was released. You'll get some charge off of each one of these things as you try to rehab it. And you get him down the line here, another item, another item, six, eight items later that have read, each one of them rehabbed to a time when they went release. The tone arm has gradually come down, and in most of cases where this is happening and there isn't also something else wildly wrong, it then F/ Ns. And the tone arm has been cured. Don't be surprised if it tends to go up, because probably a lot of his grades are overrun, because they sat on runs, or, a lot of his grades never went release, because he was so overrun when he got into Scientology, and so forth, that auditors just sort of despaired of actually getting an F/ N, and they'd give him F/ Ns of 3.9, or something. And the truth of the matter is, the guy's grades are out and they never did go release. But you've cured the earlier overruns. You can bring him up to a point now where he can do

something about it. Now you'd have to decide whether or not it was audited over out Ruds or if it was because of basic track overrun, that he never went release on his grades. Which, which was the reason? Which was the reason? Well, funny phenomena will occur. You can put in the Ruds. An upper OT guy or something like this, you can put in the Ruds before the point. Put in the Ruds before auditing. Put in his ARC breaks, PTPs, on the whole track, and get him up to a point. Now check, again, the release points. They don't occur. Good. He's not flat on ARC Straightwire, engrams, secondaries, the lot. All the way up the line he isn't flat on a single, god damn thing. Every one of them has to be run. You say, "Magnificent. How the hell did he get this far?" Well, I don't know. How far could a bunch of auditors that didn't know what they were doing push a guy? How many false attests can you get? An infinity, of course. But you'll see this case, and they will say, "Everything has been done." Particularly if you're new on post. Somebody wants to shake you down, put you in place, see? "Well, here's this case, here's this case. Zilch. Ha—hool Everything's been done! Ha hat Everything's been done. The lot. The whole, yeah everything. What has been overrun, valence shifters, confront, we've rehabbed all grades, rehabbed drugs, rehabbed ha ha ha ha ha, education. He's had forty five remedy Bs, one hundred and seventy two S and Ds, we've done everything we can do. He's, we've rehabbed all the F/ Ns that ever occurred on green forms and sec checks. We've done all of this, and there he is! Ha hat" And you say, "Oh my gods" You start looking through the auditing reports on the case which you have to study very carefully. Case supervisor always does. He looks through these things, and he looks through these things, and they all seem to be OK. It all seems to be done alright. Wow. There's your whole tool bag. Heen emptied out on the ground. Every one of them's been used. Hm! I would do something like this. On resistive case has anything been suppressed? Prep check the following. You don't care. You can always prep check things. Prep check assessment lists. Prep check S and Ds. You don't care what you're gonna suppress. You know, prep check some things. You can't even assess this list anymore. There's eighteen assessments of resistive cases in it, see? And all of a sudden something blows down. Now you can follow what blew down back as the false report chain. Got it? You can take and prep check everything on the resistive cases list, including resistive cases lists. Something is gonna BD. Something's suppressed. There's something still out. Handle it. Now, something else comes into view, and you find out that you've been handed a bundle of lies. Everything hasn't been done. I'd just compare it. The same thing. The guy, the unresolvable case, the completely and utterly unresolvable case, who yet R/ Sed and then blew down on missed withholds, and connected to suppressive groups. I mean, what more do you want? I mean, how the hell, you say, can an auditor sit there, and actually look at a meter do this? And notice it, because he wrote it in his auditing report, and never asked the guy a single question, "What was the missed withhold?" Well, it compares to a Power which I inspected in one of your folders. Oh my god. Aah. 5A. And it says, almost direct quote, "Places. No place. PC says no place is not the answer. PC sitting quietly thinking. Blow down. F/ N." And then he took him to 1D. (Drums fingers on table) Blew down on what? The PC was listing without talking! In other words, the auditing was so god damn bad, that the PC has ceased to talk to the auditor. He was listing to himself! Well, that's because the item just above it hadn't been given to the PC. They

were just listed to F/ N. Dadadadamm. You get it? Never found the item, never gave it to the PC. Or it's a wrong item. The list needs to be checked. But there's evidence, the PC listing to himself. He wasn't giving any items, but he had a blow down. And smiled quietly. I don't think he smiled quietly, I think he smiled god damned sarcastically. What was the item the PC thought of that caused the blow down? Obviously the auditor should give it to him. Left the PC with a withhold of one item. Not only did he not give the PC his items on this, but he left the PC with a withhold of one of the items, which is on 1C. This is clown stuff. But you look back over a lineup like this, you can find errors. Unfortunately, this person's already been through the CC, so that is not a corrective list. Power's not corrective. You can get into trouble, because you, you... You can correct it if the person never went clear, but you can get into trouble. How do you get into trouble? Well, when you try to straighten it out you inadvertently start running it. You find out the list, the Power list or commands or something weren't complete, and you find that as the wrongness. Now you're gonna have to run Power. And you run Power after clear you wrap the PC around a telegraph pole. One auditor in one thousand PCs would be able to do it and get away with it, and thinking he'd gotten away with something he'd find out the PC never went clear in the first place. But then your side data comes in. "Oh well, I, I ran a PC on Power one time after he was clear, and nothing happened. I don't see why there's any proviso on that." We're only dealing with all data, see? Of course you could probably rehabilitate, rehab Power on this PC or that PC, maybe even, when they were clear without any great consequence, or even with a bit of a win, see? But it's not one of these data you could do it with every PC, so every time you did it you'd take one hell of a chance. And then the PC that it couldn't be done on, boys Now you gonna untangle that, see? Because you can only untangle it by rehabbing it, which... And Power is an area where you can get into a fire fight on your correction on a person after he's been cleared, because you of course are never dealing with his Power. You'll find some body thetan on whom of course you could run Power. So you're busy involved in running body thetan Power, Power on a body thetan, and then the individual himself of course mis—owns this and thinks Power isn't flat. It gets into a mess with great rapidity. So we're talking in standard tech on the data you can do on every PC every time. But again, it follows the laws of processes. On case supervision there are only so many things that you can do. But you can only do them once. Now when they've all been done, you have to ask the question of "Were they done?" So this gets to be very fascinating, because of course they haven't all been done. Now you're, only thing you have to solve is which one is a false resort. Not to overweigh the, or overrun the, the object of the lesson. But this is what it takes. Now you're probably struggling along with an infinity of data. And you think that there is an infinity of data. And it'd only be an infinity of data if you had an infinity of fixed ideas. The data are very few, the overall technical data are probably under, I don't know what they are, just at a guess two, three four, five hundred. At the absolute outside, I'm talking about data, in the body of data. There's things like the axioms, and things like this, you include these things in. As far as processes are concerned, why there probably aren't fifty. And in the numbers of ways to do them there's only one. So what are you talking about, infinity of data? See? There's no infinity of data. There's an infinity of goofiness in life. That can go to infinity with the greatest of ease. So

whenever you see, whenever you see somebody squirrelling you know he's already goofed. And that is the law concerning it. A squirrel has already goofed. Now he can't goof so seriously that he can't ungoof his goof. That's not possible. Unless he takes a brick and hits the PC over the head, and exteriorizes him forcibly, and buries the body someplace and then can't find the PC. But if you can't get, your goof would mostly consist of being unable to get the PC to come back into session. Sometimes he has to be sort of dragged back. But a goof always precedes the squirrelling. And that goes clear back to 1950. If somebody in 1950 had taken Book One, and they'd run engrams the way Book One said, just that, and they'd done that, why they would have found a high percentage of resolution of cases. Just like that. And they got a high percentage of resolution of cases. But engram running started to go out sideways, and it went out sideways over a great many years, until a short time ago it was reported that engram auditing by chains was very old hat and even looked on like squirrelling. Brother, I sure don't know how you'd ever resolve a hung up 3 if you couldn't run engrams by chains. Couldn't. It's the only road left open. See what I mean? Somebody can come along and take one of the basic central data, he can take a basic central datum, and he can say, "Ha ha, oh it's gone now. I know we really don't do that anymore. I just came from the Flag Ship, and so forth, and they, they don't do that anymore." Move it off the line. Now standard tech doesn't work anymore. And that is normally what happens. They either take a datum or a body of data off the line by invalidation, or they put some new data on the line by evaluation. And, that way, the subject goes crooked. And it's no longer a straight subject so it doesn't work, so people have to invent all kinds of damn things to make it work. So you see then why I work hard to hold the line. It's very easily made unworkable. All you have to do is throw away the text book. Now there are certain beliefs that certain subjects of one kind or another have certain degrees of workability. That's perfectly true. Natureopathy, chiropractic, to name a few antique things, phrenology, where they told fortunes by the bumps on the skull, which I think is, they changed its' name after a while to psychology. They tell fortunes by the bumps on the brain. There isn't actually any difference in these data. Even psychology preempted the word of soul, study of. That's what the word means. When they start teaching psychology, they started teaching it by saying they didn't know what it meant. That's a great place to start a student, isn't it? "Psychology. Well we do not know what the word means, because a psyche means soul and we don't have anything to do with a soul." You think I'm kidding. But that is how the last psychology text book read that came off the press just ahead of volume one, 1950. I was down at the American Book Company and I saw this blue covered books were coming off the endless belt of the binder. And they were coming off, pocketa, pocketa. And we were waiting because there was a big ceremony involved in it, for Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health to come up the first copy through the binder. And it was following this blue book. So I turned around to a, to the head of American Book, and I said, "What book is that?" And he picked up a copy of it out of the bin. It was the University of Illinois, I think it was, psychology text book. It was their basic college textbook. And I said, "I must have this one." And took it off the lines right ahead of Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health. And I said, 'We will preserve this one in concrete so that the psychologist cannot in the future lie about how much he knew about

Dianetics.” And that is the way the book starts. We don’t know what psychology means. It says, along about line four or five or ten or something, somewhere in the volume, “Intelligence cannot change. It is that way when the person is born. It is the same when he dies.” You look at this damn thing you never saw such a parade of lies in your life. So I said, “We’ll keep this one.” I’ve still got it in my library. It shows the state of the mind just before ADS, 0. State of the mind. What did they know about it? Pffft! “Now the great discoveries that are made in universities! Professor Humphgaw! The great professor Humphgaw has just understood that life has something to do with affinity. Give a Nobel Prize.” The lion, see? See? They read our textbook you see, and they... Sometimes you can get a textbook on philosophy or religion, or something, in the library. And you can look through it page after page, and you’ll find somebody has marked lines. And they have looked through this book only to find things which agreed with their own fixed ideas. And this book, you go through a lot of library shelves on these subjects, and you’ll for sure find one. And it’s marked, you know, some obvious thing, you know? “Men are males”, you know? And you’ll see over here in the margin, “So true.” (Laughter) So you could expect for a number of years yet to come, I suppose, the great discoveries are brought about through, somebody reads “Handbook for Preclears” or something of this sort, and he reads some line in there. All of a sudden he realizes that that is the subject for a complete research foundation, and goes ahead and investigates us. It’s pretty weird. But, they’d be much better off if they found out the line following it, too. That also was important. So that you actually can get subtractions from a subject. You can get little isolated bits brought out of the subject. You can take bits out of context. And then build these things up, so that somebody’s rather pauperized understanding can reach into some situation and get “Men are males,” and then build the whole thing up around “Men are males,” and there’s a whole bunch of technology like this. But it doesn’t work. There’s no workability. Because a very few people have that fixed idea. Most people know it already. So the whole subject is any subject which you’re trying to hold the lines of, is then wide open to variation if the person, one, doesn’t have a variability, a factor being entered in by some stable, fixed idea that somebody has. And the net result of it is workability. Now people who have had the subject work well on their cases, and they’ve seen pocketa ding thud crash, and it worked just like that. They don’t have any question about this as the right way to do it, because it has worked. But then people who have been audited without those data, and without those laws or rules being applied, list over listed, under listed, items not given to ‘em, Power run upside down, forgot to run grades 2 and grades 3, and before they ran grade 4, this sort of thing, they get into a feeling of wobble, wobble. They haven’t experienced standard tech, so they consider that it is non—standard. And it’s always more difficult to teach somebody who has been subjected to non—standard tech than somebody who has received good, straight forward standard tech up the lines. But if you really want to teach somebody the subject, and make him a missionary on the whole idea, is after he has been mucked up from A to izzard, put him back together again with standard tech. Zoom, thud. He’s been worrying about his case for the last three years. You put him back together again with just straight standard tech. And you put him back together again so fast he hardly knew what happened. It went, pffft, pffft, pffft! Never knew. Wow! He isn’t necessarily overwhelmed. But he

now has the idea that it can be done wrong too. And I think in any group taking a Class VIII course there will be a certain number who have some idea and subjective reality that it can be done wrong, there will also be some, some small number of characters who have done it wrong and have received it wrong, and don't quite know what they're studying. And so don't quite know what to hold on to, because it, haven't seen the workability, subjectively, objectively. See? They've gotten into some back eddy of saurrel-ishness on the thing somehow or another, and just left their case parked in right field and their understanding parked some place back of home base, and they're not quite sure what they're looking at. And they get confused. Now in this state, groping for some orientation, a groping for something, why they'll hold onto some data like fury, which may be a very minor datum. You know, like ARC contains R. They really know it contains R. They got a subjective reality on that. You have to spread them out from that. They're fixed on that, because a lot of confusion is oriented by that. And when you say there's more to it, there's also A, and there's also C, why you're spreading 'em out to a point where the confusion starts to hit them a little bit. And so they go back to the thing, "Well I really am certain that R is R." You see how it happens? So anyway, holding the line, holding the line. Trying to get it to go straight down, right down the groove, and so on, is subjectable to many cross currents, so that the subject, with certain things subtracted from it ceases to work on certain people, who then start looking for some other way to do it, who then come in with some god damn fool opinion, who didn't know in the first place, and blow. And the whole subject goes up in smoke. Deteriorates. Which is unfortunate. Men who know the laws of listing don't follow them. Then they get some loses on cases. Now the cases they've audited don't think, they think the laws of listing have been applied, so they think the laws of listing are wrong. So they invent some new idea of listing, which is that all over listed lists must be over listed. And that is what an auditor is up against. Now the auditor himself is subjected to a certain amount of invalidation, because he does what he thinks is necessary, and what he is sure is the right thing to do. And he finds out it doesn't straighten out the PC. This particular instant didn't straighten out the PC. So, this makes him feel like he's had a little bit of a lose. He sees the examiner reports. The guy left the session apparently OK, appeared at the examiner and there was something out. Well how did that happen? So he feels a bit invalidated. He feels he should do something else beyond the C/ S. Heyond the case supervision he should do something else. So, the case supervisor sees this, and then he is subjected to a certain amount of invalidation from the auditor. The auditor, you know, didn't do so well that time. When he appeared at the examiner he wasn't alright. Something's wrong. Well, the one thing you can find to agree on in all this, and this is the stable datum, the one thing you can find to agree on all this, is that something is a departure from standard tech. That gives you an orientation zone from which to orient your disagreements. The auditor probably busy blaming the—case supervisor, the case supervisor busy blaming the auditor, and the PC sitting back there with a completely suppressed read on PTP. It's completely suppressed because a present time problem doesn't communicate to him. Every time you ask for a present time problem, why he knows what problems are. They're solution to things. And he hasn't got any solutions. All he's got is worry. The communication to the PC is out. And it

hasn't emerged. Or he's got an ARC break of long duration. He's there not on his own determinism, forced to be there. And he suffers through it all. The idea of ARC break is completely foreign to him, because the word doesn't communicate. Or, because he's been asked for ARC breaks and then had them invalidated. You can get an infinity of wrongnesses that happened with the guy, but the resolution of the case will be ARC breaks are out, PTP is out, or, missed withholds are out, or he's committing continuous present time overts, some grade is out that was supposed to have been run but wasn't, the list that was supposed to have been done was to wrong item, it's falsely listed, or the general approach on TRs completely out of the case supervisors sight, and completely out of the auditors sight. Early on, why it was just constant invalidation. The auditing sessions. He had several auditing session in which each one of them was just a constant invalidation. "Well, that's not right, actually what you mean is so and so." See? Something weird has gone on. Nevertheless you can untangle it all. It's where you've had departures from these exact actions. And some of those departures are important and some of them are unimportant. Now I'll give you an example of what is unimportant. I see in case summaries, which auditors do, they're prone to list the administrative errors of the auditor. They go through the folder and they list the administrative errors. They raise hell. The auditor didn't totally date the session, he didn't give the year, he just gave the month and day, and he writes the TA down in the wrong column, and you can't tell the difference in that, and he doesn't give all of what the PC said, and he gave no reason why he ended off the session, or something. These are administrative, administrative, administrative. And an auditor doing case summary, a case, a summary, a case supervisors error summary of course is a thing. It is going through every session you can get your hands on and finding every auditing blunder in that session, and making a list of these. Well, making this list, well, you'll find out an auditor who's green at this, or a case supervisor who's very green at this, he will go into this on the basis of the administrative flubs. Do you see? You know, he didn't date it, and he didn't write down... There is no summary report. Absolutely reprehensible. There is no summary report for this session, and so forth. And he just goes on and on and on, page after page after page. It's the wildest listing you ever saw. Because not one of them would affect a PC at all. The viewpoint from which case error summary lists are done is the viewpoint of what has an auditor done that would have messed up a PC. Now, it could also be done from, what would mess up a case supervisor. So you're interested basically in what would have messed up the PC, secondarily in what would mess up the case supervisor in trying to case supervise it. That's why admin is tough and straight. Just so the people can tell what's happening. That is basically what you want out of an error summary report. What you want is what has been done that would have affected the PC adversely? What departures from standard tech do you find? We find PTP has always been handled by "Invent another problem". Aaaahhh. Therefore we know there's going to be charge on the subject of PTPs. So we're going to have to get PTP corrected. We can prep check it. You always got prep checks, they're, you can prep check anything. Overrun. Check for overrun on PTP. Check for this, check for that. See? Overrun, prep check, do something about it. But you've got it there. Look at this, god damn it. For one and one half years this case, they attempted to solve this case in

a review, somewhere, and they consistently ran “Invent another problem, invent another problem, invent another problem”, and the case has just been getting worse and worse. What really hasn’t changed... his main basic characteristics. See, you’ve got your error summary. That would have affected the case. That was important. And the session which goes wiggle biggie zibble, zig zig, wwwwv voom. You can’t understand it, so the case supervisor’s been done in. So you say, “Out admin, shoot the auditor.” That’s what your folder error summary should consist of. What affects the case? And what would affect it’s case supervision? That’s all that’s important. There isn’t anything else that’s important. So it says “PTP, F/ N”. Doesn’t say the PC said anything, it just blew this and that. It happened two years ago—The auditor’s already been hanged. It isn’t gonna affect the case one way or the other, see, so why remark it? Say the hell with it. That way you get the important things, the very, very important things. Mis—listed list. Lists. Fifty S and Ds done in the same week. See? That’s the stuff. That’s the stuff. Now you know, you know what to order. “Too many S and Ds. Fly the needle on S and Ds, overrun of. Find you can’t do that, do an L—1.” That’ll be your case supervision. “On S and Ds do an L—1. Fly the needle on S and D rehab. If this is impossible, L—1, with the opening line is, ‘On S and Ds... ’” Do something in this character, which is very standard, standard list, you do it to this subject. But on folder summary, in looking back over it, you’ll find these damned S and Ds. S and Ds, S and Ds, S and Ds. Christ, how many suppressives are there on the planet? See? They’re over listed, under listed, wrongly executed, you know? Wow, that must be an awful zone. Now, but if we find out we can’t do anything about it we better stop restimulating it. And you get the other part of the coin. You couldn’t get anything done about it, so don’t do anything about it. Don’t get into one of these perpetuals, gonna take a year and a half to rehab this case. See? Because the case is gonna get worse and worse and worse and worse and worse. Over repair. Do you have a better grip on this ? (Yes) If you think there’s an infinity of data then you must have confronted an infinity of wrongnesses. And having confronted it, let it blow. And hold on to the main line. Thank you very much.

THE LAWS OF LISTING AND NULLING

A lecture given on 2 October 1968

Well, this is lecture number what? (Nine) Lecture number 9 and this is 2 October 1968 A. D. 16. We're concerned this evening with some very precise actions and so we will get straight along with it.

The laws of listing and nulling are a common and ordinary garden variety subject of attack. There are more cooks have more cock-eyed variations and more advice on this subject than any other single thing, because of course it is the one subject that can ruin a PC, bongo! Now the laws of listing and nulling are not something that you wonder about. You know them. You know them or you don't know them. And you know them now. And you can do them. Now I call to your attention that reading to you the laws of listing and nulling is something like reading to you the directions on how to play a piano. Do I make my point?

You can all know where a middle C is. Now auditing is a relatively simple piano. But nevertheless it is something to be played. It is not something to know about. The maker of the piano never crosses the mind of a concert pianist. Where middle C is is not something he looks down the keyboard. He isn't wondering what those black things are. Now somebody can play a piano with one finger—ta—ta—ta—ti—ta—to—ta. And somebody can play Chopin. And the difference between these two fellows is: is one knows his business and the other maybe in his elementary school read a paper that said: 'A piano is an instrument which has black and white keys.' "You get the difference?

Now it isn't that people can't read directions and then apply them. It's that they misestimate the amount of expertise required to actually apply them. So we get some student some place and he reads a bulletin and he knows all of these things. It is just exactly as he said 'Where is the loud pedal?' 'The loud pedal is on the right.' 'Where is the soft pedal?' 'The soft pedal is on the left.' In the middle of playing the overture of 1812 he thinks now I want to make it go loud, the loud pedal is on the right—left, which was it, it's on the... maybe it's the lever over to the side. Oh, I haven't put the top up. So then he has a stage—assistant who comes in and when he wants it to go loud he has him put the top up and when he wants it soft he puts the top down. You get the general idea. In playing the piano you want it to go loud, you stamp on the loud pedal without wondering where the loud pedal is."

So it is one thing to know it in theory and it is another thing to apply it, but there is no peculiarity in something, on somebody who can know it in theory and then can't apply it. This isn't a strange being, it is simply a lazy being who has never mocked it up in his skull as to what was where, you understand? So he knows the words, 'the laws of listing and nulling—not nulling, nilling. What he doesn't know about that one line is, that these are all the laws there are, there aren't any others, there aren't a bunch of hidden data, that haven't been included in this bulletin. These are it. This is all there is. So there is something to know about the title. So he isn't reading at all wondering what laws of listing and nulling have been left out. He knows that's all there is.

Now the rest of it is drill, drill. You are making a list of 'Who have you shot?' Of course that would be a very long list and wouldn't go to one item. But... (laughing)... 'Who do you feel most bad about shooting would go to one item and oddly enough the unmock—and stop—and withdraw—list do go to one

item. There are certain things that are lists that go to one item and those are the standard listing questions.

Now you start wandering off, you can list anything, but you start wandering off the standard listing questions, that are the standard line questions and you are liable to have a question which doesn't just go to one item. Now there is such a... such a thing that it is processing question and actually the only reason you are lining it down is so you can clean it up. You get the idea? Now it looks like a list but it's not a list, because it's not a standard question. You got the idea?

I'll give you an idea of what this is. You can say 'What is wrong with my case?' ' Actually you could list this 'What is wrong with my case?' ' That is, it looks like a list, it looks like a listing question and you think you could list it down to one reading item. Brother, I've got news for you. It isn't a proper listing question. The laws of listing and nutting apply to proper listing questions. If you were to say 'What is wrong with my case?' ' and then make a list and you said bongo—bingo and togobak and ragbags are unflat and auditors missed on the floggodick. it could go something like this: Bongo—bingo long fall, ragbags unflat small fall... ah... ah... ruggerbo long fall BD. And you all of a sudden say, 'Well, what is wrong with my case is ruggerbo BD.' ' Well, maybe, maybe not, but all of a sudden it wouldn't work out.

Why wouldn't it work out? Well it's not a proper listing question in the first place and you have already by—passed the by—pasted charge you have restimulated on the first two or three that read, so this is a list quote unquote.

It is simply an auditing question is all it is. It's an auditing question which is written down. So you can ask any auditing question, you can get a certain number of answers. Factually, if you ask an auditing question and then you make a write—down of the answers and then you took up everyone of the answers as you wrote it down, you get one of these 'What is wrong with my case?' ' 'What is wrong with my case?' ' You see? Tingerwaps fall, okay. Tingerwaps, let's see, when did I run into tingerwaps? See? Oh yeah, that was a bluggulogs. Good. Ah, and then you get down to ragbags. Wow! See? Oh yeah, wow! Uhum 1960 woff woff waggle waggle waffle waffle waffle and yeah, what the hell do you know about that, there's a whole chain of these ragbags. Now, the earliest ragbag was in oh let's see 2000 numbers tough here let's get a date. Order of magnitude. Tens of years. hundreds of years. Thousands of years. Tens of thousands of years. Hundreds of thousands of years. Millions of years. Tens of millions of years. hundreds of millions of years. Billions of years. Tens of billions of years. hundreds of billions of years. Trillions of years fall. More than 5 trillion—fall. More than ten trillion—no read. Less than ten trillion—fall. Ah... 5 trillion, 6 trillion, 7 trillion, 7 trillion, 7 trillion long fall. All right, we're in the order of magnitude of 7 trillion 954 million 762 thousand 727. Good. And 2 months—BD. Well, so that was the first ragbag. Now let's see, what the hell was that all about? And so forth. What the hell mate, Peter had an ARC break in it. They sent the laundry ashore and didn't get it back. Yeah. We landed in this space right here and I lost all of my clothes and the uniform was so bad, you know after that they couldn't believe I was the first mate. Oh yeah—I got that. Em... poh... what the hell do you know! Ragbags! Clean! (laugh) Good. Now, wait a minute—F/N.

That's an auditing process by which you take up everything in the book. It's,

you wrote the thing down with a question mark, but then it was a sort of a process. And then you got some items which followed the process. Do you follow? And then you handled each item and so on. Now, you don't do that process that way for some peculiar reason—not because I said so—you see it's an illegal listing question, it's it's not a listing question, it's a... it's a... it's a process, an offbeat process—not because I said so, but because it just works this way. Now we get a question 'Who or what is trying to unmock you?' (laugh) Ba ba ba—ba ba—ba ba ba ba ba—long fall BD! Poom! Okay. Ba bow bow—ba bow bow—ba bow bow—ba bow bow—ba bow bow—ba bow bow long fall BD—long fall BD—BD. Very good. Your item is 'Ba bow bow.' And that is because it is a question which makes a real list and it goes to one item. But there are tons of questions which don't go to one item. And you can dream up all kinds of them and I see them in all folders from way back when. Ah... Where are the roofs? you see, or something. I'll give you one that sounds exactly like it would be a listing question. This will guarantee to wrap some PC around the telegraph pole. 'What environment was dangerous?' So help me Pete it doesn't go to one item. Now you've got to worry that it is an offbeat question and it didn't list to one item and you can't get it down to one item and the PC starts wrapping around the telegraph pole. That's because it's actually just a process. It's a sort of an out—of—ARC—process, so it is extremely limited. 'What environment was dangerous?' And every read you got on the list you should have taken up. (laugh) If you ever—if you ever ran it as a process, see.

So there is a way of running a process to write it down. Now theoretically, theoretically, because you often see an F/ N occur and a big BD—on any of the process questions, theoretically they should be a list, right? Well, I'm clearing this up with you because somebody is sooner or later going to come along and he's going to say: "Wait a minute—all processes are really lists. The fellow who is answering a question on level 0 is really making a list. So therefore the right way to run level 0 is to go down the line to level 0 and find the reading item and give it to the PC." Now he finds the one PC in a thousand on whom this actually worked and he has had it. You understand, it is a process, it is not a listing question. And the funny part of it is, the processes that come up the line don't work.

Now—ARC—question—the level 3 question, the big change, you know, the big change. It's just borderline to being an item. It's a one—item—list. A funny thing about it is because the unlimited nature of ARC, you can actually occasionally run it again. You'd better not, but you can actually occasionally run it again. Not the ARC—process with all the change but you can find an earlier big change on the whole track. So you can run it sort of this lifetime and you can sort of run it on the whole track. This is not advised, I'm just telling you the behavior of things, see. But you find the real change that is listed on on the list the PC makes and you run the process just exactly the way it says in R3H—anybody is liable to call anything R3H these days it was an exact process.

I had somebody not too long ago actually rewrite an HCOB and send it to me on R3H. Boy I said now I have seen it all. And I find out that he was advising people to by—pass F/ Ns doing this. Oh my god! The ARC—break registrar's proper action is Green Form. That's all an ARC—break registrar should ever do. Green Form. He should do Green Form—itsa similar—itsa earlier—it's all he ever ought to do. It doesn't mess up anything. You can run almost an

unlimited number of them, because it is sort of a PT proposition because you're just handling it with itsa and earlier similar itsa and you clean up more cases than you can shake a stick at.

The ARC—break registrar however thinks he can only run ARC—breaks. Well he misses the guy with the PTPs, he misses the guy with the MWH. And why do most people blow orgs? Because they had missed withholds. So that's idiocy. I've never gotten hold of the ARC—break registrars and told them this up to this time directly to their faces, so I am trusting you to do so. Green Form! Green Form! Never do anything but a Green Form. And because you probably can't trust their listing and so forth say: 'don't list anything'. No list, no list—just Green Form. Yeah, he says, what if he strikes, he's connected to a suppressive group? Good—itsa similar incident earlier itsa (laugh). Oddly enough you'll find out it works, don't you see? It worked like a bomb.

Now, if his TRs are fairly smooth he won't kick in BPC. You actually can kick in by—passed charge of the PC, if the... if a, if the TRs are out. Fumble, bumble, stumble bum... ah... flumble, flumble—let's see the laws of listing and nulling I know... I know... I know this... don't tell me... don't don't tell me PC... ah don't tell me... ah... I should... let's see... I've got three listing... don't tell me PC... three reading items on the list... and so on... I should... that means it's the first item... no no that isn't right... ah... it's a dead horse... no no no no (laughter). You're liable to kick in some other time when the PC has been stalled on the track in some fashion or another, which he is in most accidents and things. You know, waiting for the doctor or something of the sort. And here comes in some BPC, and this hidden factor flies in sideways because of the slowness and all—thumbs—ness of the auditor, see. Do you get it? It doesn't show up in the auditing report.

Always very mysterious this fellow for some reason or other... he... the thing didn't clear up. Now you know it didn't clear up because the session went on and on and it's a four hour and 95 minutes session, see. (laugh) And all he had to straighten out was did he have a PTP, not even of long duration, see. It's what you really wanted him to do, so you said check ARC—breaks and see if this PC has a PTP of long duration. You've noticed... you've noticed that every time... every time he comes into session he tells the examiner the same thing. It's all through the folder, which of course, if you know your business, the unchanging case has a PTP of long duration. The cases which don't change have a PTP of long duration. I mean, the one side of the coin is the other side of the coin. You understand?

Well, here's... here's... here's Mr Blitz in here again with his lumbosis. He says it hasn't been helped. Now you can say, 'Oh let's see, what's the matter? Is he an... ARC—break or is it woff woff. Is it some peculiar kind of case. Maybe he was an Eskimo in a former life and these engrams got frozen. (laughter). The datum which springs to view at this particular moment is he still got his lumbosis. It is still worrying him and he's got a .? TS of long duration and the other datum you know: it isn't the lumbosis for the excellent reason that he knows that and it hasn't resolved. So he hasn't as—ised it.

There could be another reason he hasn't as—ised it: he is out of valence and can't as—is anything, but then he would have to be out of valence with the present time problem. But it isn't really a present time problem. It's a problem that has been every present time for the last few thousand years. (laughter) So, the problem of long duration, that's what is wrong with this

guy and he is always audited over top of it—unchanging case. It's actually PTP. Every time he's audited he has a PTP. Ah... you can actually fix up a case so it's unchanging by some auditor finding a PTP, that didn't exist, existing with the fellow, has a PTP because it always reads on PTP and the fellow goes around wondering what his PTP is and his... his problem is whether or not he has a problem. You see, that's a false read, that can be introduced on the case, so you always say 'check for false reads, check for suppressed reads'.

Now, getting down to cases here then there is a thing which is called a list and that proceeds from a thing which is called a standard listing question and there are very few of these. There's the Remedy A, the Remedy B. the three suppressive question ones and there is another one 'What are you trying to prevent?' Now there are several more that do end up in one item. And the ARC level 3 grade ends up in one time. Not just one ARC break, but it ends up for sure in one time. Do you understand? Now you can fool with this ARC break all you want to and run it all over the track, but the fact of it is you're looking for the major change in the person's life—you ask for the major change in the person's life. Don't you see? Whatever the question says, what you want as an auditor, you want that one change. Now you list for that. You find that thing accurately, you find the ARC break in it and the guy goes release. Poom! Very magical! Very magical!

Now, service facsimile. Every now and then you come across the line and you can't rehab the service facsimile. You'd never relist the service facsimile or the excellent reason that the PC can't remember it. Don't be an idiot. You've cared for this already. (laughter) It's erased. Why are you bugging him about it? But the funny part of it is, "is you actual could list for another service facsimile—not that he has another Service facsimile but you can always get one out of a body thetan. So actually if the fellow had 500 body thetans you'd get 500 service facsimiles. (laughter) You could probably do it 500 times before the PC kicked the bucket. (laughter) Most body thetans are above service fac, below service facsimiles, so you... the majority of them are... so you would have a ball trying to get it. But the point I am making is, is you've listed for this service facsimile, that is the principal one and so on and you let it go at that. Well now if you can 't rehab it somebody didn't get the right one. Once in a while you are out of luck you can't get the original list.

Now what do you do? They didn't get the guy's service facsimile and so forth. Well you could do... this is a very stunty stuff and isn't advised at all, but it's perfectly valid—to ask the guy what is his service facsimile, what the one found was, and you'll find out he usually remembers it. Now you ask him what the one found was, that you don't have the original list. You can list in this peculiar fashion once in a blue moon and get away with it. What . . what were the items on the list you made? (laughter) But in order to do that, you'd have to get in suppress on the list because his right item was missed. What did you tell the auditor you thought it was? On whatever the question is with the service facsimile—has anything been suppressed? Has anything been challenged? You know. Invalidated—we don't care what, as long as you clean up that question. 'No, I don't know what service facsimile. I remember I got awfully nervous at that particular time. I... I'm not sure about that... I did yeah... well... we... they found it alright. The service facsimile, I think, was to jump off tall—I don't know if it was tall blondes or tall buildings.

(laughter) It was something like that. ' Didn't sound like it. He isn't sure, but already it won't rehab. And you say—did... ah... you know... to find your service facsimile and so forth and etc... ah you know... to go release at that point. Normal pattern. Nothing happens. 'On that time was anything suppressed? Anything invalidated? Invalidation reads. Ah... oh... it did yeah. his service facsimile hasn't been found, it won't rehab. So now you can become the hassles. "Do you recall what somebody said it was? ' 'Yeah... ah... so and so... so and so. (unclear mumbling) You say—well, all right. You could prepcheck the question and ask him if he remembers any of the items he thought it was at the time. The oddity is you may be able to get it. It's very risky handling a list where you haven't got the list that was listed. A better approach entirely is to say: 'Mr Jinx, we have arrived at that point where you're going to be laid off auditing until we can recover your earlier folder which, as I understand, is in Australia. We will tell you when we get it.'" And then make somebody in Australia send him the earlier auditing folder. Or make Joe Blitz who is in Alaska mail in that damned service facsimile. You don't necessarily want the whole folder, but you for sure want that list. It might have been some other squirrely things. If you think it was very squirrely, why you want it all sent in. And you want it now. In view of the fact that you are normally operating in an organization, those that I'm talking to at the moment are certainly working at an organization, you have communication lines where this can occur. It's the safer thing to try to obtain the list. Get the actual list and null it now. What's suppressed? On ba bow bow has anything been suppressed? On ba ba bow bow has anything been suppressed That reads. On ba ba bow has anything been suppressed? That one reads, you know. On catawumbs has anything been suppressed? See? Pow! On doggerbo has anything been suppressed? No read. On rupptittle has any thing been suppressed? Long fall. On the listing question has anything been suppressed? Long fall. What was it? Oh yeah, well the guy didn't run any list on it. (unclear speech) As a matter of fact at that particular time and so forth... ah... waggle waggle waggle waggle. Okay. Now you've unsuppressed these items, call them again. Bluey and blah. There are two reading items on the list. Ah... but everything on the list isn't live so therefore you haven't by—passed the item. Now you get down here and you put a bar over to the left side of the list and you say list extended date and you put the additional items on the list and one of them blows down. You renull the list to make sure... the whole list to make sure you haven't got anything reading and that is it. Sometimes a PC even gets restive and unhappy because you list the whole list. Ah, there is a degree at which he is saying wow wee, that is it wow wee, when you don't null but you're taking a chance. You're taking a chance. You actually are. So you've got the fellow's service facsimile from the original list. That is the correct action. Now once in a blue moon you have to do this other action, which I'm talking to you about. You get everything unsuppressed. Now you could even ask 'Was there anything you hadn't told this auditor? ' You see, the missed withhold. Ah, at that time were you ARC broken about anything? And so on—you can pick it up, 'see. Pick it up. Pick it up. And any every one few of these you find out it suddenly rehabs. It was the right service facsimile and it did rehab, but it was listed over out Ruds and the F/ N declared on it war a false report, but it was the correct service facsimile. Do you get the complications that can occur here? Very complicated.

It all comes from this: now on one of the questions I just asked on an examination, I better repeat this, the way standard tech ceases to be standard tech is somebody has already done something non—standard. The way to get standard tech back in—he's missed some piece of standard tech—the way to get it in is you find out what piece of standard tech was missed and you remedy this. You got it? And the case will then fly, because there are only so many pieces to standard tech. See, wild things could have occurred. He could have been listed standing on his head, any damned thing could have occurred there, thousands of outnesses that could have occurred in the session, this is the one thing I've got to push home to you. There are thousands and millions—an infinity of possible errors in a session. Do you follow? The only error you are interested in are those errors which violate standard tech. You got it, you've got to get this point or you won't actually be able to repair anybody. You look for the points of standard tech that have been violated—the session run over a PTS, the session run with a missed withhold. Do you get it? The... the bird that walked in to the org and they started to do engrams on him and he couldn't run anything and...(unclear speech) and so on. his TA was up and so on and they went ahead and ran grades and all this sort of thing, with the guy flubbed up madly way back down the track on points of release. There weren't any points of release ever rehabed on this case. They were running ARC S/ W without rehab. The guy came in, ran ARC S/ W, you see and got some results for God's sake. The TA never really came down but he got results and he had a cognition and he and so forth and that was pretty good and actually they marked it that they had an F/ N, but for some reason the next time he came into session the TA was at 6 or something and then they're going to run Secondaries and in some peculiar way Secondaries are run. And this case is just doing a weird one. Well actually he walked in with a high TA. What the hell is somebody off the street doing with a high TA? Well, obviously he's been overrun. (laugh) I know but he never had any auditing. He never even read a book. But he's been overrun.

What overran him? Well, I want to call to your attention that there it a lot of livingness going on. And also here and there on the whole track, here and there on the whole track they knew something dim about running engrams. They didn't know it well and they didn't know enough not to overrun it. Every point of these you find overruns associated with them. There are various methods of getting rid of engrams. In space opera society they had a sort of a Chapstick that came together with an awful crash while showing the guy a photograph of the area he was injured in and this was a signal to the thetan that he was supposed to chop it up and wad it up into a ball and throw it away. If you worked this area over and run that off you find the original incident sitting there. That's quite fascinating.

But there was some effort from time to time to handle a thetan's pictured here and there on the track it's been known that a thetan had pictures. They didn't have any other technology to back it up, but they had that and where these were run you get an overrun. So this can happen, the PC comes in and ARC S/ W is great, Secondaries seem to be alright and then engrams the TA went (whistles)... 'Is it getting more solid? ' 'Are we on the wrong chain? ' What the hell is this? It's an overrun on engrams. You won't find it an overrun on any other part of Scientology but you'll find occasionally an overrun on engrams. But most frequently it's an overrun on drugs and I would

adventure to say that you occasionally have an overrun on life, just the subject of living, and you occasionally have the subjects of an overrun of dying he's died too many times. (laughter) Well his death is a release, what the hell. But you'd have to figure out what it is. What is it? What is it that's been overrun? Well, it could be a lot of things been overrun, so you'd better find out what's been overrun. Now what has been overrun or what has been going on too long or what have you done too often? Any version of the question that would communicate is handled and it is not a list—it is a process. But you get a read on this item and then you do a standard rehab and then you ask—it didn't F/ N—so you ask for another one and you ask for the release on that. And it's a little bit better and the TA comes down. And then you ask for the next question and it didn't read and then you ask for the next question and it read, so you rehab that. And you keep this process up and if you do it well you all of a sudden will have this sitting there looking at an F/ N. Go ahead. Dead simple. Now the fellow lives 50 or 100 years later and he's got a high TA, see, you could ask him again 'What has been overrun?' If the question reads there will be one, two, three items that have been overrun and you rehab each one and you've got it made. In other words all that is is a method of finding areas to rehab and it's a process, not a list. Get the difference. Alright!

Now, in sequence there are two key processes: 1. Valence Shifter. The Valence Shifter. 'What valence or identity would be safe?' All right. List to one item. Bong! Because you want to list it down to the bottom of the pile and bongo! Which is followed by a question 'What can you confront?' which is a process. Now you can actually write down these What—can—you—confronts and sooner or later the guy's going to BD on something and sooner or later some wiseacre is going to tell us that all processes should be listed. Now hear me, hear me good and clean, hear me very straight. If you list a question which is not a one item question and by—pass the reads on the items without handling them you pack the case up. You'll pack the case up as neat as anything you ever packed up. So if you ever see on an auditing report form, if you ever see on a worksheet 'What has been overrun?' with item, item, blank, blank, item, you know reading, item—reading, item reading, BD. And you just see it there and you look back on the worksheet and you find none of them have been handled.

The weird part of it is the case will have a tendency then to be packed up. It is not something you do and correct because you're trying to be pedantic, trying to be the villain of the piece who says all the commas must be in the right place. No, you'll find that the case is now packed up. So somebody has got to go back over it again. That's why you must always teach your auditors always to mark the falls and BDs. Don't let them make a bunch of stuff without. And you know, I see, most of the worksheets I see these days, have no falls or BDs marked on them. There is no SF for small fall, F for fall, ah... LF for long fall. You can't distinguish. And doing C/ S work is very difficult. It's no trick to writing these things down.

Now you would just see horror of horrors 'What has been overrun?', some type of process of that particular character which is really just a process and if you were to see that listed with no falls after it, and the thing wasn't even nulled, you're not really in trouble, you would actually put in on the listing question 'On what has been overrun has anything been suppressed, anything been invalidated?' put them in very lightly, you're going to get a

lot of read out of it. Ah... very good, read the first question, on this has anything been suppressed? Woof fall. Good. Rehab it. In other words you have to unsuppress the list and get each one of them rehabbed. Get what the proper repair action is.

This is one of the vicious ones that can come your way. It already happened a couple of times. You say 'Use what has been overrun, list what has been overrun and handle each reading item as it reads'. And the auditor comes along and he runs a little list. It is a list, being well trained it's a list and he doesn't even mark the reads. And he's listed it. He didn't do anything with it. Now what I'm warning you of is liable to have packed up the case at that exact instant . You're going to have trouble with the case now. Wasn't rehabbed. Because every single one of those is a restimulated by—passed charge. It was listed wasn't handled. Now on, sooner or later some auditor is going to make this list he's going to find an item, it is going to blow down, it is going to go F/ N and he's got it made. And from that he's going to move over into the thing that every process should be listed.

So I make it loud and clear to you that there are two types of questions: one is simply a process and you write down the answers and it does look like a list, but it's not a list under the heading of listing and nulling. It's not a legitimate question. And under that heading can come any question that reads. An absolute infinity of questions You can actually as a C/ S dream them up if they read great. But that's how you'd have to do it. Each one of them has to be handled. Because they are not legitimate questions. Not legitimate lists. An infinity of it.

Now you sometimes do this very lightly to find information from the case. Let's give you an example where... where you are trying actually, you are actually trying to find out why this fellow has an invisible field. He somehow or another by some mystery has wound up at about 5 or 6 OT and he's got an invisible field. Well he can't see anything. You've got a blind thetan or something. Now you can actually undertake this as an as an action. It's merely an exploratory action. You can ask the auditor to list what it is. 'Regarding this invisible field what is it?' (laughter) Now you hold a pistol at the auditor's head on this, you say 'falls, small falls, long falls, BDs for god's sake mark them down, boy, mark them down'. It's an illegitimate list don't you see, but it's still alright. Ya, it's handled like 'What has been overrun?' It isn't one thing and it never will be one thing. It's always a composite.

Now you get into trouble this way by thinking in this framework: the magic button. I've lived in the atmosphere of this god damned non—existent magic button since 1950. There is one thing wrong with the org. There is one thing wrong with the case. Now what would you do as to all other considerations, look for this one magic thing. In 1950 it was the fellow who was supposed to be shot in the gluttonous maximus by a biochemical thing which made him at once clear and which we would by now be rehabbing like crazy so we could get on with it. (laughter) I don't know if anybody here remembers those days but there was a great deal of discussion in those days concerning the fact that there ought to be some chemical, which one would load up into a syringe and the word One Shot Clear became current, but it was actually a sarcastic word. But people listened for this button and for quite a while I researched on this basis, so actually I've given time to this idea and I can absolutely assure you, completely and 100% that there is no magic single button.

For instance the LRH Comm WW was looking through policy letters the other day, he said 'something is wrong, something is wrong' and therefore it must be contained in policy. Well alright, undoubtedly too within limit. And so therefore I'm going to read all of these policy letters and applying it out and all of a sudden he found out that it says that an organization, which has undergone a period of interiorization, heavy traffic internal, heavy traffic internal will shortly after that go into a slump. Heavy internal traffic is followed by a slump. Naturally it's interiorized and isn't handling outside, so it goes into a slump. You probably remember the policy letter. Anyway he found this policy letter and he promptly started applying it and got people to promote and just dropped the idea of internal this and that and the other thing and he said let's just have at it and let's do this exteriorization action. And I'm sure they'll make it. 4 or 5 weeks from now we'll have them coming up the line. But he should... he was looking for a magic button, a magic single button.

Well the reason he came down to looking for the magic single button which would resolve the case at that particular instance is because a great many buttons had been very neglected for a very long time. Now at any given... what... what deludes you in this is at any given instant there is a magic button, see, at any given instant there is a magic button, which when handled changes to another magic button. (laugh) You do that in putting in the rudiments. When you're putting in the rudiments the single magic button on the case—ARC break. The single magic button NOW is PTP. The single magic button would be missed withhold. Do you get the idea? And actually going up the grades each grade is the next magic button. They are magic buttons alright, but they are not just one button. There is no button, there will never be a button. I can assure you there will never be a button, which pressed with great expertise will suddenly blow a person to OT 8 from insane asylum or wog. There is no such thing. And the reason there isn't such a thing is because awareness is a gradient. It's what he becomes aware of. Now maybe you can shorten this gradient down to an hour, but it would still be not one button. It would have to be a whole series of buttons in this hour, ba ba ba ba ba ba ba ba ba. Do you get it? And you'd have to know what button to push at any given instant in that hour in order to clean that thing up. Do you see? So the one button to hell with it. You can say, well I know the button. Yes, yes, I know of a button. The guy is just mocking up his bank and if you could get that and work on that he could be convinced of that, why naturally then the whole bank would blow and he would be a Clear. Obvious. So there is one button.

Well, in the first place right above that there are a whole lot of body thetans who also have the same consideration, only unfortunately they have the consideration they are him when they are not, and unfortunately above that at 7 he will discover that there is another whole row of aberration, as a matter of fact there are about 6 of them, quite in addition to pictures. (laugh) So you see even that doesn't turn out to be one button. He's Clear alright. Great. Great. Se hasn't got any pictures. Fine. Now he goes up to III and he gets rid of all his body thetans. So he hasn't got any body thetans and so on. He can mock up pictures and not mock up pictures. he's in beautiful condition. IV is all straightened out. Re's all rehabbed and so forth and he suddenly begins to ask the question 'Why am I not 9 feet tall yet? I was 9 feet tall on Thursday and I as only 2 inches tall on Friday.(laughter)

Why is that? ' Well, there are 6 or 7 more things that are wrong with him, and they're contained in the upper line of 7 and 8. I'm not trying to make a mystery out of these things and say, oh well you find these things when you get to 7 and 8. There are things like postulates and there's things like interpersonal relationships, there's things like the interrelationship with life itself, there's on 8 there is 'who made this damned stuff?' (laughter) Who made it and also who didn't want him to? (laughter) Do you see there are things like this. Is somebody standing around holding it there and mocking... keeping it mocked up? (laughter) You can get a lot of questions come up. The resolutions of these questions and so on are all that's wrong with a thetan.

Now let's get back to where we started here. Do you have some idea now that the listing and nulling laws apply to legitimate listing questions? Now there possibly could be more legitimate listing questions than the 7 or 8 which are already there. I don't say that some of these would not list to one item, but if they list to one item it's because you're asking for the mostest or the bestest or the biggestest. Do you get it? 'Who is the biggest watermelon?' (laughter) 'What is the biggest planet you have ever been on?' ' One item question obviously because you asked for it. And that would determine it to that degree, but there are a little row of them, which don't have the biggest and mostest, they just come out to one item. And unless they come out to one item, cut the PC throat, it'd be kinder.

Now the questions of VA oddly enough are so centrally located with regard to the PCs mind and beingness. What have you got? You've got persons, places and subjects. Wow! And the funny part of it is that you could probably carry them on and on, you could probably get some other reads, you could probably do this and that and they are so centralized in the field of aberration that they... actually you could count on the first BD being the item on the list so that you can cut it short, but do you realize that that doesn't disobey the laws of listing and nulling.

On a centralized question like that the first BD is it on the list. Take it. The weird point about it is when you go back to rehab VA, the minute you go back to rehab VA, providing the auditor marked the BD, which BD'd. You know he didn't do A, which BD'd really, but then wrote down B and put the BD after B. he could make some goofy error like this. But you go back and repair these VA and it's very very peculiar, you'll find out it's the first blowing down item. Now you say, well that therefore must be a law of all listing. It doesn't have to be a list of S& Ds, it doesn't have to apply to S& Ds, so it's still the one reading item on the list. So please differentiate, that in VA you are just being given a fast route which still follows the laws of listing. It isn't a special case. It just happens that VA follows the rules of listing, all the rules of listing occur on the first BD. Bong! That's all. It's peculiar. And you'll find on some S& Ds that it's not true. So what I've given you you'll see in VA, it's this peculiarity, it's the first BD.

Now you can look on a VA list and you can see that he took the second BD, and it inevitably will be a wrong item. So it's not correct, it's the second BD. You look on an S& D list and you'll find the third BD reading is the correct item. Insufficiently central to the intelligence of the being, you see. (unclear)... you've listed here over on the fringes and he blew some charge here and he blew some charge there and he blew... if you say, persons, places... what the hell man, you're going right up against the substance of 7 and 8. Bongo! Bongo! Dead on! And the person says 'oh yeah' because he's

sitting right there. It's just a peculiarity, so that is simply given to you in an effort to let you get it done in a hurry. And no other significance than that, so don't lean on it all over the place and run up a big ridge.

Now where an individual is rehabbed on VA you always carefully do the whole job, you null the whole list to see if it has to be extended in any way... Why? The PC thought of something else when he was listing. He didn't have the listing question. This. That. There is a goofy outness here, see. The PC was still thinking about something, all of a sudden something else distracted his attention and he thought oh well, what the hell, I mean we've got to get this session through with here... I've got to meet my wife, or something you know. Attention came off the session, he got a BD, something goofy like this. There is no way you can prevent this except by being an auditor. What the hell are you doing auditing so up to? Well, what were you doing auditing a PC who had to meet his wife? I've never audited a PC who had to go out and meet his wife at 4 o'clock. Oh no not me! Now I want to put in a Reality—factor here... we gonna run waffle, waffle, waffle, waffle. I'm going to run a resistive case list on you... That's a hell of a gag. Boy that's real scum. Didn't this auditor ever hear about the fact that he had to be in ARC with the PC? One of the reasons the fellow runs the resistive case list, he can run a resistive case list on somebody who is just momentarily hung up and find out what it is, he still falls in these categories. The guy was sick on Thursday, must do an assessment on the thing. It says he is physically ill. That's it. So, the net result, the net result, when a guy gets the R—factor he's liable to tell you something like, ja ja ja ja ja ja... you know, funny attitude, this guy must be in a hell of a rush... ask the guy you were rushed on anything? Oh yes yes I have to meet my wife at 4 o'clock. Good. Before we start this session actually I want you to get out on the telephone and call her. Oh I'm sorry you can't, she' driving around in the car now. Good. Alright, I'll tell you what, at the risk of upsetting you, and so forth... ah... we're going to have this session this evening. Be back here this evening. Why, why, it's perfectly alright with me, I can suppress this while you're auditing. (laughter)

This is all part of making the PC fly, you see. You actually could have spent time, have you had food, have you had sleep, do you have to go any place, and so forth, except this is so god damned pianola and play it by dropping the penny in the machine and so forth that it is a damned bore, as they are currently saying and they'll be saying something else in the future sometime, it is a drag. (laughter) It's a waste of time. Ah... therefore, therefore you immediately assume that your PC is in one of two conditions to be audited, which is he set up to be audited or he ain't. (laughter) And of the he ain't there are two categories, the ones the auditor can repair and the ones he can't. Well, I'm very sorry I'm in an awful rush. I have an appointment with a physician to have my leg sawed off at 4 o'clock. (laughter) Actually there is something an auditor can do about that—you can say go and call him up and cancel it, huh. Why should I do that? Well, one of the reasons is I'm auditing you. Mixed practices. (laughter) So therefore a process can be written down and look like a list and there is a thing called list, which you then list.

Now as we look into this with more intimacy we find that the definition of a complete list is a list which has only one reading item on the list. Oh yes, you know all about that. Of course the other items that just tick, no they wouldn't do, many exceptions to this rule. Ah... the... ah the list which we

null with out rude has long falls on various items. There aren't any exceptions to it none! None! None! That is a list and this is brought forward for this remarkable reason: That the auditors in 1962, in 63, used to come around and ask me all the time how many items should be on the list. How many items should be on the list. Should list be four items? What is a full list? Should it be two items? Three items? Four items? Twenty items? You have to give it some sort of a figure. You're asking me some balderdash question like how long is a rope? And it's as long as there is a complete item on it.

Now I have seen some pretty damned long lists. I have seen a list go two or three pages before the item fell out of the hamper. That sounds incredible and it is almost un... incredible. It happens damned rarely, but it does happen. So you see some auditor he says, well let's see I've gotten down to the bottom of the first page and somebody is liable to be very upset indeed if I go on listing page after page. I've been shot for it in the past and I don't have any item yet so it must be a dead horse. Listen, did the question read? The list won't dead—horse. No listing question which read will ever dead—horse, because the only reason a dead horse dead—horses is the listing question did not read. (laughter) If the question read you get an item. And I've actually seen very recently a folder in which there was a reading listing question and then after listing half a page the auditor decided it must be a dead horse because all the items up to that point did not now read, two or three of them had read.

So what was he doing? He was auditing one of these wide things. Do you know that the PCs attention, goes way out and comes way in and goes way out and comes way in cyclically. There's certain test research processes you can run and he starts talking about this, see. he'll say the table, the chair, the clock there, the bureau, the glass of water, the room, a wall, that duck over there, America, that star, the sea in the Galaxy, yes yes yes the Galaxy, the star that other star of the planet, of the moon, that range of Hills, the the tongue there, the floor.

You can watch his answers, they go out and they go in; he's buttered around the place. Do you follow? And if he is really dead in and he wasn't really right to recognize there was anything like this and the list is being listed just a little bit soon on his case should we say... ah, it read, it's going to be a long list. And you read it and you null it and if the question read then one of two things is true; the items are suppressed, which is easy to do because you null it with suppress, or the list is incomplete. And I actually have four little questions that you can ask and you have them on a bulletin write—up. It's most usually the first item on the list on a long list that's always the figure.

The candidate that has been by—passed is the first item. That most frequent. The second item comes in a little bit behind the first item. And the list is incomplete or the list is suppressed. There's certain various positive things that are wrong with lists You can take these laws of listing and make a list of the laws of listing for assessment and go down the case with each one and you would eventually find every damned reason. One assumes that standard is in before he does the laws of listing, so you would have to put on that something like 'Was it listed with out Ruds? ' To make it a complete assessment form I would just check on that. To make an assessment form on this you would have to put 'Was it listed over out Ruds? ' and for the uninitiated you would have to list the Ruds that could have been out while

the listing was going on or which were now out and then you would have a total which was more or less known anyhow.

But these laws of listing could be added up. Do you see how you could do that? You can take any of the materials of standard tech and list them out and ask questions of it and work them this way and work them that way, because what you are doing. It's the difference between a mechanic using a screw driver and a pair of pliers. You know, he uses a screw driver and he uses a pair of pliers. Well he sure can use them in numerous ways. Got the laws of listing, there are probably a dozen ways you could use these lists. All right, complete list, there's all there is about a complete list, because that's what it is. But remember by the word list here we mean from an authentic reading listing question.

Two, the TA rising means the list is being overlisted. It's too long inevitable and invariable a rising TA inevitably means that something has been done too long and so on. Sometimes with a suppressive and so on you will see a TA rise. You'll see a suppressive—TA rise. And you say aha, that's a variation from the laws of listing, because, look at that, it's been a stuck high TA and it has come down like mad when we all of a sudden got this suppressive. Oh oh oh oh, I'm not trying to make myself right. It was simply an overrun. He was an overrun. Se was around far too long. (laughter) One of the reactions of suppressing are incomplete cycles of action and overrun on cycle of action.

To handle the handled is also very suppressive. You got a floor all clean, somebody comes along, tells you to clean up the floor. A Suppressive cleans cleans. It's one of the characteristic. It doesn't make somebody who cleans a clean a suppressive, but he invariably does this. He's got... the house is all painted, it's all finished, just getting ready to put away the paint brushes, the suppressive comes along and says look at that, you'd better get to work on that, hasn't been painted well enough, go on and paint the house. He'll also come along with only one wall half painted and say you will have to rake the garden now. But different suppressives they are in the overrun or in the incomplete.

So you've found a suppressive is overrunning something. Also you will find that the subject of this suppression is an overrun. It is not a violation of this, but once in a while you'll find an S& D is the reason of a high TA, once in a while. And then you sit very mysterious, but of course it's quite obvious that the person needs an S& D, he's sick, PTS and so forth. You just happen to give him an S& D and you happen to see the TA go down, you wouldn't necessarily always order an S& D because some body's TA was high, do you follow? It doesn't work. Now, a TA rising while you're doing a list it means it's overlisted. And boy you can catch that right now, right now, right now, right now. It was the second item it starts to rise on the third item. You can catch it right now, just like that. Pow! Pow! Because you see a rising TA is first signaled by a needle going from right to left, instead of left to right. Now it's true that there is a little bump that a person can go across, a little bump he can go across and you said jinx and you had a surge and then you said brown and it sort of rises a little bit. You know the needle return to position, and then it says balderdash and goes bbblumsp. you got it. So it isn't the first tiny little bit of motion of the needle. And when that thing is going up the PC starts to think. There are other things that go along with it, he starts to comm lag the needle starts going over to the left and you've already... you have a forecast of the fact that you are just about to overlist. This is

forecasted.

Now if you did this, if you did this, if you nulled the first three items and it was starting to apparently rise on the fourth and it did the first three items and then having done the first three items it looked like it was rising, you went back and nulled the first three items, you got in suppress on the first item and on the second item, and you still didn't have an item you go on listing. Do you understand? And if the TA now really started up like a surge you would go back and examine that first item again. Do you see? He's done something. We had an example, we had a person of another nationality and he was given an S& D and he put the item on the list, which by the way some sessions later came up, but he put the item on the list and then he thought oh my god that's not socially acceptable and he (bang). And boy, nobody could persuade him to let that item read again.

In America such an item would be mother, do you see? You wouldn't dare put, a lot a lot of areas wouldn't dare put the word mother on the list. In Italy it would be priest. You know, father Giuseppee (laughter). Has anything been unmocked? Yes. Who or what has tried to unmock you? See? You're asking, anything tried to unmock you? Right away this is what communicates you know. he's asking himself has anything been unmocked, anything uncocked, father Giuseppe, aha, oh no. (laughter) Can't give it to him. Now you do give it to him. He is now all in the middle of guilt. He'll give the manifestation of you having found the wrong item but only visually, the way to really get him in trouble is to continue with, a little bit further, and really give him a wrong item, you let him struggle with that one, very often you give the PC a wrong item, he struggles with it. But you can give him a right item which he struggles with. It's whether or not it obeys the rules of listing. It obeys the rules of listing, that's his item. Father Guiseppi that's it, pooh. Oh no oh no oh no, yes, yes I guess that's it. (laughter) he'll come right straight through it, you see. Alright!

Number three: a list can be underlisted in which case nothing can be found on nulling. The question read, the question read, you listed a list, nothing is suppressed, two or three items read as you listed it—incomplete list. Nothing read, so extend it. You put a little bar over here and mark extended. Don't ever you or let your auditors get into a position or habit of extending a list without marking a bar over to the left of the list saying ext. And if you ever extend a later list, later extend an early list is what I mean why say ext with the current date so somebody knows it's been repaired.

Now, if after a session the TA is still high or goes up a wrong item has been found. And that can happen between the session and (the environ) and the examiner. He left the session having done a Remedy B. He left the session and his TA was at 2 and he arrives at the examiner with his TA at 4.75, to give you an extreme example. You don't have to ask any questions about it whatsoever, you just say wrong item, back to session. Or you say examine the list. Now remember that it was always wisest when you have a direct evidence of an incorrect list to get the list corrected before you bingle—bungle around with Ruds, because it is the out rud. So, this can happen a couple of days later, only it doesn't show up as a high TA, it shows up as his face went solid. Yeah, I have some pressure on my face, or something of this character. (unclear) I was all right after the session. I was sure it was... And your correct action is then go back and have the list corrected. It's a wrong item, wrong item, wrong item. Another evidence, particularly on VA, he got

in ethics trouble within a very short time afterwards, 48 hours something like that he finds himself in ethics. Ah the... he finds himself in the hands of the medical officer.

Now, you might run into some firefight like I ran into one time, whereby the galley was busy feeding badly in an unsanitary area and a whole bunch of crew members came down epidemically at the same time I was getting some auditing accomplished with those guys and (laughter) and now we had to disentangle what this was all about. Were they being super suppressed? All of a sudden had a mad team walked in on the scene? What had happened? What had happened? Well all that had happened was somebody had fed them rotten meat (laugh), but it sure made one wonder.

Now the funny part of it is the guy who had fed them the rotten meat had had three wrong items on power just 48 hours before he knowingly fed them rotten meat. (laughter) Now you say I was looking all over the place to find the wrong items—well I found the wrong items, I found the guy.(laughter) That's how far it can go.

Now if the PC says it is a wrong item, it is a wrong item. Now the trouble with that is, is this father Guiseppi thing that I just said.—So the PC is saying ah I don't think that is my item, I don't think that is my item, I don't think that is my item. All the rules of listing say it is his item. What are you going to do? Interesting question—what are you going to do? Alright, we leave it at that. (laughter) I'm not going to solve all your problems (laughter). But this is true. If he says it is a wrong item it is a wrong item. In the first place he is going to go around worrying about the catholic church to such a degree that he's going to spin in if you give him father Giuseppe. I'll will solve it for you, there is nothing to it actually. Ah, you ask him, just discuss this item with me, I 'm not trying to force it on you, you don't have to have this item, no you just don't have to have this item, anything been suppressed and so forth on it, invalidated and so forth. Oh I sure invalidated it, oh wow. (laughter)

Now where do you put those auditing reports normally? (laughter) he's landed up with a problem hasn't he? Well, if you force the item on him against that sort of thing and so forth, as far as he is concerned it's wrong item, he'll come around to it being a right item, if you just acknowledge it. You say, it says here that father Giuseppe is your item. No no it couldn't possibly be. All right thank you very much. Now do you say, it is too your item? (laughter) On six, the question must be checked and must read as a question before it is listed. An item listed from an unreading question would give you a deadhorse. And that's all, you always listed, but let me tell you something, it could be a false read or a suppressed read. Now a person who is being suppressed suppresses the suppressed. Do you see, he is suppressing suppressed because he is dramatizing being suppressed. And suppressed reads when you say lightly with a gay heart, ah... is it withdrawn from, is it stop or is it uncocked? Most of the time you'll get away with it. But the reason this guy is PTS, he is upset, he is sick, ah he is this, he is that.

There is every reason in the world, but boy this guy is PTS and remember that the whole subject can be this. WSU will normally shine outside of the question and you normally can get your read on a it. And it says "U" (unmock) . So you say who or what, and you can check it, is trying to unmock you. Some guys who are a bit blue only react to is trying to unmock you. It's a current situation. Who or what has tried to unmock you if it... attempted to unmock you—that sense of the question does not reach them,

so you have to test the question, get a suppress in on it and you suddenly see it reading. Make sure it isn't a false read. In other words you handle this. It's got to be a handleable thing, but if even after you handle it still doesn't read and then you knuckleheadedly go list it. Boy you want to have your own head examined, because it'll give you a dead—horse every time. A dead—horse proceeds from a non—reading question and that is the reason for a dead horse and an auditor who does not check the listing question before he lists it is a knuckle—head.

Now, if the item is on the list and nothing read on nulling the item is suppressed or invalidated. Yes, so true, so true. Now one that cures that comes in number eight. On a suppressed list it must be nulled with suppressed. On balderdash has anything been suppressed? And then you don't say the item, because of course the read on suppression transfers to suppress, so if the item is going to read it'll read on suppress anyhow, and now you've cleaned up suppress so you know the thing is going to read. Now an invalidated item reads on invalidate. A suppressed item reads on suppressed. And the odd part of it is that it reads the exact amount on suppress or invalidated that it reads itself. On the item the reads transfers. As to the exact right item it's going to read on the list. On ragbags has anything been suppressed—boom. You should try it out a few times just to see what the hell happened. And all of a sudden you're totally relaxed, you say ragbags, it'll read the same read exactly that you just got on suppressed. Exactly. Same length. Same everything. It's one of the miraculous little things.

It's the wildest thing I ever saw in my life, when I saw it. The exact read with the same hitch, the same level, the same (unclear) it's exact. And you can transfer it off to suppress, transfer... suppress it and now suppress will read, you can clean it up, suppress it again, read it under the suppress once more, the suppress now reads, you clean it up, bring it back, make the item read again—it's the wildest thing you ever saw in your life. So it is one of the methods of identifying the item. Is it the item that was suppressed? Does it read like the suppressed read? So then you'd say on balderdash has anything been suppressed? Well you know it's going to be it so you do it, but to hell with it.

Supposing you wanted to check this thing out you say balderdash. Did it read the same as suppressed? One of the ways of checking it. Very cute, it's identical, identical read. Now, on an item that is suppressed or invalidated the read will transfer exactly from the item to the button and when the button is gotten in the item will again read. Just as I told you. Every once in a while you see some auditor say on balderdash has anything been suppressed. All right, thank you very much that's your item. When you are nulling you just say on balderdash has anything been suppressed read. When you've got the item, say the item and then the su... its read will come off. Otherwise its read will stay on it. You've got to say the item again. On balderdash has anything been suppressed, on ragbags has anything been suppressed, on... bong. Balderdash is the only reading item on the list. You say, good balderdash, there is your read. All right, you say, your item is balderdash.

Now an item from an overlisted list is often suppressed. The damndest thing you ever saw in your life. If you see an 89 page list some knucklehead has done in Kyokak, for Christ's sake know that the item is probably the first

or second item on the list(laughter) On occasion when you pass the item in nulling all subsequent items will read to a point where everything on the list will then read. In this case take the first read, take the first which read on the first nulling. So, so this idea of slant, slant, slant, slant or X, X, X, X, come off of it. Don't do that! Don't do that! It's SF; F. LFBD. Say what the read was! So as you're coming down you read the first item on the list (unclear), ah balderdash, topsat, oh wait a minute! What the hell is this? Catterwamps, that was a LF, balderdash a SF, chipmunks F. catnip F. [unclear] F. What the hell is going on here? Well what's going on here is you're carrying the read of the first item right on down in the list. If you keep doing this you're going to be in a hell of a mess In fact I don't know of a good method of separating out this awful mess.

Now, an underlisted and overlisted list will ARC break the PC, and he may refuse to be audited until the list is corrected and may become furious with the auditor and will remain so until it is corrected. He'll also become sad, he'll also get other manifestations of ARC break. Overlisted and underlisted, an incorrect list is something is the first thing you correct for straightening up the case. Listing and nulling or any auditing at all beyond an ARC break without handling the ARC break, such as correcting the list or otherwise locating it will put the PC into a sad effect. And that is so true. Just what it says because it is the same as an ARC break. A long—duration ARC break that is audited over top of, will bring about a sad effect.

Fourteen, a PC whose attention is on something else won't list easily. You list and null only with the rudiments in on the PC. That's where you would put it, doing a list you would have to expand that question as I was inferring. You would have to say, you know while you were being listed, you know, did you have a PTS, a MWH. Ah... an auditor whose TRs are out has difficulty in listing and nulling and in finding items. Oh so true. Now if you wanted to send every item to the examiner to be checked to make sure it was the right item, it would simply be stating this: every auditor, I have, has out—TRs. We are not sure that the person went release on the process he was run on. The analogous statement is: none of our auditors have their TRs in. When TRs are out things go release and do various weird cooky things, that they shouldn't, but when we say TRs are out, God! it's got to be awfully damned bad. It's something that you would break down and cry over. The auditor is sitting there eating candy and the PC is looking out the window, more or less self auditing, and the auditor is reading a newspaper between questions. It'd really be corny, see, for this to happen. Listing and nulling errors in presence of auditor's code violations can unstabilize a PC, believe me. You take a PC who is not been fed or something like this or has not had enough sleep etc. and you insist on listing and you carry the list over, and it's already difficult to audit and you shouldn't be listing at time anyhow, can unstabilize a guy. He he can feel like he is absolutely spinning, for a day, two days, three days, four days, woof! Now the lack of a specific listing question or an incorrect nonstandard listing question which doesn't really call for an item would give you more than one item reading on a list. Sometimes you see a list which has lots of items reading on it, for Christ's sake go back and look at the listing question. And it could say. "Are tractors necessary?" (laughter) Don't get so obsessed that you think only one thing will read on that list—everything under God's green earth will read on it. You cease listing and nulling actions when a floating needle appears, and this is perfectly true. You

cease listing and nulling actions when a floating needle appears. You don't cease auditing. Do you get the nuance of that? (laughter) It means what it says.

Now, always give the PC hit item and circle it plainly on the list. Wait wait wait a minute! That's auditing past listing and... Boy, you'd better. his F/ N will pack right up, PC go around what was my item what was my item, what was my item. See the bank freezes before the PC speaks, so it probably went F/ N before he gave you the item. You tee, he thought ragbags, F/ N, and then he says ragbags and you write it down. See, there it is. Sometimes when you are nulling (snaps fingers) you get your F/ N.

Now if you just sit there blankly the PC is going to go into mystery. So you always give the PC his item. And twenty, listing and nulling are highly precise auditing actions and if not done exactly by the laws may bring about a down tone and slow gain case, but if done correctly exactly by the laws and with good auditing in general will produce the highest gains attainable. Note, there are no variations or exceptions to the above. It does not alter VA power procedure. People think sometimes this alters it or they're different. I'm just... I already told you why. And ethics should be put in where these laws are violated. An auditor who isn't convinced of something, you should list him on some question, insists it goes to one item, particularly if the question doesn't read. What tractors are sick? (laughter) Went into 89 pages and insist there is an item. That's too gruesome. I know you can't confront it. I wouldn't be able to confront it either. I'm sure you'll—all do these laws correctly and I'm sure use a blackjack on those.

People regard these laws of listing and nulling far too lightly, far far far too lightly. They are very important, and with the auditor's code are the most important errors that can be made as far as case effects are concerned, so they are not to be regarded lightly. You don't list a list and then don't null it, you don't muck about with listing and nulling. You don't let an auditor list and null for you as case supervisor that you are very doubtful of. You got it? You make him itsa or something.

Got it? (yes)

Help you out a little bit? (yes)

All right. Thank you very much. (applause)

ASSISTS

A lecture given on 3 October 1968

... and you are being well advertised, class eight's, you are being well advertised. A full spread of the Auditor. We sent a mission, we sent a mission up to the Pubs Org in WW, and we got ourselves a complete spread in this. It has a double page internal spread of photographs... taken by the only photographer in the field. And you will notice that the pictures here are actually posed by Sea Org members. They are not in, actual fact the first class eight students and that's because you were all so very, very busy that day. And the AOs are represented here: "The class VIII auditors course begins at AOs." But that is quite an action. A rather typical Sea Org action actually. We banged it together, organized the whole shot, shot a missionaire up to Pubs, got it on the presses, its rolling, it will be out and released in England in something on the order of about two weeks from this date, and it will be over in America in three or four weeks.

And it says here that as you read this, why, Class Vllls will be supervising cases in your nearest org. So it looks like you guys are very well advertised. Very, very well advertised and I am sure you will make the grade. You better had.

The action here is that you have to get a reality on what standard tech will do, and what you can do with it, and which way it goes and so on. All of which is very easy.

OK What's the lecture number? Which one? Ten! You mean you've gotten up to ten and you are not class Vllls yet. Lecture number ten, lecture number ten. And this is the third of October, AD 18 and this is a lecture that covers exact processes and is very ratatat—tat.

The first process I wish to cover is an assist. An assist is done on, if you will notice your scale of special cases, the sick PC. Now the sick PC can also include one that is in a flat out agonizing he doesn't know what is wrong physical condition and the approach to that particular case is included in the head... under the heading of assist.

The most common assist is a CONTACT ASSIST. You take the person to the place where he was injured and make him do a contact of the injured part to the place where... and the thing that was actually the cause of the injury and you do that and you will get a somatic blow through and that is that. That is very common and very easy to do. That is called a contact assist. And you never do a touch assist when you can do a contact assist. If the thing is there it's there. This comes from the fact that the exact thorn in the rose garden which pricks your finger will turn on that exact somatic when contacted again.

In other words if the MEST is available you can do a contact assist and it is a very easy thing to do. There are hardly any commands involved with it. The less you say the better off you are. Your whole object is simply to get him to go and put hit stubbed shin up against the lawn mower where he has hit it and you make him do that and touch it again and touch it again, and touch it again and touch it again.

I must tell you something about assists. When you come up scale as an auditor you can actually see a somatic go through. Now some of you will be looking for a painted picture eight feet square. It is not that. It is simply a very faint, very faint impression, and you can actually see a sort of faint impression go (noise) through the PC. You know the somatic has gone

through the PC. Also it is assisted by occasionally he flinches at this moment and so on.

Now I must say something about a contact assist. The object being to get him to go up and touch his shin against the lawn mower, is all very well, but if you force him to go up there, it is the same as forcing a sick PC, which is very, very bad indeed. And the funny part of it is that you can do this on a gradient. He does not want to come nearer than one hundred feet from that damn lawn mower. You can actually find this in a child. That's the closest he is going to come to it. Well you make him do a contact assist with his shin and his body at a point one hundred feet from it. And you gradually, by gradient, narrow the distance to it by gradients, that he is willing to approach it. Eventually he will go up and do a contact assist on it. That fact probably is not generally known, but you must not drag the person up there forcibly, because you are going to do an overwhelm.

Now a TOUCH ASSIST is the next grade of assist, and a touch assist is with the command, which you don't articulate any more than you have to, the PC gets the idea very shortly, you touch him with your finger and he is supposed to feel the finger and then signify that he has felt the finger. After a few commands you'll find out that when you touch him he will give you a blink, or a nod, or some representation. You knock off the verbalization at that particular time, and you simply continue to do the touching and he continues to...(so on?).

Now you wait for him to acknowledge. It's rather hard to do this on a person who is only semi-conscious. Then you try to maintain the communication cycle. It all depends on what part of the body is injured, what you do with this contact assist. The most difficult area to do a contact assist on is the head. And the head and the nerve system of a body is a pain cushion. It is a pain absorption cushion, and any electric shock caused by pain distributes itself throughout the neurons of the body, and you will find out that there was a wave of shock, which went, let's say a hit head, that went all the way from the head down through the nerve channels and the electrical... you can even measure the speed of an electrical impulse through the nerve channels. It happens to be ten feet a second. But it went from there, as a shock wave straight down through the nerve channels, which go through the spine, and there is about a dozen neurons, something like that, through the spine, and it goes to the extremities of the body. So you will find a person who has had a head injury normally had something wrong with his spine afterwards. And that is because the shock wave is locked up in his spine.

So your touch assist should include going from the head to the extremities of the body. Now if you are just trying to get him back on his feet or something like that, you are not going to go to the soles of his feet and try to do a super—super thorough job of this, because later on you are going to run it out as an engram probably.

But the thing which I am calling to your attention is that it does go to the extremities of the body, so your touch assist is not just around his head, and you have to approach the injury, go away from the injury, approach the injury, go away from the injury, approach the injury closer, go away from the injury further, approach the injury closer, go away from it further, approach the injury closer, go away from it further, approach the injury to a point where you are actually touching the injured part, go away further, and when you are going away and coming up, you try to follow the nerve channels of

the body, which includes the spine, and the limbs and there are certain relay points, like the elbows and the wrists, and the finger tips. These are the points you head for. The back side of the knee, and so on. These are all points which the pain can get locked up in—the shock wave.

What you are trying to do is get this communication wave flowing again through the body, because the shock of injury stopped it. What they know as operational shock, accident shock, things like this is simply the thing stopped, right there, see? The individuals trying to withdraw from it. It is Stopped. And therefore he cannot get a circulatory system going in the area. Now if you do anything on the right aide of the body you also do it on the left side of the body. Let us take an injured hand now. If you do a touch assist on an injured hand you go further away from the body down the hand and closer to the body going across the area of the injury, touch at last the injury. And then you do exactly the same thing on the opposite side of the body because the brain communication system cross locks and you can find that a pain in the left hand runs out when you touch the right hand, because the right hand has got it locked up. So you do the right and left side of the body. Se has hurt his right shoulder. You should also give the touch assist to his left shoulder. The principles are simply these. Near and far. Near, far, on. Try to do it on a gradient, and then use the other side of the body too and the other operating point is follow the nerve channels. Now if the fellow is bleeding from an artery and is going to loose all the blood in his body in the next four or five minutes, you would be an absolute idiot to do a touch assist and then apply a tourniquet. The proper sequence is to apply a tourniquet and then do a touch assist.

Now the proper sequence is not to give him a shot of morphine and—then do a touch assist, because you are processing an individual under the influence of drugs. And it will just slow down and nothing much will happen.

The object of a touch assist in this particular thing, supposing a man had broken his hip or something like that, you give him a touch assist, you give him a touch assist. Try to get some of the shock off of it. Try to get some of the shock off of it. If it were the left hip, you would do a touch assist to the left hip. You would go up the spine, down the spine, back of the legs, to the area. And then you would it on the opposite side of the body. And its a “feel my finger” throughout except you don’t have to say it once he’s got it in the groove. And then of course after you have got the edge of it off the guy may still be in agony, because the thing is pretty badly smashed up, then let somebody shoot him with morphine.

Then let him be packed off. Let him get the thing set, let the medicos have their day plumbing him also. Let the medico have his day to do what he can, try to minimize the amount of conversation around the injured person is one of the main criteria, you don’t let people talk around this thing, even though you have to kick them in the stomach. And you don’t keep saying “shut up”, and “be quiet”, because that becomes part of the engram. You signal them to be quiet and you walk into their chest and you walk them of the scene and then say “shut up” you know. Like that. And then come back and continue it. Because you are just putting content into the engram. Now the medico goes and patches the thing up... and hit... the structural fact is handled. Now at some later time a few days later, a day or two later he’s out of his shock, something like that and he can stand up to auditing now; you give him a session which runs the engram and you give him just a standard

engram session, there isn't anything peculiar about it it just runs down the chain of injury and all that. You understand?

But that engram running comes under the heading of assist which I cover with you in a moment. Now that is nothing more nor less than a contact assist and a touch assist, and this is how they are done and that is standard tech. We have been doing them for 'yars' (exaggerated way of saying 'years') and yars and yars. And it's amazing to me to find that there are Scientologists around who don't now how to do these two standard actions in a standard way.

Alright. Now. What about this engram. Now this is this special case which is a sick PC. It could be a sick or severely injured PC but it's a sick PC. In other words an acute now condition which is devouring his attention. And you're going to fly the needle on ARC breaks—huh? No. Now here is something funny. here's something funny. If you are auditing him with a meter you audit him on exact standard tech. It isn't a peculiar brand of tech which enters in. But it has this exception. You're hope of flying the needle before going into the major action is zero. Because he is sitting in the major action, with all devouring concentration—do you follow? So this is an exception, and there aren't very many exceptions in standard tech but this is an exception to fly the needle before undertaking a major action. Because the major action is there. Now this tells you also then if you can't fly the needle before that, that the PC is in a rather perilous condition and if you try to do a forcing technique on the PC. If you try to shove the PC into something heavy he isn't sitting in and doesn't want to go into you can easily overwhelm the PC and spin him. Now just as you can't fly the needle before you run the engram, so you must very definitely obey the auditors code, and try to do your very smoothest TRs. And gently, gently. And that's how you run an engram on a very injured person.

Now this approach includes the guy who falls on his head in three because of the restimulation of an engram. You are going to find, I am very sure somewhere in your career individually, because he is not going to be very rare, an individual who all of a sudden has not run out his incident one or his incident two or something of this sort. All of a sudden he is going to tell you he is dying, he's collapsing, the body is ceasing to breath and what do you know, it is. You understand? This thing goes into a sudden... You see he didn't do a good job on three, and so on... he hasn't been well reviewed, something like this. And he is liable to go into a sudden agony on the thing. And it could be very real agony. Now the funny part of it is he can't identify what it is. It is very mysterious. Something wild suddenly occurs. Now you could actually have this happen with a very malignant body thetan, all of a sudden hits the guy, do you see. He just started to run this body thetan and wham, wham.

We have already had one in an AO. A guy did something to a slave girl at some time way to hell and gone back on the track and she's been around ever since. When they gave her a little bit of auditing and tried to boot her out, she left, but three days later she came back, and man, she really knocked that guy flat. He was the flattest PC—you ever saw, there is a case history on this. What they did was do the usual... did the usual actions of three. The auditor however, on a meter and so forth, located and isolated what the thetan was, handled the thing, ran the incident one, incident two necessary to resolve the situation and finally and forever, why the slave girl

blew. Very remarkable circumstance. Apparently this body thetan had been around for many many a century.

Now this... these are interesting phenomena in that the individual is suddenly and inexplicably hurting or very ill, and if he were ill from ptomaine poisoning or something of the sort, you actually could not distinguish it. You look at the PC, pale, clammy, looks like he's sick. Se might even be vomiting see, something like that. Now the individual simply could have been fed bad food and is being... is going through a bad food spell, dysentery, something like this. Well, what can you do about it. You can let him get well, and feed him an antibiotic. Do you follow, If he doesn't recover from that I have got news for you. It is because it is held up mentally. Function is senior to structure. Thought is senior to function and structure. And an individual who is bound and determined to be sick because of the bank, or body thetans trying to make him sick, or something like that. Brother! Brother!

You could treat him all the antibiotics in the world, boy. You can operate on him. Do most anything you want to do, and there isn't very much going to happen. It's very funny. This kind of an action has taken place. An individual with a very severe infection, fed antibiotics and other medicines to alleviate the thing, and just go right on with it just right like that. AA auditor comes along in spite of the antibiotics, gives him an assist session. Cleaning up what he had goofed up, or what was goofed up on the case, and although he stays... he's on antibiotics, and he stays on antibiotics, right after the session the antibiotics suddenly start to work, and the fever turns of, the temperature goes subnormal, it all vanish, runs out it cycle very nicely. It's a very remarkable phenomena. This individual is coughing and coughing, and coughing, and he has had a cough for a long time and they to some sort of an analysis and a culture and a this and a that and they finally find out that he has got galloping whose's (invented name) and only they call it some Latin name, and it proved it, proved it absolutely conclusively that he has got this, do you see? he's got it alright. Only he doesn't respond to treatment.

In medicine they divide illness into three groups... patient reaction into three separate categories, which is: what causes it, what makes it sick, you know, what makes it come up to an immediate acute condition, and what prolongs it. Now there is data on this in, I think, Dianetics Modern Science of Mental health, it talks about that.

Now. Three phases, you see. So he can get something which precipitates the illness. Bong, he's sick. And now he doesn't respond. He gets prolongation. And he doesn't respond to the cure, he doesn't respond to the cure. Auditor comes along, you just do standard tech and run an engram or secondary, is all you do. But it is standard tech, see. It's done by all rules of standard tech. It's done neatly, nicely, smoothly, realizing that you can't reach very deep and his ability to axis is very poor, and he is pretty wongo—bongo and if you get him all over the track with fifteen engrams in restimulation one right after the other, boy, you might as well have shot him with a shot gun to begin with, you understand. So it has to be gently done and the control of the session has to be very good. You have to be a very good auditor to do this sort of thing. And you hit this chain and you fix it up. Now oddly enough you don't even get to run it out. You hit it, you date it, you do what you can about it, and all of a sudden the medicine works. All of a sudden the individual starts to get well. Or the individual goes back and runs three. The

individual returns to solo, or he gets his next grade or something like this, do you follow? He gets back into the standard line of things.

Now it's called an assist, it's called an assist. But it is done very, very, very definitely, by very standard tech. You check your ARC break and handle that ARC break. You check your PTP, you check your missed withhold. I don't care, the guy's woo—woa—wao—woa (etc.). Check these things. Because the funny part of it is, it may be such a hell of a break in reality. He was sitting there minding his own business and all of a sudden a bullet went through his head. That's the way it feels and he is in agony, see? Whoa! You check your ARC break, and the ARCU and CDEI and you go through any of the motions you can.

Now the one exception is if you expect the needle to fly you are a fool. You won't. And if you try to force this needle to fly, you are just distracting him. Now you don't want to audit over an ARC break, you don't want to audit over a PTP, and you certainly don't want to audit over a missed withhold, but they will all be germane (= relevant) to the incident he's sitting in. You won't get anything else.

So you pull the ARC break out of the incident so you are not running an engram over the top of an ARC break. You pull the PTP out of the incident. It's just the PTP of the incident that he has it. You pull that out so that you get some change, and the missed withhold concerning it, and so on, so that he won't natter and blow up in your face, because it's all on the incident, but the needle, the chances of the needle flying are very, very slim. You understand? The only variation here, then, is that you don't expect the needle to fly before you're doing a major action, because you are already doing the major action, not of your own choice. You are presented with the major action, now.

The PC has presented you on a silver platter with the major action. Bong! "I was down in the restaurant. I was sitting there. (various noises dramatization of how the PC would sound—hope you don't need a full transcript! here are the words, without the ejaculations:) I was sitting there. There it goes again. there it goes again. I was sitting... and I was just sitting there, and all of a sudden my right arm fell off." And to this chin music you get in ARC break, PTPs, missed withholds. He will answer your questions, boy, because they are right there ready to spit out, and then find out what it is. You don't arbitrarily audit something without finding out what it is.

So this is one of these things where you are doing a sort of an assessment. It isn't a list don't you see. You're assessing. And you ask him what he thinks it is. And he normally will tell you, "I don't know." So you have got to suggest it. You know he is very often he's saying (PC in agony noises again): "Oh no, Oh god, I haven't got any idea. Oh, my God." See? That's the type of music which you are liable to receive. Many, not slightly, there have been many PCs like this, around AOs and out in the field. Except people immediately take it for granted that they are terribly ill, and they don't do anything about them. You see? That's for the birds. So you have to do the list, and it's this little process which you see on my case supervisor notes, assess, you know, bla bla (noises). Take the one that reads the most, and do something with it.

Well actually, under an emergency of this particular character, you are handling the similar situation that I have often handled in babies. I am very good with babies. And so on. I have had a lot of experience in this line. And I get along great with babies, kids, dogs, people, beings, horses. Horses and I

argue a little bit. But the... well we do. We don't see eye to eye. Horses feel put upon. They have been replaced by the automobile and they feel supernumerary. But the upshot of it is that a little baby went (baby crying noises). And you will see some goddamn nurse girl walking back and forward patting the baby in the butt you know. Walking back and forth, and back and forth. "There, there, there, hush now, hush now, hush now." I come along and I hear all this catastrophe going on and I say, "What cooks?" "He has a colic, and so on." (Noises) Well, she has misdiagnosed it obviously and the baby keeps on crying. So I take a look at the kid and first they have a safety pin shoved a quarter of an inch—in to his butt.

But the funny part of it is I sort of have to ask him. It isn't any sort of telepathic communication. I have to look, you know. I have to look, and look at the reactions, you know? There isn't much communication with it. What... what the hell, you know? What is this. Because he really doesn't answer up. One of the reasons he doesn't answer up is he is so frantic, you know. It isn't that he can't talk or communicate. so is just frantic. That's all... the nurse girl, his mother, maybe even a doctor around you know. Christ almighty, he is frantic. And you finally say what did you give him for supper? Oh, well, he just had his regular ration. Where is it?" "Oh, it's over there. I mean it's odd that he won't eat. He won't eat." I squirt some out on the back of my hand and taste it. it's live. Pure live. Somebody has mixed it up with baking acid, or something. You know how it is? You know? It's completely sour. The devil himself would have turned purple if he had ever got it in his gullet. You know? I go up and I whip up the kid a mess of milk or something, and I hand him a bottle, and he takes... very suspicious, you know. Well all of a sudden: "Oh, thank God." And you find out he hadn't eaten for two days.

It's idiot stuff like this, actually, see, but this is... a little sort of an assessment. Let's see, could it be food, could it be that he is hungry. Could it be that... (vague noise). Could it be? Is he wet? Is he chafed, or something, you know? It is something. And that's what they miss entirely, but it's something. It isn't ever nothing. Now you see you have to learn that about cases. If a case is having trouble, it is something. It is never really nothing. Unless somebody has wished a nothingness off on him, and when you get the nothingness off, you will find out that there was still something.

So this is the way you have to approach a very ill PC. And you, as an eight (= Class VIII) are going to have this problem in AOs and in Orgs and you are going to run into it and you are going to have to tell somebody what to do about it. Well it is something you should learn well. It isn't something that is not going to happen to you. It is going to happen to you and you have to do an assessment of all the possible things it could be. Only they are pretty obvious. Has he eaten bad food? That's one list, see... list item. It is one of these little assessment items. Bad food. Body thetan. Engram. You got the idea? Something in that order is all of a sudden going to cause a BD.

You say it to him and even though he's gone (noises). "My God." See? You get through. You don't have to shout at him. You get through. You just say it. And all of a sudden you have got a blow down. Well if it's a body thetan... If it's a body thetan, you would simply follow through the routine of three, of OT III. But, the second you start contacting what it actually is, or identifying it starts cooling off, and the PC reaction becomes far more reasonable and rational, even though it's knocking him half flat, you see?

So what you would do is try to get this body thetan... Find out what's wrong

with the body thetan. Find out what it wrong with him and the body thetan. Let's just get a little itsa on it, lets get some data, and then let's try to run an incident one off of this body thetan. And you sometimes will find the body thetan has been overrun already, on incident one. You see a number of conditions can exist, when you are handling a body thetan. Now the... But you find out what condition it is, and then you do the usual for three. Now don't always assume that it is a cluster, but it could be a cluster, and there is a mutual engram. So, if it is a body thetan you would then do a Milazzo, which is say you find the mutual engram, the mutual engram. And the first action of the mutual engram is to date it, to date it. Date it. Date it. What is it's date? That's the most available datum. You date it. And then you find out what it is about. And you can do both of those... You can first, your little assessment is: what is it? See? Physical illness. You know? Body thetan? Engram? Whatever you might think—see, you put it down. Those are the most likely candidates. And you put these things down. Bad food, see? And you put these things down, and, if you don't get a blowdown on any of those things, don't quit. You have got something missing from your assessment line. The guy might simply be high on pot and in delusions. You get it? Unbeknownst to you, why he took himself a whole big smoke and he went up in smoke. You see? Well it could be something. So your perception enters into what goes on the assessment form. To give you a canned assessment form of every thing that could be wrong with a thetan in this universe would be an adventurous action. Because operating at different places at different times you will get different items. But those are the principle ones.

Now if it is a body thetan you got to identify if it is just one or if it is several. Now the funny part of it is, it will answer up as just one. Body thetans normally do. But when you say: "Is it several?", you will get a bigger read. Now you want to know if it was several, what is the date of the incident, that brought them together and you are going to date it, and you are going to do a standard dating drill that doesn't vary one hair. Tens of years ago, hundreds of years ago; The only way you can miss on this sometimes is that it happened last year, or it happened yesterday. Then you would have to start out in minutes... seconds ago, minutes ago, hours ago, days ago, weeks ago, months ago, years ago, tens of years ago, you got it? That's the safest assessment and you go on up and don't start slowing it down, and say: "Well we got to trillions, and nothing happened." After trillions comes quadrillions, I think. They go way up, boy. Thetans are very old.

But someway along that line you are going to get something like, hundreds of billions. Good. And that read a bit. Now is it more than five hundred billions or less than five hundred billion. It read on more. Is it more than seven hundred and fifty billion, less than seven hundred and fifty billion. It read on less than seven hundred and fifty billion. Is it more than six hundred billion? And meanwhile you are listening for the PC to spit out a date. The PC very often spits out a date. Oh. Six hundred and seventy two million nine hundred and forty five thousand, seven hundred and forty two. Yes, that's right. And two minutes. You know. Very good, you write all that down. It reads like hell. Bongo, bongo, bongo. That's the incident you run. And when you just start to run this incident on a cluster you very often... very often they go (noise). Fifteen, twenty of them leave, all at the same time. Something like a hundred of them. Leave. (noise) Thank God, know. Good—bye. (noise)

Alright. Now, if the PC at that moment where... gave an aspect of relief and looked well, you would say, "That's good." You understand he had to be an OT III, or this sort of thing would not be happening, you know. You don't run this on people below that level, you'd kill them.

So he says "Yes. Oh that's great. Oh, my God, what a relief. (noises) God!" And you say: "Alright, that's fine. Thank you very much." And let him take it up himself.

Now he is going to go on the basis that they all blew, and I've got news for you on a cluster they don't always all blow. There are fifteen of them left. It looked so spectacular to see such a mass disintegrate and so many of them leave. But, there might be some still around. Now you have to finish running the engram out to that degree and run incident one on each separate one of them. And they go thud, thump, gone, gone, gone. That cleans it up. Because the funny part of it is let us say, he had a terrible throat. (noise) Couldn't talk, see? And then you found this incident, you dated the thing, you got some substance of what it was all about and all of a sudden you got this (noise) gone, you know. Still going to be left with a bit of a sore throat. You're going to say: "Well, that's natural." No, it isn't natural, that's the ten or fifteen you've left. That's the engram, the engram is still remaining with those few, do you follow?

Now also, there is a copy. Now thetans copy. What has just been copied. Thetans copy what has been copied and make copies of the copies, you get the idea? So you get this kind of a thing, the thing came off your back, see? Came off. Gone. But the mass is still there. All right, whose copying the thetan who has just left? That's the trick. Well, this one is copying, and there goes that mass. Cross-copying. And you run into a lot of this cross-copying, and so on as you try to run this stuff—got it?

But for the purposes of an assist, the (noise) "Good—bye Joe, see you later." That's good enough boy. You don't push your luck. That's good, get on with it some day. Let him recover. Let him get his breathe. And then hit it later. But you normally have these characters coming back saying how it didn't all go away. Well of course it didn't all go away. Not all the cluster left (= went away). Now the engram wasn't erased. There is a basic on the engram. There is a whole chain that hasn't been gone down, do you follow? You didn't finish the job. All it was was an assist. You got it?

So what happens when this fellow all of a sudden starts spinning, and he says: "There is an opera singer standing right in front of my face, and she is going round and round and round and round and round and I don't know understand it and I don't understand it, and, oh, my God, my God. (noise)" There goes the fever again, you know? What is all this?

Same procedure. You try and get in the Ruds. Do it to the degree you can. Make a little assessment of what this thing might be. Then you date it. 'Cause it's going to be some sort of an incident. And when you date it, if it comes up that the key dates of incident two, which is of course seventy four million plus. It's almost seventy five, million. Almost in PT peculiar to this planet. (If) it came up with about four quadrillion, it's incident one. They are that far apart. That's peculiar to all the thetans of the universe, they all got that. So of course it tends to make them cluster. That is why they blow up, and go park, and everything works out, when you hit so called incident one. All right. It comes under the heading of an assist. And you cool it off to a point where you can leave it and he can bear it, and that is it. And then he

lives to be audited another day. You got it?

Those are all assists. Now it isn't a proper session, because you didn't fly the Ruds for a major action. You didn't fly the Ruds for contact assist. You didn't fly the Ruds for a touch assist. You didn't fly the Ruds for this assessment. You can, by the way, make an assessment after the assessment. You can make an assessment for what it is and then you can make a little assessment and write down asking the PC questions. "Well what's the content of it?" "I don't know. I don't know." "Well just tell me something. Is it an accident. Is it a shock of some sort? Is it a..." And then he is liable to volunteer one or two items and you sort of put that. It is not a one item list you see. It will work out sort of like that. Because it is usually just one thing. But you are not trying to list and null this thing. You are just asking the question. You are writing it down to compare the reads. Do you follow? And if he runs out of it, you can furnish a couple yourself, because he's not so... violates like hell putting an item on the PCs list, so it isn't really a listing and nulling action. Do you understand? It is just trying to find some information.

So, it is an assist. It isn't really a proper session. But you must in all cases carry on an assist with the discipline of the auditor. Don't force the PC. He is persuasive. He is gentle. Keep your TRs in. Do the actions which you can do within the limits of the session. Do you understand that? You are going to run into this character who starts going round and round and round and they say: "They say the helicopters are going to crash. It's going to crash." And you are looking for a helicopter accident. What the hell. It's R6, boy, and nothing else. I don't know. I think it is for about a day or two, it takes this helicopter to crash in R6. There is no helicopter there. The guy is frozen in alcohol and glycol. Sitting in a block, being given a big three D (dimension) Cecil B. DeMille special motion picture.

Now the consistency of this you should understand. Incident one is simply incident one. A person can have himself more than incident one... more than one incident one. A person himself can have administered some incident ones. There can be an overt incident one. It is a relatively simple implant. But it is quite effective, in lousing people up. Because it interrupted them from creating what they would have been creating. And took away what mock ups they did have, and it stopped their cycle, and it put some thing there that was unwanted, so when they tried to create they created it. Because it fixed their attention by process... by protest.

All right. For this planet. For this confederacy and the twenty—one adjacent stars and it's seventy six planets, the incident two, it is a very long, involved and complex incident. It's about thirty six days. It starts out normally with a capture. Some kind or another, capture. And don't think of yourself... I'm trying to run a capture... of having been airy—fairying around in the air and somebody something or other and got you down with a net and all that balderdash, because people at that particular time and place were walking around in clothes which looked very remarkably like the clothes they wear this very minute. And the cars they drove looked exactly the same, and the trains they ran looked the same, and the boats they had looked the same. Circa 1950, 1960.

This civilization has simply copied R6 one hundred percent because they were told to. And they walked down streets that looked like these streets, and lived in houses that looked like these houses, and so on. That's, what the hell... And there was suite a bit of huffle fluffle and upset and so on

before R6 took place. What it was was the loyal officers were the body, the elective body, and they called them the loyal officers and they were there to protect the populations and so forth. And they had elected a fellow by the name of Xenu to the supreme ruler. And they were about to unelect him. And he took the last moments he had in office to really goof the floof. (Yes, I don't blame you for dropping something.) And he took these last moments to really upset it.

He of course had several key birds who were close to him. He was a suppressive to end all suppressives. He got these administrators and so on and heads of planets in various positions and places. He picked off all the cowboys in the white hats, and he got rid of them first fast, and then troops, not knowing what the hell they were doing, but fed all kinds of false orders, were fed in against the population to pick them up, one after the other, tat—a tat—tat—atata—tat—a—tat.

One of the mechanisms they used was to tell them to come in for an income tax investigation. And the United States just copies income tax. It's just R6. They are a bunch of dramatizing psychotics, these guys. So in they went, and the troops started slaughtering them, and then the troops of course were ordered out to get hold of certain bodies of renegade troops which were ordered to get certain bodies of bad troops and they shot each other up and implanted each other and wiped it out. They were making billiard balls out of these places. They were imported.

They were actually... The trick was to shoot somebody, disable somebody, very often a needle into a lung, and at the same time to hit him with frozen alcohol and glycol, which preparation is guaranteed to pick up a thetan. All they had to do was pick him up and put him into a refrigerator, and they had him boy. Because if he tried to exteriorize from the body, there he was frozen. And they threw him into collection points. Boxed them up in boxes, threw them into space planes which are the exact copies?... DC8's, the DC8 aeroplane is the exact copy of the space plane of that day. No difference. Except the DC8 had fans, propellers on it and the space plane didn't.

And they threw them into refrigerated units. And so on. And in view of the fact that Einstein was absolutely right. Man can't go faster than the speed of sound... speed of light. Which is a bunch of balderdash. The length of time from the planet Coitus to the planet Teegeeeack, which is the name of this planet, was nine weeks, and you'll see that it is many light years. Coitus is one of the planets, and is to this day one of the planets of the North Star. Polaris. And people were ferried in here by the billions and the billions and the billions and they were ferried in here with boxes. And they were put in boxes and they were stacked around. And the people who were on this planet already just caught it in the teeth. They weren't bothered... no body bothered to pick them up. They just shot their administrators from guns, and shot their control points out and they took these people in boxes and so forth and they dumped them and then they set off hydrogen bombs on the top of each primary volcano there is on this particular planet and when they blew up it blew the thetans into the air and after the bomb an electronic ribbon, which also was a type of standing wave was erected over the area. The tremendous winds of the planet blew every thetan there was straight into those particular vacuum zones which had been created. These were brought down, packed up, and put in front of a projection machine which with sound and color pictures first gave them the implant which you know as Clearing

Course and then a whole track implant which you know as OT II.

After this, however, up about a... the remainder of the thirty six days, which is the bulk of them is taken up with a three—D, super colossal motion picture, which has to do with God, the devil, space opera, etcetera, they go five pictures to five words. And we have the full record of what it is, and it goes on for about thirty six days and then these poor bastards were let wander out... pardon me... they were then boxed up again and the boxes were mixed so that... there were two assembly areas, one was Las Palmas and the other was Hawaii. And in these two assembly area they took samples from each volcano area put it in little boxes. And they had an assembly line. And in Las Palmas it runs down the main street of Las Palmas. You get more damned accidents on that main street than you can shake a stick at. One of our captains was feeling rather queasy until I told her: "Well, the old assembly line of R6 is just twenty five feet from you as you lie here on the slipway". That blew the charge.

The entirety of Roman Catholicism, the devil, all that sort of thing, that is all part of R6. Practically anything you can think of. All modern theaters in actual fact are built with the exact symbols shown for them in R6. They even have the symbol on the boxes on the side of the theater. They preserve those to this day, it's so indelible. They are not quite right, but they still know that there is supposed to be a design on those boxes at the side of the audience to the left and right, and so on. There is supposed to be a certain gold... gilt design over there and they still put it there.

And in the thing there are about four or five assignments of who did it. There are about four or five different things that might have done it. It is blamed on one of these things that time an another thing that time, and so on, so as to get people very confused as to what was the true cause of the entire thing. After they were packaged up they were blown off into space and let 'em (them) go to hell. These planets averaged one seven eight billion human beings per planet. One hundred and seventy eight billion. There were two hundred and fifty billion on this planet. The name of this planet was Teegeeak and this is known as the bomb place and this is the evil place. This is the place where they all got smashed. You wonder today where you see large areas of where there is alleged volcanic action has been, those are R6 explosions, the remains of them. If you go down through many layers of civilizations archaeologically you come to green glass.

Now to get rid of the whole damn thing it is only necessary to run incident one really, in most cases, which runs out the whole track because the fellow realizes he is mocking it up. And he knocks it off and that is that.

But incident two has a volcanic explosion, which follows the actual explosion as its picture, and it's very tricked—very tricked up. So that you actually... a bunch of thetans and they get bombed. That is one of the... it's wild, that is one of the explosions that is shown, and there are several explosions shown in sequence. So actually what happened was, that there was the real explosion, which was the guy was boxed up in a box, or he is walking around, or some of the loyal officers that were caught here and so on were chained on the top of buildings, and so on, so when the bomb hit, why they would be flicked of into the fantastic hundreds of miles an hour, thousands of miles an hour winds of a gross, complete atomic explosion all over the planet. And they were whirled in these terrific winds and so on. Everybody on the planet was killed, and about three days afterwards is actually when the implanters

started operating. They had it all rigged to operate and then to make a long story short you can easily get into one of the false explosions. As the fairy queen, the fairy palace. It is supposed to be a fairy palace, and dive down to save somebody because there has been an explosion, and that's all phony. So there is false start after false start after false start to the incident. What this is really designed to do is to make the individual cease and desist from creation and to knock out overpopulation. This is one of the big ideas they had, that they just did all this, then they would get rid of all overpopulation. The target of it is the second dynamic. So it is full of second dynamic suppressions. For instance you find people who are totally obsessed with sex with children. Well that is taught in R6. They were nice guys. Anyway, to make a long story short there is even a motion picture studio in it. They even give the writers and so forth of the thing. They had several tricks that they used they can make a full figure appear in the room which looks totally solid and totally three—D to the person. They are just tricks. Just nothing. We know so much more about the mind than the R6er that there is no comparison.

Now, the net result of all of this was to make a seventy five million year vacuum, as far as this part of the universe is concerned. You wonder why don't... if there are saucers around, why don't they land on this planet. This planet traditionally, traditionally, over the various zones and areas has an evil reputation. Mutineers and deserters and that sort of thing are often dumped on this planet. They often come here in refuge because they know nobody is going to come after them.

This planet is the planet of the evil repute. This sector of the universe has a very evil repute. Now, all the data which you have... That was seventy four, plus, plus, plus, billion years ago, almost seventy five. And this catastrophe overcame this confederation, and it has made a very unsavory part of the universe, to say the least. About, well relatively, almost modern times... twenty million years ago, something lie that, somebody started up a body line on the planet. It's gradually worked through various areas of barbarism and once more R6 tailor made it to be nothing but a cave man civilization. But nevertheless they moved up the line and they moved up towards the dramatization of R6, and that is what man calls progress. They have managed to make things, this way and that way, the technology is rather pathetic. But they have moved up the line until there is some possibility of establishing communication with regard to the activity. The fate of the R6er... you will have many a PC will say: "Oh, my God, they are after me. Well (noises)."

Sure fixed up an area. They fixed up an implant that there... people are taught carefully that any man who tries to save the world must be killed. he must be mobbed and hanged. Any man who tries to save the world. So I of course, shifted our valence over to a more optimum R6 valence. The whole population of the planet responds like a clock to R6 symbols. They respond to nothing else. They do not respond to reason. They only respond to R6 symbols. So you occupy the wrong symbol and people begin to think of you as a person who is going to save the planet, then one and all are more or less under orders to slaughter you.

Well, they booby trapped it. They booby trapped it very badly. The Roman Catholic Church, somewhere along the line, through watching the dramatizations of people, picked up some little fragments of R6, and they

make it look like it's continued forward into present time, but the truth of the matter is that the loyal officers were not all killed. Xenu missed. And they were not all killed. Not by a long way. Although the civilization war battered it still had weapons, it still had transport, it still had some semblance of organization and the loyal officers who were at remote bases, who were airborne at the time, who somehow or another on other planets were not effected, suddenly turned around right after this great catastrophe, and the administrators and renegades which Xenu had brought in were not very effective, and a fire fight ensued which put the finishing touches on the galactic confederation. The towns that were left and so on were just battered into ruins, were you had the renegades that had been hired and so on, and the administrators that had been loyal to Xenu were still trying to hold out. Within a year he was in a... under arrest, and within six years the lot had been wiped out. The loyal officers were triumphant. Xenu was put with several of his cohorts in the center of a mountain which is still on one of these planets, and in a wire cage which is charged with an eternal battery. He is not likely ever to get out.

And the loyal officers looked around and there was not anything left. And of course nobody could manufacture this, or that or the other thing, and what people there were left, they could not obtain any supplies and they couldn't maintain the civilization and what little was left that wasn't battered to pieces simply went by the boards and vanished from history. There is a base on this planet, and it is so shredded away as to be hardly recognizable.

Whenever, then, anybody tries to do anything about this he is apt to get a flashback. So you must not go around talking about being the people who are going to save the planet. You are the people the planet obeys. You are the people who own the planet. You are not the people who are going to save the planet. And, thereby, you will save it. Now I could give you much of the symbolism and so on which goes along with this but you find it recorded. This, of course, man responds to (Ron shows a DMSMH book front cover, which is an exploding volcano). He responds to that. He understands that. It doesn't restimulate him because he's not up to being restimulated, he just knows that that's all right. In R6 everybody is shown crucified. So is the psychiatrist shown crucified, although the psychiatrist is a dominant character and that's how he gets away with what he gets away with. He electric shocks people. The medical doctor is not really represented in R6. It is only the surgeon. The surgeon is shown cutting bodies to pieces. That's the right thing to do. Actually he shreds a body down to just raw meat down to a skeleton and the skeleton is in agony and then it too is chopped up. Anyway, every man is then shown to have been crucified, so don't think that it's an accident that this crucifixion... they found out that this applied. Somebody, somewhere on this planet, back about six hundred BC, found some piece of R6. And I don't know how they found it either by watching mad men or something but since that time they have used it and it became what is known as Christianity.

The man on the cross. There was no Christ but the man on the cross is shown as every man so of course each person seeing a crucified man has an immediate feeling of sympathy for this man. Therefore you get many PCs who say they are Christ. Now there are two reasons for that. One is the Roman Empire was prone to crucify people. So a person can have been crucified. But in R6 he is shown as crucified. There are certain things which

make people ill and that is when they get into certain zones and areas or positions which approximate the R6 position such as a body lying in the rain with a rat below the cross. Guaranteed to give people colds and so forth. So they have colds from rain. Yet they take baths and get wet and don't get colds. When they get cold it restimulates frozen alcohol and glycol as a mix and therefore they get into a dramatization. So the sickness is very closely tied in with R6. Quite in addition to that one of the volcanoes Japan on its explosion gave a certain definite implant that tells people when and how to be sick. They are supposed to be sick at five they are supposed to be sick at ten they are supposed to be sick at four. Up to fifty the change of life that men get and women get and so on. It's all dictated in this sickness implant. People are supposed to get sick.

Also a body was only supposed to live seventy years which is a bunch of balderdash. Before R6 and so forth they lived on and on and on and on and on there was no such thing as this. They taught people death. They taught them amnesia. These various things they all come from this zone and area.

Now that is peculiar and lonely to this planet and to this confederation. There have been other implants of various kinds and sizes but this is probably one of the longest most violent and wildest implants in this sector of the universe. Now to get an edge in in this particular area and blow this up as a mass engram and so forth is quite a trick and we are involved in doing just that. No universe is safe where people are smashed that badly.

It becomes the business of any thetan. Because the universe in which he lives as long as it contains a cancerous area such as this whole confederation and so on is not a universe in which one can really freely move. Simple. So the project is open and shut and as I point out to you, once again, the truth of the matter is that it is more the business of the inhabitants of this planet than it is mine.

Now where we are making headway, we are making headway and we must go right on making headway, because we might not ever get another chance. The dramatization of exploding a bomb is contained in R6, so sooner or later someone is going to smoke this planet into a cocked hat. That is why I have talked occasionally about having to get there, with the most.

Now realize when you are auditing a PC, for God sakes, that you are auditing against this background. You are auditing against the background of tailor made sickness. Auditing against a background of this, of that, of the other thing. Now the grades take one very smoothly up this line. But you are auditing basically a sick PC. Why? He's an earth man. So, what do you do? Standard tech. Follow the line. Go right on up the groove. Because these are the things which stand in the road of any thetan. Not just the people of this planet. But three happens in other zones and places. Something blows up, and five or six thetans who are in the railroad car together, or the space wagon, and after that think of themselves as just one thetan and get all smashed together and stay that way for a while. Somebody kills another body, in a dual, and the owner of the second body is so revengeful that he promptly jumps on the first guy and this guy is now a dual being, who sort of hates himself.

A thetan goes mad at exactly that point in his career when he begins to stop things. So you can always find the point where somebody has gone round the bend. So therefore the button stop is very important to remember in running incident one and incident two. Very important. Because it will be the

point where... which makes and breaks his sanity. You get the button stop in and the incident starts to run. Well why is stop so important? Because it stops the incident, any incident.

Don't think that's all there is to the track of incident one and incident two, but these oddly enough take the puzzle apart. There are so certain other things, and I forbear actually to tell you too much about these things, because you will at once go out and try to find them on PCs, if you don't watch it.

But there is the incident called the obscene dog, that is just a little bit later than incident one and sometimes actually by running it, why you can get the PC into incident one. The obscene dog... this is sort of a brass dog in a sitting position and any body who got around to the front of the dog got caught in some electronic current and passed through the dog to the dogs rear end and spat out. Thetans didn't like this. So there are very often trick incidents of one kind or another and they could vary from being to being, but not everybody has an obscene dog, and incident one lies ahead of it any how.

But there are these incidents. Now I have given you the length and breadth of what you are working with, with regard to this planet. And when I tell you that an individual is liable to have an assist, I am talking against what he is liable to be manifesting when he needs one. He's most likely to be in two. The odds are way in favor of his being two or he's most likely to be the victim of a cluster, but these are merely most likely. You still go through the whole process, you don't just immediately just hang this round his head because it might be an odd case that is wrong. Do you see?

Now if your PC were to suddenly start to spin when he was doing three, he has audited an incident one on one thetan, and started an incident two on another one, who hasn't had his incident one run. If you can get to him in time you have the second thetan run back to the incident one and run it. In other words the PC makes a mistake. Then PC idea from solo auditing and so on... there ideas (of) running body thetans are some of the damnedest things I have ever heard of. Pardon me, I'll amend the statement. They are some of the goddamnedst statements I have ever heard of. They are weird, weird. How the hell can they dream up these things. There was somebody the other day we found, who was putting in a R factor, and he was going through the entirety of model session and so forth. I suppose the guy who has trouble running another thetan at that proximity, probably not very horsepowerd or something of the sort. Well all I ever did with a body thetan was just think got to the (noise)—think—(noise)—go through it and get your stop off (noises—zoom). "Hey, that's mine," he would say, "I'm leaving, good bye."

Now people very grossly underestimate the number of body thetans there are to run. Tremendous underestimation. Many people are too frightened of body thetans. They all of a sudden say: "Ahhh! I will go and attest. Let's hope nobody finds out!" They cut their own throats, because the later OT sections are booby trapped. Now the exact way you take a person who has skimped on body thetans. He is still having a lot of trouble and so forth. He really didn't finish three, just went zoom and cut and ran; status happy or something—is you take the individual and you do a standard action for four. He says he's... he says he's four. All right he says he's finished three. All right, we'll do it. Don't argue with this. Don't keep sending these people back on three don't keep sending them back on three. The hell with it. He says

he's done his four. OK. If they found none and so forth it's sort of my contempt. The guys told me already that he is just solid in the head, you know? There is not such thing on this planet as a body thetan... I mean a person who has no body thetans... a body that doesn't have any body thetans, is just like trying to tell me that cows exist on the planet who have no heads. The way you do it, give him the four run down, which you've no reason to go into at this moment. It's a very exact run down. It has variables that if the case is a very special case that hasn't gotten along to well, you run the valence shifter early, before you do rehabs, and you will get along much better. But if he has been running along fairly normally, a fairly normal TA, do the valence shifter after the line up. That's all that determines it. Case had a thick review folder, run the valence shifter early on the case. If he's not had any trouble, you run it after you have done all the rehabs. I mean it's as elementary as that. It doesn't matter which place you run it. But it does matter that every time you do a valence shifter you must, I've found out, very definitely, you must do a confront. The individual goes into his own valence and he can't tolerate it. And if you don't also do a confront he's liable to practically spin on you in the next few days. Valence shifter is very powerful process.

So any way, that follows one, two. It's one of these things were you set away with it here or there and it's alright, and you then you assume that it can be alright, but it turns out that the majority have to have confront also run and so it becomes a package. A valence shifter is always followed by confront.

Now. You do your standard four rundown, you get it fine. The guys feeling good. He's doing this and that, and so on, and now you just find any injury chain and you run it, particularly this lifetime, and you run it as an engram, standard engram running, just by the book, absolutely. Take him down to the end. Deal with that engram or chain. no matter where it goes it will go earlier similar, and earlier similar, it will go eventually to a similar incident that will run. You've run each one, you see but it didn't run out. And so you got an earlier similar incident. You've got your date of it, your erasure, you know, just text book, completely textbook. Done deftly, swiftly. Down the line he goes, earlier, earlier, earlier. F/ N! (whoeee) I sure feel good. I've never felt better." Well, what the hell have you done? You have picked up every area where he had a hell of an opportunity to get hit in the teeth by body thetans and where there might be a cluster. And you have shaken one or more body thetans loose. In doing this rundown don't be amazed to have a whole bunch of body thetans all of a sudden clear out.

Zoom, they are liable to go. But that isn't inevitable that this happens. It is just a little bonus. Now, you have got it down and it goes F/ N... now you go find an incident one and you run it. And let's try to find another incident one. And let's find another one and let's just drain this case of incident ones. You get it let's run as many incident ones as we can. Well of course each incident one will go F/ N, because it's on a different being. And all of a sudden you run out of incident ones. Starts overrun.

Now here is a screamy screwy one you can do. Overrun on three. Long fall, that reads. Go and attest. Oh, the auditor who could do something like this or the examiner who accepts something like this it a complete idiot. It isn't overrun on three. It means that one body thetan has been run one too many times or incorrectly run through incident one. So you rehab the one body thetan and he blows and the person is not now overrun on three. It's always

the body thetan that is overrun... Now the PC himself could run himself one too many times through the incident, and then having done so he would get an overrun on three. It would read. But you rehab his running incident one, and that does not mean he is all out of body thetans. He can find a body thetan, run incident one on it. Do you understand? So overrun on three is where you can lay an egg. You can lay a big egg as an auditor, because it means overrun on incident one or overrun on incident two, by a thetan, or the PC, and that is all it means. You can't overrun three.

Now, the next action, the next action, with regard to this sort of thing would naturally be something very complicated and clever, and on an examination I just gave you haven't yet got the exact mechanism of how an individual squirrels, and you better damn well get it. The individual has been audited non standardly, therefore he appears to be a strange beast on whom non standard... on whom standard tech doesn't work. A person whose supposed to know how to audit has audited the person on standard tech and now the person has not resolved. So it's a wide open invitation to invent a technique. Invent something. Invent something strange. this individual is very peculiar indeed. He doesn't respond along this line. Now, what I am trying to teach you is, is that only happens where, that standard tech has been followed is a false report. It hasn't been followed. You go back over the case and you will find out that he had missed withholds, or he had PTPs, and it's blown down on auditing reports and every other damn thing. List, listed, lists a mile long, and so on, and then somebody is giving you a false report. The case has just been audited by standard tech, I mean so what. No! Standard tech has not been followed. That is what I am trying to teach you. There is no case that standard tech does not solve. There are people who say they have but haven't applied the standard action. And you look through the folder and you will find the evidence right in front of your eyes. I've got to teach you that, and I've told you about four times and you couldn't answer on an examination, so learn it now, please.

That is how squirreling begins. Do you understand? That is how an individual gets an invitation to squirrel. It's the false report. "Oh, yes we ran a valence shifter, and we did this and we did that, and we did everything (noise)." Case is still going in there going (noise). Anybody told me anything like that the look of contempt they would get would be quite withering. There might even be a beam go with it. I would look through the auditing report and look over the PC and I would find out the case had been audited over ARC breaks. He is one of these seven special cases. He hasn't been assessed. I mean the guy, I mean the guy... they did it all bonkers and backwards, while telling you they did it all the way that was supposed to be done.

And then you get an unusual case, and the way you solve the case is to do right what has been done wrong. That thing you've got to learn, because it is your only shield against the invitation to invent something new and strange. You understand? Well alright, will you get that down, because that's a very important point. That is how squirreling occurs. The case now is a strange case. Well the only thing that is wrong with him is that standard tech has not been done, while somebody thinks it has. So you have got to find out what standard tech hasn't been done and get it done, and he ceases to be a strange case. Right now. You follow? All right.

Now this is a wide open invitation. The case I'm just telling you about, that's why I'm interjecting this. I'm not cross with you. There is a wide open

invitation. The barn doors are wide open. You've run this engram chain. It went F/ N. You've found an incident one. You ran it. It F/ Ned. You found, no you didn't, there wasn't any other. You didn't going to come up and say: "Well, that was it (noise... finished it all up (noise)." There he sits, you know, going (noise), or some other normal mannerisms, you see. And he looks at that moment like standard tech has just fallen on its head, boy! He's got an abscessed nose, or something of the sort. "Well haven't got any body thetans." Now anybody who invents some technology—"Well scan your body and see if anything reads. Good." He is probably ordering a body thetan who can't scan to scan anyhow, see. "Scan your body." "Did you scan your body? Oh, yes, well nothing read. Alright, you don't have any body thetans." Booh! The guy isn't alright. He's got body thetans. He's got pictures when he himself is clear. Plus what; he is perfectly unwilling to run anything. He hasn't got any more. He can't find any more. That's it, you run the basic track, and... he can't find any more. That's it.

Now one of two things is true. He either hasn't run his own incident one or incident two. Or he hadn't got his own capture straight, or he hadn't got something straight with regard to his own track on incident one and incident two. Nothing else. That's him. He's got that... and remember every body thetan there is answers up to that... to the pronoun 'me'. "This is me." Read. Oh, alright, yes, he's talking to the PC. Everybody body thetan knows he's known as me.

So either himself has done something kooky—he's overrun incident one, or he had two incident ones, or he didn't run his incident two, or he ran a capture that belonged to somebody else, or he ran an incident two that belonged to somebody else and said that was him, or he is actually, just when he ran his incident two he was only running a copy of some body else's incident. You know, something goofed up. Or he's got body thetans, one or the other.

Now you can establish this very easily, but you don't have to be very bright to establish this. You just find an engram chain and you run it by engram by chains and you go find yourself an incident one or an incident two. And then you run as many incident ones as you can find to run. You got it? It's—the same damn phonograph, over and over, do the same thing.

Find the severe injury chain. Run the PC through it. Get it exactly by the book. So forth. Pongo—pongo. Go down the chain. That, or down the chain. You are going to get an F/ N. When you get down to the F/ N at the bottom of the chain, why, it's F/ Ned, great, that's it. That's finished with the chain. Good. Find incident one.

All right, so he finds an incident one and he runs it, and then you couldn't... it won't run out and then something weird happens, so you check it for overrun, and you are already running the overrun body thetan you have been running the engram chain out of anyhow. So you rehab that body thetan and they blow. Then find another incident one. And in this wise, the PC all of a sudden starts saying: "I can do this." You say: "Good. Thank you very much."

Bring him up to a proper ending point of the session, fly his needle on something, and let him go do it. Do you follow? It is always the same phonograph record. Find a severe injury chain. Track down the severe injury chain until it goes F/ N. By the book. Try to find an incident one. Find an incident one. Run it. Now I didn't even say the severe injury chain had to

read on your meter, as long as the PC could see it and go through it. But we have already run a severe injury chain that was so solid and so late and so impacted with body thetans who wouldn't let any other body thetan ever move that if the needle just flicked a time or two in trying to run the engrams, but they promptly went solid. So he found the earlier incident, got it's duration and so forth, ran it and flick, that's about all you get, an earlier flick. And then all of a sudden incident one, BD long fall, long fall, long fall. BD, fall, fall, fall, small fall, small fall, long fall, long fall. Just running it exactly as an engram. And all of a sudden—where—it went F/ N. The PC said: "Now wait a minute, I ran mine. Where did the other come from?"

You will find PCs walking around who are clear and who aren't mocking up pictures any more, who have got automatic pictures. And it never seems peculiar to them. Then they start thinking I must have mocked up a machine which makes up some pictures, and so forth. (exclamation) Bull! They got fleas. A colloquial term—derogatory term for a body thetan—they got fleas. That's the routine. And that is a sort of a review assist which gets the guy running who ain't got any. Do you see how it's done—how that is done exactly by the book. You fly the needle you find the engram chain, it all goes F/ N. Now you have got the gradients of assists, and there they are spread out in front of your face. There are not many to know how to do. There is not very much to knowing how to do. There is a great deal to knowing when to do what. You have to know when to do what. Well there is not many choices there either.

So the net result of all of this is, that there are assists to assist somebody to run his grades on solo, and there are the other types of assists. and they run the gamut from making him touch his head to the door he bumped on through to flying the needle, finding an engram chain, finding an incident one and the individual gets started again on three.

Got it?

ASSESSMENT AND LISTING BASICS

A lecture given on 7 October 1968

And this is the seventh of October 1968, and I think the eleventh lecture. I want to point out with that caption, that the last lecture was the tenth lecture of three October, so nobody will think that there are three or four lectures pulled off the line up here.

This, the amount of material which I can give you on the subject of auditing, of course is quite voluminous. And it is my job to find out how to codify and communicate to you the material concerning the mind and spirit, and the beingness and the universe, in such a form that it will be comprehensible and usable. The certain communication media, absence thereof, makes this difficult. These tapes, probably have a deterioration of only a few years span. One has to be alert to this kind of thing. And additionally, we get the wild enthusiasm of somebody, of placing material on the line which is completely additive, and has nothing to do with it, and sometimes do this and sign my name to it. And we have the wild enthusiasm for pulling key material off the line, which makes other things, then, not make any sense. And these various things have occurred in the past, and you right now have several instances of this. The major one of these has to do with assessment and nulling. And we will go into this immediately, and directly.

Assessment is an action done from a prepared list. Please, for god sakes get that through your skull. Please. Please, please. For god sakes understand what it is. Because it has messed up thousands of preclears. This miscomprehension of what this is all about has messed up preclears all over the world. An assessment is an action done from a prepared list! A prepared list! Prepared by the auditor. Prepared by me. Prepared by somebody else. It is not given by the PC, it is prepared! Prepared! Made up. Listed by somebody else! Not the preclear. A prepared list! And that is the action of assessment! Assessment Assessment! That is the word that goes with that. There is no other word goes with that! Assessment does not go with anything else but that! That is all that assessment means. It is associated with a prepared list. Only a prepared list! Period! There are a number of laws and actions which go along with assessment.

There's an entirely different subject, just as different as pulling us the anchor and splicing lines. A different, different subject. Different! Different! Completely, completely, completely! Utterly, utterly, utterly! They're even years apart in development. Called listing and nulling! Listing and nulling. This is something listed by the PC. Listed, listed by the PC! PC says it. It is from a questions The auditor asks the question. The PC then gives him items, which the auditor then writes down from the PC. That's called listing and nulling. Listing! Listing and nulling! Nulling! Nulling! Listing! Not assessment! Not assessment!

Let me give you the background of this. Now the reason I'm being emphatic is because it's practically killed thousands of PCs! The confusion between these two things And they're two entirely different operations.

Now the laws of listing and nutting do not apply to the laws of assessment. And the laws of assessment have nothing to do with the laws of listing and nulling! And I never would have DREAMED anybody would have mixed up the two. They've got nothing to do with each other. In the E—meter book, EM 24, has to do with assessment, assessment, assessment! Nothing but assessments. And that is assessment.

Now let me not hear in the future that somebody hasn't done it. And done it correctly. Because it is assessment. And it is done. And guys come into the line up and they say that is old fashioned and we don't do it anymore, and yik, yik, yik, yap, yap, yap, yaps That's the additive. We DO do it. It is a key, vital piece of auditing! Assessment, from a prepared list. E—meter book number 24. And there's an exact way to do it! And it has nothing to do with listing and nulling. Nothing. Nothing. Nothing to do with listing and nulling. There isn't any connection with listing and nulling. None! There is no listing and nulling drill in the E—meter book.

Listing and nutting has its' own laws. They're on tapes They've been on tape for years at Saint Hill! But people come along, and they've taken the laws of assessment, and they said, "Well, in view of the fact, we don't list and null them anymore. You don't assess, I dunno, yea, yea, well actually the law of assess... of list... and so on, is so actually to get something to one item on an S and D, you grind out every reading item on the list except one!" And by doing that, thousands of PCs have been ARC broken and chopped up. So I don't care to think it was unintentional. Because there is a list on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course that tells you how to list and null. And the laws which you had recently issued in an HCOB, 1968, are all there on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And they apply to the subject of listing and nulling. Listing and nulling. The laws of listing and nulling. You ask the question of the PC, the PC gives you item, item, item, item. The auditor writes them down, and then he nulls the list. And there must only be one item which has any read in it of any kind whatsoever on that list.

So, the PC says, "Dog biscuits, roast beef, catfish," long fall BD. The auditor then goes over the list, "Catfish", or he goes over it, "Dog biscuit, catfish", doesn't read, doesn't read. And then, nothing read on the list. Anything been suppressed on the list?" "No." So, "Balderdash", he extends the list, "Balderdash, lemons, oranges. ' And he goes back up to the top. "Good. Biscuits, dog biscuits, catfish, oranges, lemons", oranges reads, lemons reads. He's had it. There are two items now reading on the list. So he puts a bar over to the side, and he extends the list. And the answer is Manhole covers. And he gets a long fall BD. Now he goes back over the whole list again, clear from the top. "Biscuit, dog biscuits", right on down the list. Nothing reading, nothing, reading, nothing reading, nothing reading, "Manhole covers." That's the PCs item. It reads, he gives it to the PC. And that is the action of listing and nulling. And that is the whole action of listing and nulling, and that is the way it is done. And it is not done any other way! And these two actions are entirely, entirely, completely, utterly, different!

But I know somebody's come along and says, "We don't do that anymore. We don't do that old drill, and we don't ever assess from prepared lists anymore", and so therefore nobody knows how to do it. Because I know at this moment, 1968, that is has not been taught for at least two or three years. But they knew how to do S and Ds wrong. They knew how to do those with three reading items on the list. And then wondered why their PCs were ARC broken, the cases weren't getting any better, and so forth.

Do you get the enormity of mixing up two entirely different things? Now look, you've got to know, you've got to know how to assess a prepared list. You've go to know this. Now maybe earlier, maybe earlier I could have told you, I could have told you this separately, and so forth, and made it all very plain, but how the hell could I predict anybody was going to be a complete

kook? Because there's an infinity of errors. An infinity of errors can grow up. The one line is a very narrow one.

I could give you billions of words of lecture and bulletins, trying to predict every error somebody's going to make. And we would still get one missed. So you have to know what you know. And one of the things you have to know is a thing called assessment. And it is EM 24 in the E—meter book. And it has nothing to do with S and Ds, nothing to do with remedy Bs, nothing to do with remedy A's, those are all listing and nutting actions. Those haven't, have, they're completely separate. It's as different as a ship and a bus. Completely different.

I'm using this as an example at this time to show you what can happen that wrecks a workable technology. One set of laws that has nothing to do with the subject is applied to the subject. The action to which the laws are connected is said to be old hat and not done anymore. Recently it was being brooded about very broadly and widely, "Oh well, we never run engrams by chain anymore. That's looked on as a squirrel action." How the hell are you ever going to get an F/ N on an engram chain? How would you ever run engrams on somebody that was way up the bank, very very chopped up and charged up? You couldn't get him to run a single engram. Because the engram's up in the top. You can only go through 'em a couple of times and they go solid. So you have to do it by chains. And then it goes down the line, you finally find the basic and the whole cock—eyed thing blows—And somebody to come along and say, "That's old hat. We don't do that anymore." Well my answer to that would be, "We don't audit you anymore. You can go on and fall on your head." Because it's a dirty trick. It does in every PC whose case is only resolvable by engram running by chains at the level of running engrams.

The reason you have trouble with cases is, the usual hasn't been done. The standard hasn't been done. Hasn't been done, hasn't been done. We had a case here the other day. Wildest thing you ever heard in your life. Auditors were doin' their nuts, going around in circles trying to resolve this case. This case was an unusual case, a fantastic ones "Oh a very difficult cycle, bla bla bla bla." Finally the case went into treason or something of this sort. I made it my business to try to find out something about this case. And what do you know? He was on upper OT Sections and he had never run a grade in his life. Never run ARC Straightwire, never run secondaries, never run engrams, never run zero to four, never been on Power, never run R6EW. He was an unsolvable case. Nobody'd audited him. So, you get the case who was audited with off beat tech, and you get the case who has never been audited on tech, and they alike can be failed cases. And the solution at once, to the two types of case—the one who's been audited on off beat tech, and the one who has not been audited at all—, same solution. Find out what hasn't been done on the road to standard tech and do it. And the case resolves right now. And that's how difficult it is. So all you have to know is what is standard tech, and then find out what hasn't been done in standard tech, and get it done.

Now where tech is violated, and where standard tech is violated, you have to have repair actions which put them back together again. Now supposing we have a case which has eight hundred and sixty nine lists that have been done in Balderdash, North Slobokum. And then they lost his folder anyhow, and the auditor who did listed list couldn't write, and a bunch of things like this. You thought didn't have his folder, and so on. And this case is wrapped

around a telegraph pole. He's in terrible shape. How you going to resolve that case'

We haven't got the list to correct. Maybe you haven't even got the auditor who knows how to correct a list. And an auditor who doesn't know how to list and null, and thinks that listing and nutting is assessment, and who's all screwed up anyhow, he couldn't correct it by list anyway. But there is a way to correct this case. And that's very vital. It's a serious thing to lose somebody's lists. But there is a way. There is a way. And it contains assessment. It's an action called assessment. And the auditor dreams up a list of things. And he says, "Auditing, auditors, review, sessions, Scientology, Dianetics." Do you see? "Lists." And then, that is put down in a column by the auditor and is assessed over and over until one item is left reading. And that is assessment. And you, all of a sudden, got staring you in the face, "Lists". Alright, turns out to be "Lists." Good. It could just as well turn out to be auditing, or just as well turn out to be review. But it turned out to be "Lists." That is the hot button in this field—Now that will come close enough to what's wrong with him to solve it. And then you've got a thing called L—1. So you say now, "On Lists, ' and you itsa, earlier itsa with false and suppress on any of the reads, on the L—1. You take up each item in order from the top down. "On Lists", boom. "On Lists", boom. "On Lists", boom. And you clean each one. And all of a sudden the PC goes F/ N. And those old lists won't bother him anymore.

It's absolute magic that you can undo a bunch of lists, and things like that. But it depends on the auditor being able to assess. Now is this technique of assessment so old hat? No, I don't think so.

Now I'm going to give you some sort of an idea of an assessment as she is done. I will write it down here on the blackboard and a sheet can go along with this lecture. And this is this business of assessment. This now, is a prepared list. It's a prepared list, and it's something like, "Auditing, listing, review, Orgs, Scientology, Dianetics, grades." Now, the auditor makes that up or the case supervisor makes that up. And the auditor, he puts it into a line up like this. And he gives it, he gives it of course it's date, which is eleven, ten, sixty eight in this case, and he puts the PC's name on it, which is T. J. Pete.

And here's the other one. All of a sudden at Saint Hill, I heard with horror that this was going on. They're doing S and Ds over ARC breaks and out Ruds. I couldn't understand it! Last November. I've been trying to unravel this since last November. Why?! Because people would say, "Well, an S and D isn't auditing. An S and D isn't auditing, you know? Ha ha ha ha ha." Assessment isn't auditing. Assessment isn't auditing. It is simply trying to locate something to audit! And you can assess anybody, at any time, anywhere, and there's no session involved. Assessment has nothing, but an S and D, that is auditing. But assessment is never auditing.

You say the word right to the PC's bank. "Bombs, bombs, bombs." You can pick him up, I don't care if he's in an ARC break, I don't care what the hell is wrong with him. If your own TAs are OK you can just go bang, bang, bang, and you can get the item right out of the PC. He doesn't even have to be... if he's even doped off you can get the item. Just take a piece of paper, it's got these items on it, take your meter, and you say these things to the PC. You say the first one, like, "Auditing. Auditors. Lists. Reviews. Out. Scientology. Out." Now we've got one column and we've got two items reading. And this

is assessment, this is assessment, it has nothing to do with listing and nulling, nothing, nothing, nothing! The PCs Ruds, we don't care, this can be done on a street corner if you've got some place to park your E—meter.

Now we've got two reading items, haven't we? So we go down here the next time. And, we find out where this thing is. Lists. Scientology." We have one reading item left on the list. And that is all there is to it. And that is assessment. Ain't that difficult? But let me tell you, if you can't do this there are a large number of cases you can't crack. Because there are many types of prepared lists.

Now let us get an entirely different action. We're asking the PC, "Who done it?" And this is listing and nulling. And it's in session. And we're saying, "Who done it?" That's not a legitimate question, I'm just giving it to you so you won't interiorize into your case while I show it to you. Sarcasm. A lot of people listen to me with banks.

So we ask the PC, "Who done it?" And the PC says, "Joe, Bill, Pete", the auditor marks it fall, "Toger, Lige." Now we go over the thing, and we say to the PC, "Joe, Bill, Pete", second one here with a long fall, "Toger, Bob, Lige," oh brother. We have two reading items on the list. The list is not complete. Because there's two reading items on the list. Pete and Toger. And this is not assessment. This is nulling. Nulling. This is not assessment, this is nulling. And it didn't null. And we now know there's two reading items on the list, so we know the list isn't complete. So we put a bar over here, and we write "extended" on this little bar here, E—X—T we put. And under this we get, we say on this question "Who done it?" And the PC says, "Bigelow." Long fall, BD, as the PC says it. So now we go up to the top of this thing, and we say, "Joe", second X, "Bill", second X, "Pete", "Toger", out, out, "Lige", out, "Bigelow", long fall BD, 2.1. "Bigelow is your item." That's listing and nulling. It's an entirely different operation, isn't it?

Now you ought to spot whoever told you that the laws of assessment applied to listing and nulling. Now you see how it can get mucked up? Look it isn't what I says it is, it's what works. And this operation of listing and nulling, if done wrongly, if those two items "Pete" and "Toger" are left on the list, and you simply scrub it out and grind it down so that "Pete" doesn't read and you've got "Toger" left, you give the PC that item, he'll go through his skull! Boom. ARC break, apathy, upset, become angry, out of session, and very often just finishes with auditing right at that point. That's the most ARC breaky action, is listing. And listing is a dangerous action for that reason.

You try not to let green auditors list. You try not to let them list. When a guy has really got it down, great. They can assess, anybody can assess. There's nothing to assessment. Do you see the two different actions? Well, there's only one way to do both of them. There are no additional ways. Now when you get into 5A, running Power Plus, you'll find out that it's odd, but it's just a shortcut. 5A follows the laws of listing, but on the subject and the person and the place, person, place, subject, on those things, on those things it's just peculiar, but the first BD is always it. The first blow down is it. So to save time and because the subject is hot, and because this is a reliable action, all you have to do is grab that, bongo And give it to the PC. And you know it will be true. But it's a short cut, and it's just peculiar to 5A. And you try to do it on an S and D, and you'll very often get your throat cut. List is incomplete on it. So 5A can be done in this shorthanded fashion, but nothing else I know of can. And it's unfortunate because it looks like a, a different set of laws. But

there are no different laws, it just happens that it always comes out right if the PC is in session.

Now 5A can also blow on just the subject of persons. Persons. Long fall, BD, bong, F/ N. You try to go past that and you're gonna rise the tone arm right up through the roof. Now these are such key subjects with an individual, that an individual can become seriously, seriously, seriously ill, or upset within two or three days after a wrong Power Plus. So if the PC comes back a couple of days later and he's sick, or something like that, you know his 5A is out. It's elementary.

But now, when you put it in again, do all the laws of listing and nulling, with regard to it. Do everything. He says, you get such a peculiarity of, "Yeah, I thought of an item." And he didn't put it down. Or the auditor, he said it and the auditor didn't write it down, or something weird went on, don't you see? It's very off beat. It was a lousy session. It's not dangerous to do 5A, it is just incredible the amount of goof by which it can be done. The PCs who get very upset, and so forth, and they've had bad listing in their past, the best thing to do is to actually get the lists and correct them. Get the earliest list ever made on the PC and find the right item off of it. Sometimes you're lucky and you can do this. Sometimes you can get the list.

And then you can be an idiot, too. You can get the first list, you can get the item off of it. It was suppressed. It's usually the first item, or something like that, first or the second item. And it's very suppressed. And here we are, first S and D he ever had. And out of that S and D he gets "The collector of taxes", or something, see? That was the item. It was never given to him. He's had twenty, thirty S and Ds since then. So, "Collector of taxes", long fall, BD, and you got the suppress in on it and so on. It was an eighteen page list. And this was the second item on the list. Oooh! Odd kind of comm. Boy, was that lousy. So anyhow, long fall, BD, you give him his item, he says, "Yeah, reads, reads, tears, yeah thatch its" Now go to the next S and D and try to correct that. It's got the same item. Except by this time it was suppressed, and you stopped putting it on the list. Every S and D he had from the first S and D he ever had is always the same item. Now he can get little local locks on this suppressed item, and that comes out to be "The organization executives" or something, usually. 'Cause by that time he's turned kind of vicious. Do you see? What the hell? Why would you correct more than the first one?

Now if you were lucky enough to get the first remedy B the fellow ever had, and get that on its' exact items. Well a remedy B for that command will be that remedy B. and that blew, and thatch it. You're handling real horse power. You're handling tremendous horse power. See, those aren't light techniques. 1950 you could overrun, 1955 you could go on and on, you could do various things. You can't do those things today. The technique is too powerful, it's too fast. Zing, boom, bung, boom!

When we got into R2—12, R2—12 runs so... something minor. Something... A minute, two minutes, three minutes, couple of items. Goes F/ N and that packs up the whole subject. But somebody who had to have all of his intensive would some times get run twenty five hours on something that cleared up in two minutes. Well it was just at that point, at that exact point that we crossed the boundary line from technology which could be roughly handled and still come out, into technology which if it's exactly handled sent your PC flying. It was at that point.

Now somewhere during that period the confusion here on assessment is because of this: Assessment was something done on what was called the pre—have scale. By assessing these things and running them, you could fix a PC up now so he could have something. So these old pre—have scales, something around 1959, '60, they became so numerous and so heavy, that I developed further technology and collided with the whole subject of listing and nulling. Let the PC put it down. Up to that time all the auditor ever did was put it down. So now, when the PC put it down, that was a brand new set of rules, and you had to know these new rules, because they didn't follow these old rules. It's quite obvious they didn't follow the old rules. So on the research line, as it came forward, you find somewhere around '59, '60, '61, you find the discussion is of assessment. And then time marches on, and later tapes when they talk about listing and nulling are talking about the subject of listing and nutting as I have just differentiated for you in this lecture. And they have nothing to do with assessment. But assessment was the pre—run. It was the forerunner. And all the laws of listing and nulling had to be learned, 'cause they were entirely different than those of assessment. Now oddly enough, you can't much upset a PC by getting the wrong item on his list, but wait. If the case supervisor, or the auditor, is hotter'n a pistol, and he's looked back through this case, here's a folder a foot and a half thick of review sessions given at the Bide—a—Hee Review Center. And he looks back through this. Ohh. Oh my god. And then he sees some clue that the fellow was audited before that in Bull Isle, but he doesn't have any of the laws, any of the S and Ds that came from that area. What's he gonna do? You can upset the case and do an over review of a review of a review, of a correction of a correction to correct the correction, and you'll get into a hell of a fire fight with some auditor, particularly if the auditor is not very expert. Trying to get him to correct a pile of lists. He just keeps plowing it in further. He himself hasn't differentiated between assessment or listing and nulling. He doesn't know what these actions are. If he just club—footedly goes in and leaves three items reading on the list which you told him to repair, but now we've got a repair of a repair, we have actually exceeded the ability of the auditor to correct, because he couldn't list and null in the first place. Now a very smart case supervisor, he says, "OK, this fellow's had a lot of auditing of various kinds whatsoever in various places, and has pretended to be a very tough case, and so on. The basic thing is that standard tech hasn't been applied here someplace. So let's find it out, and let's try and correct the case up so he's at least auditable." Alright, so he does a list. And the list is, "Auditing, auditors", anything he can think of that might be in connection with this. "Centers, franchises, you know, anything he could think of that might add up to this, and he turns it over to an auditor who looks bright, looks like he has a head. He hasn't got two heads, god knows. And then what's this, what's this quote, "Auditor", unquote do? He even messes up the little simple job of assessment. And he gets the item that isn't the biggest reading item on the list. He suppresses that. He suppresses that one. The first item on the list, still, in assessment, is likely to be the one most missed, because you don't have the pcs' attention or anything, and you haven't told him what you're doing, maybe, or something. So he misses that first one. He doesn't... nothing hears it, he just sort of goes, "Blup". But anyway, there's no R—factor, you know? You got to tell somebody you're going to assess. I usually tell them, "I'm going to assess a list on you. Keep

quiet." My R—factor. And I don't want anybody talking on assessment. It isn't auditing, you're just trying to find something. And the more the PC talks, the more he's going to screw it up. So you want him to shut up. So you ask him politely, with complete ARC, to shut up. You say, "I'm going to do a list on you, and there is no reason for you to say anything. I would prefer that you did not", if he is prone to be yap yap .

Now, you go, "Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark", go up to the top of it again, 'Bark, bark, bark, bark", go up to the last reading, "Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark." That's the item. Now I don't care whether you give him the item or not. But somebody who is very inexperienced, and who lets the PC itsa, "itsamamnfwhfmf", and has the PC squirming about and doing other things, and doesn't know how to get a PC to hold the cans, and a few things like this, you know, little outnesses. Like, PCs itsaing about his mother—in—law, trying to run a PTP while the auditor's trying to assess a list. That's something stupid, see? You get a wrong item. All of a sudden the PC ARC breaks, because there's a hotter item on the list. There is, usually on these lists, the hottest item. And it isn't enough to get the longest fall. That's not correct, to write down the longest fall. It's the one that's still in, because actually what happens is, is you sort of scan him up and down the track, and he eventually sticks in the falling area. It isn't that things scrub out. He will just, his mind, automatically will park where he has the most interest. It's a method of paralleling the mind. So as you go over the reading items, why his attention goes, zuuu uu. Now, if his attention was on one of these items and you give him another item, he'll therefore ARC break, because you've excited by—passed charge on the right item, and you've given him the wrong item. You try to prep check that, or do something with that, and he ARC breaks further. So you can, you can goof it up even with an assessment. So you have to know how to run an E—meter. That's elementary. You have to know how to run an E—meter, get the guy to sit still, so on. I've seen auditors doing their nut because the PC was boiling off, or doped off, or doped off in an assessment and therefore the assessment isn't valid. You know the assessment is valid. The assessment is valid on an unconscious person. You can actually take an unconscious person if your tone 40's good enough, you can assess a list and find exactly what it is. It's the auditor. It's the auditor. The auditor. That's the law.

Now the net result of all of this is simply that assessment is assessment. But assessment requires that you do get the right item on the list you're assessing. It's almost inconceivable that anybody could get the wrong item on this list, but it0 actually could be done. You could get the PC so he's fighting it, so he's suppresses it, so he does some things, so he... You know. So you can actually correct one of these assessment lists, but that becomes very idiotic. It's such a simple, fast operation, that the whole essence of it is getting in there and doing it before the PC finds out. And then he'll all of a sudden start saying, "Wait a minute. Yes." Of course, you've parked him right where the most charge is. Of course he then has a tendency to say, "I have just remembered that woof, woof, bluff, and itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa,..." Wait a minute. Woah, woah, woah. You're not processing him. You don't know what the hell he's going to itsa. You're going to prep check this thing. You're going to do something with this thing. You are gonna adapt it to a recall question. You're gonna run it on a list 1. Well he's pulling the wrong action on it already. So therefore, it's even stupid to indicate it to

assessment of a list. Trying to get some dope here. "Alright", he says, "Great, great." F/ N. Now you go into the auditing action that you were going to go into, or just knock the session off. You've got the dope.

Now that dope, if it adds up right, can become a process. Now it can be done on L4A, it can be done on L1, it can be prep checked, you can pull a number of different gags out of it. But those are the major things you can do with it. "On bla bla, has anything been...?" Do you see? List 1, or prep check. See, there's various standard actions that are undertaken with this item. But the item is hot, and you want to get it as good as you can. You want to run it right down and get what you can off of it, and then get an F/ N that will stay that way for a while.

Now, that is the use and value of assessment. The use and value of listing and nulling. Now you may find on Saint Hill tapes, you may find on older tapes that this differentiation has not been made, you may find it is missing in a tape line up, it may be this and that, but certainly I am making it clear to you. Now therefore you should be aware of somebody pulling something out of a line up that he himself doesn't understand what the hell it is. Do you see? There can be a serious action. It's actually wrecked I don't know how many cases.

Now I don't say that this is now going to be wrong in the future, 'cause you guys are all going to make that right, and you guys'll probably for a long time been trying to straighten up little points like this, and so forth. And I'm giving it to you as a horrible example of what can happen. The technology that applies to ARC breaks is suddenly applied to missed withholds, to give you an idea, see? On a missed withhold, is it A—R—C—U, or C—D—E—I? On an ARC break, "Do you have an ARC break?" "Well yes I do. ' "Weil what was it all about?" "Well, I was, they were very cross with me this morning. ' Very good. Who nearly found out?" You could get that really screwed up, couldn't you?

Now I don't mean to be profane about it, but I have talked to many people very sweetly, and I have taught them how to audit with great kindness, and they haven't learned. In many instances they haven't learned. So, you will forgive my emphaticness.

Funny part of it is, in this particular unit at this particular time, your auditing picks up about a hundred percent every twenty four hours. That's a very remarkable line of gain.

Now. The next action here is there are certain methods of teaching which go on on this course, and which should go on on this course, and which are exterior, actually, to the bulletins, and so on, which must be called definitely to attention. And that is, that case folders of cases supervised by myself are part of the course actions. Now, Power folders were done in another day and another time when we were trying to develop and handle Power, but they nevertheless greatly assisted people in the case supervision of Power. And they were totally removed from the course, so that nobody'd ever seen or heard of these things for over a year. And nobody knew how to run Power all of a sudden. So I call to your attention that case folders, supervised by myself, and case supervision by myself are part of the curriculum of this course. And those must be studied—And it is the best part of those, the sessions that are well done, rather than specializing only in session that are badly done, since there can be an absolute infinity of error. There is only one single track of well done. Also, auditing at this level is not what you get away

with, it's what you do perfectly. We are auditing at a different strata, a different altitude. It is what you do perfectly. You're a total perfectionist. We don't care how the PC, and you don't care either, how the PC came out of the session and said, "Oh, I had a wonderful session." You look through the thing and it's something like this. "Do you have an ARC break? Who else has been ARC broke with you? Do you do things to make people ARC break with you?" You look over at the examiners' form, "What a wonderful session. Had a won..." There is a thing called propitiation. You are a perfectionist. You are not looking for the result. You are looking for the perfect rendition of the technology. We don't care how the PC felt afterwards. Because if it was perfectly administered on standard tech, you can, with perfect confidence, say that you will have achieved a perfect result on the PC which is lasting. But the rough TRs, the introduction of squirrelynesses, the failures to follow the exact things which are being taught, the failure to, "Do you have a present time problem? That's clean. Do you have a missed withhold?" Plunk! We don't care if he did or didn't have a present time problem. Why the hell did the auditor have to go and ask about missed withholds without getting an F/ N on PTPs?

Well you say, "Well of course the PC was stuck in a missed withhold. That's why it didn't F/ N." Naahhh. You're an auditor. You're auditing from a level of Class VIII. What the hell do you mean? The guy comes into session with a missed withhold? My PCs don't. They're not supposed to have missed withholds, ARC breaks or PTPs, and if I ask them about it and they tell me something it F/ Ns. Not because I say it F/ Ns, because it does. TRs are in.

Now, if this guy is all goofed up, and he's got out Ruds, and he's out of session like screaming crazy, and he's running the session, running the session, "No, I don't have an ARC break, but I have a PTP. Let me tell you my PTP. So and so and so and so and so and so." Of course there's a missed withhold mixed up in the thing. "Now what we're going to run in the body of the session..." There's only one reason, there're two reasons, actually that a PC does that. But we don't expect one of them to be valid, which is the auditors TRs are out. We expect the auditors' TRs to be in and perfect. But when the auditors' TRs are indifferently in, and a PC is out of session and behaves to control the session, the answer is out rudiments. Out rudiments, that's all. TRs fair... See now, an auditor with perfect TRs could probably audit over the top of out rudiments. But that's asking a hell of a lot. So if his TRs are fair, his control of the session would normally be good, and the PCs madly out of session, we know that the Ruds are out. It's one of these A equals A. Out of session, Ruds out.

Now the answer to that from the case supervisor is ratta—tat—tat. "Fly each rud to floating needle using suppress and false." Meaning simply that you don't leave one of the buttons unless you get in, it's itsa, earlier itsa to F/ N on ARC breaks. And when I say it's flunk, flunk, flunk, because he said, "Do you have a PTP? That's clean. Thank you very much. Now you do have a missed withhold?" Why didn't PTP fly? Well it's either suppressed or a false read. If it didn't fly it is either suppressed or a false read. Let's get this level of think. That's a very extreme level of think, isn't it? When you ask the PC a question and the needle doesn't float, then it is either a suppressed or a false read. You've asked the PC a question, now let me put this again very strongly, and very exactly, you've asked the PC a question, and it was clean, didn't read, and it didn't F/ N, then it's either suppressed because of false

reads, or there is a suppressed something on it. Why didn't it F/ N? Well, that's a hell of an extreme way of... here we labor and sweat and go through twenty five hour intensives, and so forth, to finally get an F/ N, and all of a sudden Ron looks at us here and says, "We ask the PC a question, we didn't get an F/ N, there's something wrong with that." Hey. Now get this as a different viewpoint. You ask the PC, "Do you have an ARC break?" And the PC F/ Ned, 'cause he didn't have one. Now if it didn't F/ N either he's been told he has had ARC breaks when he didn't have, or he's told he read on them when he didn't, so he's eventually suppressed the whole subject. Or he's got an ARC break that is suppressed, or he's got one that reads. And he's got one that reads, you itsa it, find out what it was, get your A—R—C—U, C—D—E—I, get the charge off of that, and then check it and if it hasn't F/ Ned yet, you ask him, "Is it suppressed?" See? Ana get the read. "Alright, is that false?" You got it? "Somebody told you you didn't have one?" I don't care what it is, you haven't got an F/ N yet. So it's an earlier, similar, earlier, similar, reads; there is no such thing as an ARC break that reads clean. There's ARC break to F/ N.

A needle that does not F/ N on a question... Look at the extremity of this. A needle that does not F/ N on a question has either been falsely called sometime or another, and has so been suppressed, or it is suppressed. Because it isn't an F/ N. F/ N is native state.

I get out of bed in the morning and grab a hold of a couple of cans, and so forth, and have a dial wide F/ N. Why? There's neither suppress, there's no suppress on it. I'm not asking myself anything. If I ask myself something on the meter and it stopped F/ Ning, I would know there was something there. Or, that it was false, or that it had been suppressed. Or there was an answer. I answer it and it F/ Ns again.

You should be auditing a PC from an F/ N, wondering why the F/ N is not continuous, rather than trying to sweat it through for the next seventy five hours to possibly get an F/ N. What the hell are you doing with no F/ Ns?

Now I know exactly how good your auditing is and how bad it is. I don't have to need anything more than the PC did not come to the next session with an F/ N. That's all I need to know.

Start of session he had to have his Ruds put in. He's losing some portion of the gain he should get. So I look over somebody who is an auditor, exclamation point (!), and I know that his PCs are going to start coming to session with F/ Ns very soon. And to run a major action you have to wreck the F/ N.

Now if you ask a PC who had an F/ N if he had an ARC break, perfectly reasonable to do, and the F/ N stopped, then you've either got a false or a suppress. See, the F/ N stopped but it didn't read. Then there's false or suppress. So you'd have to get in those buttons. So now let's go back to this. The guy says, the guy says, "Do you have a PTP? Clean. Do you have a missed withhold?" Plunk, plunk, plunk, plunk, plunk, plunk, plunk. He just passed a read that's either false or suppressed. He's been called falsely, so the guy suppressed the read or something, but it doesn't F/ N. He doesn't F/ N on the subject of missed withholds. He doesn't F/ N on the subject of PTPs, so it's false or suppressed. Do you get the idea?

Now that's a hell of an extreme point from which to audit, but that's the kind of case supervision you're getting at this particular stage of the game. If you wonder whv you're developing such aeronautic proficiency, and such aquatic

expertness, is because you and me are auditing from two different standards. And I'll tell you how to win in this game. You start auditing from my standard. Not because I say so, but because you will find out that it works. Pcs that don't F/ N when they come into session have been roughly audited. Not roughly taught, not roughly handled, they've just been roughly audited. Pcs whose F/ Ns don't even last to the examiner two minutes later... "You mean an ARC break's handled, and PTPs handled, and his missed withhold's off, and a good session under his belt and he's just cleaned up some big section of his life and his F/ N doesn't last from the auditing desk to the examiner? Balderdash. My god, mine even lasts doing case supervision on your folders. Horrible thing to say.

Now. So therefore the methods of teaching include the inspection of these case supervision, and anything that is improved or done in any way, why case folders and so forth, which demonstrate this will be added to the course. So that this is definitely part of it. Now, something which is supposed to be taken up, something supposed to be taken up by the supervisor, and so on, to find out where the student is actually weak, and it's supposed to get him to do it in clay. The... He's supposed to get him to do it so that he understands it. It's up to the supervisor to get the fellow clarified on these things, not asking a bunch of goofy question, but get it so that he can actually take a look at it. Because the basic cognition on this stuff is it's as simple as a shot arrow. I mean, it's just simple. It's like this assessment. It ARC breaks me, because I taught it for years and it's been done for years, and it's a very simple action, and assessment can be forgotten, or somebody can't do assessment? I wonder why an auditor would leave four items reading on a prepared list? What good it that to anybody? And then show me that one was three inches long and one was two inches long. I don't care how long they are What stayed in? What stayed in? That's the whole clue to the whole thing. That's all you ever want to know as case supervisor.

Now I assure you that every one of you, without going out of valence in the least, are going to be exactly in my boots as I am, trying to teach you how to come up the line on standard tech. Each one of you will be occupying these two boots. You're gonna have the same problems, you're gonna get twice as outraged, and you'll have to be able to do it in such case state that your needle floats through the lot. So those are methods of course teaching which I must remark upon.

Students quite normally take up case supervision folders, take up case supervision folders in a group so that each one of the cases, the auditing sessions which got well done, definitely taken up why that is a well done session. Now you will see in some of these case folders that instead of being a raging beast, I actually am not much of a raging beast, I am more than kind, because you'll occasionally see little slips I don't say anything about. See? They're so tiny, and knowing that the auditor was so over strained at that particular point, that it would seem too damn petty, because it didn't mean anything to the session. Little points of out—admin. You know? Like he doesn't put the time down for four columns. So you can't find out when the hell he did the action in the, in the session report, because he never put down the time. So you know that the action, and so forth, and then there's no time put down on the list when he does the list. So you can't find where the list fit into the session. See? These little things. I know you'll find me not saying much about them, but you should move up into that level of

perfection.

Now, as far as tapes are concerned, and listening to tapes, usually the quality is so very, very bad on tapes over home recorder machines which you listen to through earphones, that this course at least is designed to play the tapes in a common hall to the students all at one time. But this poses the problem, this poses the problem of what about somebody who comes in late on a course, and therefore you could only give the course every so many weeks? Or, something like this.

No, you'll find these tapes, more or less you can, somebody can start listening to these tapes anyplace. And you carry it on through. But all the tapes should be listened to. I've tried to tell you often enough on the tapes so that you don't have to take notes, it's a very embarrassing thing in an auditing session to have to take out your notes. I remember one time, back in 1950, when an auditor who was going to audit me had to find Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health to find out what the canceler was. And opened up my book and read me the canceler as part of a session. You're supposed to know your data very quickly.

Now the student, you'll find the cases make out on the course best when students start to audit late on the course. The students who are auditing later on the course, rather than those who audited once on the course, turn in a far better session. They've got the data, the theory under their belt, and they've normally integrated it so that they can put it together into a session without a lot of questions popping up. So a student should audit relatively late on a course, not early on.

Now, when I say late, well if he was going to be three weeks on course, why about the earliest he ought to do any auditing is after about a week and a half of very furious study. And it would have to be very furious study. One is expected to go through the checksheet on this course at least three times. I consider that a minimum, I'd consider nine optimum. If you knew it by the time that you'd hit nine, boy you'd know it. And you wouldn't be worrying about it, trying to remember it. The only reason you make mistakes is your're trying to remember something that's about as obvious as can be. Now the other thing is, is we teach auditors, not cases. And on this course, why auditors don't have cases. There are no cases on the course. And that is an old rule, but there are no cases on a course. And that's the most remarkable thing. I've tried to teach you without teaching you through my case, and you should be able to be taught without being taught through your case. Now the net result of that is, is auditors don't have cases. Every now and then a solo auditor gets going about his case, or something of this sort. Well all right, but he is also the auditor. And he can't have the excuse that he keeps bad admin and doesn't audit because his case is bad. He is a different thing as a solo auditor.

Now the whole subject of this course that you sort out eventually are the relative importances. And you should have gotten this a long, long, long, long time ago. It should have been way, way, way back when. The, the final assortment of data is actually in the axioms. And you should have learned these a long time ago. Axiom 58: Intelligence and judgement are measured by the ability to evaluate relative importances. To a lot of people a datum in Scientology is just about the same as a data in Buddhism, is about the same as a drop of water in the ocean, and so on. The position of the E-meter is an equal importance to the TRs of the auditor. In other words, monotone

importances. You should know this axiom 58. Intelligence and judgement are measured by the ability to evaluate relative importances. When you eventually sort out the material you're going through, you won't find that there are fifty data that are important. But you have to know the rest of them to back it up. But there are fifty, no more, no less, than. What is important? What is important? And that is the thing you have to break through.

Somebody came in here on this course asking me questions about heredity. Well, I don't care anything about heredity. The Russians have heredity. Bysinko, I think, had something to say about it. Somebody dreamed it up sometime or another. But brother, it has the relative importance of an ink blot on a rock in the South Pacific. So your data has to be evaluated against other data. I've had somebody tell me that you could find everything there was in Scientology in Rrshnamurti. Well, it was a hell of an exaggeration, so I said, "Now show me something." And they finally dreamed it up, and they said, "Well he said something about time." And I said, "Good. We also said something about time. Now show me where he said something about time." And they showed me one sentence which was in a whole book. And this one little sentence, by misinterpretation, could be said to be the fact that time exists in this universe. But nowhere in there did he give it any relative importance. And it was just of monotone to every other thing in there.

So somebody comes up to you and tells you, "Well that's just like the Vedic something or other", they've got a lot to learn. Because they don't even know the relative importance amongst the Vedic actions. There is an important Vedic hymn, I've forgotten which one it is, about the fourth one, which gives the cycle of action. And it gives, actually, a very, very wise little piece of information. It defines the cycle of action, way back in Vedic times. And in the entire panorama of Vedic materials there isn't anything else but sand. That's a hell of a thing, isn't it? But there is one, was one datum there. Now, the people studying Vedic hymns I am sure think they're all of equal importance. There was only one useful datum in the whole line up. Very valuable datum.

Now where, where a student has to shake himself loose, where he has to get himself squared around, is to find out what is important and what is unimportant. And when he is able to sort these things out he is then able to do what he has to do, he is also able to teach. And this is a primary job which is done by the student. Under the heading of methods of teaching, this is something that is up to the student to sort out relative importances. Until he does so he is just in one horrible maze. Every drop of water in the ocean is just like every other drop of water in the ocean, and all those drops of water in the ocean, they really don't relate to anything. Well he's gotta get that stacked up, and he's gotta find out what are the important data. What are the important data? And get those things arranged. And arrange those important data without recourse to whether or not they solve his case or not. For as a student, he couldn't care buttons about whether they solve his case or not. In the normal course of events they of course will resolve his case. But they actually won't solve his case unless they solve all the cases. Some people like to be individualists and have different types of cases. I'm sorry for those people, but we may even invent a C/ S which satisfies their status—happy seeking. "We have to run on you now technique ST. And that is a technique of spotting the number of spots on spots. It's a very special

process. It's for very genius people." If you did such a thing as that it would probably be dishonest, but I never let my sense of humor get the better with my case supervision. But sometimes when you hear what some people think is a missed withhold, that even I have heard half around the world, this girl's busy getting off this missed withhold, see? Well I've known that for years. I know one girl that went clear to Australia and buried herself in the bush and has never come out towards Scientology again, because she had a withhold that only she knew in company with; she never got it off in a session, but I don't think there was anybody in London didn't know it. She's down there busy hiding this withhold that everybody else knows. It suddenly strikes you with some pity, looking at some extreme action like this, that humanism and status, and a few things like that are put above power, decency and freedom. But those are the relative importances of the being. And he will sort those out as time goes along.

Now, I could go on and give you a lot of data about this and that and the other thing, but I do have some very, very important data. I've already told you that no session control is out Ruds, and relative importances, but I want to tell you something very astonishing. Something absolutely astonishing. And that is the one hand electrode, as used in solo auditing, can obscure floats to such a degree that a person overruns himself consistently. And you will find that in auditing of such people, you will be amazed, and he will be amazed, when you say there are four, five, six, eight, ten times they went clear on the Clearing Course, or something of this sort. They went release on it, or something. And he didn't see any floats. Well he was handling a one hand electrode. And it doesn't float. Furthermore, it gives a TA lie. It can be high, or it can be low. Now if you want to straighten this out for yourself, get a couple of cans with the alligator clip, couple of old tin cans the way those meters are designed against, I think it's a size eight or a size ten tin can. And they have alligator jaw lead—ins that clip to those tin cans. You take those two cans and you hold them, and that meter is calibrated to work in, calibrated to react to, two tin cans, one held in each hand.

Now when a person gets up in the OT Sections, he is insufficiently in contact with all parts of the body to register worth a god damn on a one hand electrode in many cases. You very often will find the one hand electrode is registering 2.5, that the needle appears to be relatively loose, that this appears to be OK. If you were to take at that moment two one hand electrodes, you know, two, two different electrodes which are separated, each one held in one hand, making a two handed connection to the machine, the needle might be doing a float. And the TA might be in a completely different place.

Now it's very amazing how completely erroneous this can be. The TA can be at 3, floating, on the proper two cans, and on a one hand electrode can be at 4, stuck. But because it actually is calibrated to be floating on the two hands, and is floating, and is actually floating, any effort to get it down from the stuck 4 is, of course, an overrun. Life can be marvelous, can't it.

So those electrodes are best, and those electrodes are only reliable, which are held one in each hand, or which are connected to the two opposite sides of the body. Now a word of warning, if you try to hook up an electrode against the skin it very often, I mean like under the armpit, or some tender portion of the anatomy, watch it, because it only has seven and a half volts going through it, but it actually gives a sensation of burn, and can actually

burn somebody. We do have somebody who tries to handle electrodes by lashing one to his leg, and he's always been thinking he is such a marvelous special case because it burns his leg. Well my god, it always burns anybody's leg. It'd burn your leg, too. Don't think I haven't made tests of that character all the way across the line.

But this latest data here, about a one hand electrode is a result of a series of tests which I have taken in order to resolve some materials and some reactions on the higher OT Sections of research, and—I'm telling you this for the first time. It isn't that I've withheld it from anybody, but that it doesn't float as you go up into higher Sections. You don't get a float anymore. And you get the weird action then, of an overrun, and you put... Now you, as an auditor, put the guy into a review session, and it's sort of packed up, and it's spooky, and the needle's doing this, that or the other thing, there's not only a false needle, but a false TA. So there's Worry about the TA" is one of the buttons which you must remember comes about in solo auditing. And you have to put into your line up. His TA. Worried about his TA. His TA is low, or his TA is high. He's worried about his TA. And it comes up as a problem and can act as a sufficient problem to operate as any other present time problem operates at no case gain. Every time he goes into session he has this problem with the TA. And in a one hand electrode he can read up to 6. Stuck. When he actually will be floating, dial wide, on two cans.

Now you will see then, this mystery of this guy was all worried about his TA, and he'll be sitting on the meter, all of a sudden he'll have a dial wide float while you're auditing him, and he tells you he's worried about his TA. Well that is the mystery of it all, is he's got some floaky electrode set up, which messes him up. Now there's some material in progress on this, and this will be resolvable. But I'm just warning you that this condition does exist, and that you will run into this condition.

Now, the actual actions of auditing on a solo level are very often very, very, very, very, very badly done. Incredibly badly done. Guys go into session, they don't put in their Ruds. The rudiments are out, and they try to use the OT Section in order to handle their PTP. You got it? And they then audit over out Ruds, out Ruds, audit over out Ruds, out Ruds. Now you get somebody that can't run an engram, can't run anything else, and he gets onto OT 3. Isn't trained, wraps himself around a telegraph pole, messes himself up most horribly. One are the difficulties is, that he will run an Incident 1 on one thetan and turn around and run an Incident 2 out of another thetan. I sometimes find somebody who says, when you're trying to run an Incident 1 on him, well he has no reality on it, and so on, and yet he claims to have done something with 3. He can't have done anything with 3 unless he ran some Incident 1s. He can very often run his own Incident 1, blow quite a few body thetans. He doesn't necessarily have to be on it forever. But he certainly had to run Incident 1! And he certainly had to run it several times!

Now, therefore, why didn't he? Well he doesn't know engram running. He can't run engrams. And not able to run engrams, my god, he couldn't run 'em on a PC, he couldn't run 'em much less on himself, he hasn't any control of his own bank, he therefore is somebody who, by reason of training and by reason of a charged case, did not in actual fact have any business being on the OT Sections, because his case is too charged up. Now his case is too charged up because his grades are out. It isn't a very difficult thing. Engrams, secondaries, ARC Straightwire, back it down into that zone, he's

had drugs. They have never been rehabbed, something like this. And god almighty, he, he's trying to get through the OT Sections. Well it's something like this. Standard tech rehabs all former releases on any subject. And if those things aren't rehabbed, I don't care whether it's done early or late on the case, if the person's not actually had ARC Straightwire run, if he's not actually had secondaries run, if he's not actually had engrams run, all correctly, zero, the real processes of zero, one, two, three, four, actual Power, R6EW, no fudge to it, actually run 'em. His case is too charged. His case is too charged up.

Now one of the ways you can tell a case is too charged up is he starts to run secondaries or engrams or something like this, and he doesn't seem to be able to get much reality on it, and he sort of brushes it off, but somebody ARC breaks him, and he goes F/ N. "Well, you're a clear. That's it. We've got you released now on engrams." Oh. Now you try to take him up through the grades. Kooky things like this have happened, but those are violations of standard tech. Standard tech includes that an F/ N is not a valid F/ N unless it's with GIs. But you say the thing did F/ N, and he didn't have GIs, and when I started to run it further it packed up and the TA started up. My dear fellow, you now have found out that it was a real F/ N. So, F/ N with bad indicators. So you decide it's just an F/ N with bad indicators, and I'm going to do something else with this F/ N with bad indicators, and I'm going to run it a bit further, I'm going to do something else with this. All of a sudden the F/ N packs up, the TA starts up, my god it wasn't an F/ N with bad indicators, meaning an ARC broke needle. It was a valid F/ N. You've had it. Now of course, you're going to have to come off of it and rehab it right away. Bongo. Rehab. Indicate the overrun. It goes back to its' proper F/ N. He's just, sort of, a sour puss PC in general. But he never has, nobody's ever seen any GIs on him. Never seen any good indicators, and so on.

Well the trouble with the case is, the trouble with the case is, it is simply super—charged. It's just a charged up case. The guy's just charged up like crazy. Well there's something wrong. And a person who has ARC broke needles is an over—charged case who is liable to go low TA. He's a potential low TA case. So the resolution of the low TA, it was very necessary to say that standard tech covered all cases. There are several ways to resolve a low TA, it is resolvable by valence shifting, it is resolvable by a proper run on OT3, it is even resolvable by PrPr6. So I have just pulled the rabbit out of the hat recently, and I've got low TA cases resolvable at the level of ARC Straightwire and secondaries and engram running. We might as well cure them up there as any other place.

So I do pull some rabbits out of the hat every now and then. What's resolvable on the upper levels, I've made it now resolvable on the lower levels. All of which is part of the standard tech which you're being taught.

Alright. Now the high TA is inevitably and invariably overruns. Inevitably and invariably. But there's a hooker on this overrun. It might be the profession of somebody that is overrun, and you have to find the person. He's just one damn too many dentists. And you find the dentist who constituted the overrun and the TA blows down. The subject of dentistry doesn't go, but the subject of dentists does. Do you follow? He doesn't blow down on operation, but it blows down on the subject of dentists. How would you find such a thing? Well you would normally find such a thing very easily by the interesting mechanism that he was PTS. PTS, you do an S and D, you get a

big blow down on the thing, well he was actually overrun on this subject, and that made him PTS to it. And it's all very involved in his head. But we don't care how it is. So overrun is high TA, but it could also be the overrun of the person. You can get the phenomena of over~ un showing up on an S and D, and you'll think maybe PTS makes high TAs. It doesn't. OK?

So you got the high TA, you got the low TA, and other things with regard to that. And your technique is pretty straight. Now you think in my teaching of you that I, at this stage of the game, that I have become savage, that I have become brutal, that I have become utterly mean. I call to your attention that I have taught you kindly and sweetly before.

Now I won't try to make you wrong by saying you have done it all wrong, because the actual fact before I arrange this course to teach you this, I did get a simplification of communication to try to find out where you might possibly be snarled up, and have done everything I could to unsnarl it. So I'm not trying to make you horribly wrong in everything you have learned. I'm just trying to make you horribly right by getting you to get all the gain there is as an auditor, and as a case out of standard tech.

Thank you very much.

MORE ON BASICS

A lecture given on 8 October 1968

The assessment's supposed to catch a little bit of doubt on it, because you couldn't quite read what he thought about it, and the other one was a C/ S, which was for the birds. Which wasn't actually germane to the auditing session. And so, it may be brutal, it may be horrible, but you are moving right up the line with greater speed than I have ever seen a group move up before, so I thank you. (Thank you.)

Now, you will find that when an individual has been trained and trained and trained, and trained by various instructors, instructors, not supervisors, but he has been instructed in academies and on the Class VI course and ACCs or any other kind of course, he's had, he's had a cycle that he goes through. He begins, he looks at his basics, and he says, "Yeah, that's right. OK. I'll do it." And then somebody comes along and says, "Well that isn't quite right.", and he gives him something else, and steers him sideways. And so he doesn't quite know whether that was right or not, but he goes on and does it. And he sort of gets away with it, and he's not sure. And then he goes along a little bit further, and he runs into a contradictory datum or a datum that somebody else says is contradictory. I'll give you an example. Somebody all of a sudden said, "All the laws of assessment really apply to the laws of listing and nulling", and at that moment, why every auditor had had it. And then somebody came along and said, "Well assessment, that's old hat. We don't do that anymore." You want to watch this we don't do that anymore". And so this noosed up the laws of listing and nulling, and then somebody says, "Well the tape on that is lost or something. We don't have that today. But you just do it like an assessment", and then it's ssss... It doesn't come out right. And an auditor wonders what is going on, but he somehow or other perseveres, and he again doubts his own grip on basics.

So when we get to the level of Class VIII, and we handle this. And Class VIII is probably a simpler course than an academy course. Probably simpler. The data which is delivered, including C/ S now, is so straightforward and so simple, that it's almost unbelievable. It's incredible that somebody wouldn't have picked up this data along the track to begin with, because it was all there. Actually this current activity is being taught against a great deal of in tech, out tech activities. But we can't suppose that just because Class VIII has moved into view that in tech, out tech, contradictory tech, you were not quite right even when you did standard tech, will disappear forever from the planet.

But let me assure you that as the organization gets bigger, and it does consistently and continuously, that you will get more and more areas, and the very multiplicity of it, the numbers of areas which exist, give you that many more opportunities for things to go wrong. And I have noticed consistently, consistently that we seem to run the same time track—The same things happen. An org starts up in Keokuk. And there is a town called Keokuk. I hope some day there is an org there, and if there is, why I'm sorry, because it simply up to date has been used as a hypothetical area. An imaginary area. Anyway, this org starts up in Keokuk, and it's going to probably go through the same convulsions of the Dianetic Foundation, go through the same errors of the fifties, go through the same difficulties of the sixties, probably get in fire fights with the local council, you know this. It'll have, undoubtedly, a somewhat similar time track to the subject as a whole.

Except it will have it in a small bit. You'll get somebody, an auditor went to Keokuk and started up something. Audited quite a few pus, and moved out and left them flat on their faces, never finished up. A tour got to Keokuk and it picked up the cases that were there, but it generated some more interest, and then some more PCs were audited, and some of those fell on their faces, but there was no org there to really take care of it. Finally somebody puts a franchise center into the area, it goes squirrely, somebody comes in and begins to give colonies at the same time their giving intensives, and it folds up. And then finally, why, a good, steady franchise man gets in there, it builds up to an organizational status, it begins to hold on, it starts taking responsibility for the cases in the ares. But this is this planet. And this is the planet Teegeack. And this planet had a very sorry history. And to get anything started at all on the planet is quite miraculous. Quite miraculous. It's a great tribute to the tenacity and stick—to—ivity and carry forwardness of Scientologists that's it's going forward. And it is, right now. There's some little, tiny pipsqueak two bit town right at this moment that is trying to pass a local ordinance or something against Scientology, saying it is so evil, it is causing fantastic quantities of distress, and the birds who are trying to pass the law, of course kill four or five patients a week in the local sanitarium, by various methods of butchery. And nobody pays any attention to that. So the planet gives you many contradictions. It's an incredible, it's an incredible scene, where you find the cowboy in the black hat is in charge, and where the bishop has nothing but choir boys in mind, and he is looked up to as a pillar of the community. And they wonder why they seem to be eaten all the time by termites. They're certainly carving into that pillar. But he is his own termite man. And these things happen. You see, we wouldn't be at work at all if the planet were in perfect condition.

Now the hard way to start out a straighten up of the old galactic confederation would be to start it on the planet Teegeack. And the people who went through that one could start it up anyplace, because this was the one which was hit the hardest. This was the place where they were brought. So to get it going here is fantastic. And that, however, doesn't excuse us for tolerating less than perfection, of pushing forward, of keeping it going, and so on. It's a lot of work—And the vagaries and wobbles of auditors and the public, and that sort of thing, no don't think they're going to stop wobbling. It wouldn't matter if we were in charge of the whole planet—You'd still find a file clerk, or a Mr. Bonkers someplace or another would have started up an "I will arise", which has as its' sole goal a slaughter of Scientologists, or something. You know, I mean, it's that kind of a planet.

Alright, so it is a tribute to Scientologists that they carry on and they do get their job done. But along the line of training, you get into, you get into areas where people are leaning on this training. They're reevaluating it. They're doing this with it, they're doing that with it. And when you get to level eight, when you get to level eight, it's instead of falling on your head and feeling that you are now guilty for practice of out tech from here, there and every place, you probably are making progress on the realization that you had your basics in the first place, and that those basics were the basics, and that they were right there and available, and you now probably, because you've been through it all, probably couldn't be improperly trained against the results and precision which you are learning at Class VIII.

I can imagine one of you right this minute. Somebody rushes in and he says,

"Oh, well, we don't do that anymore." I can imagine the lip curl he would get in response. He'd probably get examined very carefully.

But you see that a subject goes as far as it works. And it has been necessary to develop the technology, to develop it along a certain research line, and to make sure that it worked here, there and every place amongst the Hottentots and the Mohicans, amongst the Park Avenue and Mayfair, as well as down along the London docks. And it had to work. And it had to work on each, all and every, and that meant that you had to have nothing but the common denominators. So, but there is this difference. There are the common denominators to all persons. And then there are a lot of peculiarities that each person has which are peculiarly his. The C/ S pays no attention to the peculiarities. The more attention he pays to peculiarities, the less success he's going to have. It's a Q and A. It's a Q and A with a difference. The road out is one road.

The oddities that happen in cases are very often fascinating. There's many a good laugh along the line, that's for sure. We get laughs along technical examiner lines. We got one the other day that just, marvelous. The PC, the PC walked up to the examiner and says, "I feel great." And the examiner's report is, "I feel great. R/ S." (Laughs) Magnificent. A whole model must be contained in just that one little sheet.

And so you will find that what is out, and what is being shoved out of line are basics. They're just basic things. Now there's certain basic data which have arisen since the beginning of the research line of course, naturally, because the search was for the common denominator of all cases. This was pretty well wrapped up in 1966 and became very standardized about that time. But the standardization of it wasn't too possible to one and all, because there were certain people who insisted on being contradictive. They, you know, "He wrote that wrong, well... Waaaa." And they were either operating out of their own banks or against some unfortunate win.

There is this thing, you know, about the unfortunate win. The auditor goes in and he takes a look at the PC, and he says, "What's the trouble with this PC? He thinks he has a head, and he's so fixed on the idea that he has a head. So I'm going to run, 'Do you have a head? Do you have a head? Do you have a head?'" And this one case out of a thousand, this guy all of a sudden goes, feel, touch, mmmm. "My god, I have a head. My god, I'm in a head. Wows" And he blows off and becomes exterior.

Now this poor auditor. This poor auditor will go through years trying to find another person on whom that process works. Now unfortunately it is a trait that he will do more selling than he will do research and applying. And he will start selling the idea that this was a great process. That it is a great process. That it ought to be done. That all other processes are wrong. We've been through all of this in the fifties. And it simply worked on one, two, three people, and it didn't work on anybody else.

Now there is such a thing as some processes being so pistol hot that they're hardly trustworthy. R2—12 is one of these things. You can overrun R2—12 with just, while you're turning over the bulletin. It's, it's one of those things. And people insist that it seems to produce a great deal of result for a very long period of time. So we have somebody who ran R2—12 fifteen hundred hours. Oh, wow! And it did, it practically ran him into the ground. He actually, probably, went release on it in the first three or four minutes of auditing. And that was practically that. Don't you see? But the auditor, who

was green, would be adjusting his E—meter in those few minutes. He would be trying to settle into the session. So R2—12 becomes dangerous in the hands of a relatively untrained auditor. It becomes dangerous, because he hasn't really got his session going yet, and he hasn't got himself tuned in and the meter down, and he hasn't got his paper, you know, and he's still sort of looking at the PC, and he's still trying to straighten this out. And the damn thing has gone release. He's setting down, and you, you know, settling down for a long haul. And it all happened already. Only he didn't notice it. It was too quick. Do you follow?

Now that is one of the dangers you're going to run into with Class VIII techniques. Trying to get somebody to do them. Now what's out with the individual is his basics. It isn't any airy-fairy nonsense. Any time you hear of this course being taught on the basis of "It is all very airy—fairy, and you have to be in wawawawa, 'cause it is old... And really the basic theory that this is sort of a feel, you see. Class VIII auditing is really an art. It really takes a certain type personality." Any, any, any variety of this, why give the guy the bird, would you please? Because what is inevitably and invariably out is basics.

Now basics can go out on a long trained auditor by being misunderstood or being contradicted. And when he comes back to his basic data and looks at it again, now he has no choice but to get off his misunderstands and the contradictions. And he gets his data back. Now there are a few data that he won't have heard of, perhaps. And the subject is an advancing subject, and sometimes you have a little breakthrough of some kind or another. But that would inevitably just be put in a bulletin form. You discover all of a sudden that the... There've been a couple of them while I've been teaching this course. A discovery of the actual liabilities of a one hand electrode. And it's a liability, because a lot of solo auditors have thought, "Oh my god, my TA is out of sight. I don't know what is wrong with my case." And then they get into some weird one, because they go down into session, in reviews you see, and review says, "Your TA is 2.25." And they say, "What?" "Well, I don't know. Something must have happened between here and there. I wonder what that was." No, their TA was 2.25 all the time. Now if the one hand electrode was a constant, you could throw the trim check knob of the E—meter over, so that the one hand electrode would read what the two hand electrode should read. But unfortunately there weren't any meters built at this time which you could trim check to that degree. They don't trim check one and one half division of TA. That's too wide a trim check. But there are solutions to this sort of thing. You can even do it with a one hand electrode, providing you had two electrodes standing by. And whenever you take your, your TA, grab the two cans and plug them in, to find out what the one hand electrode is telling you wrong. But the trouble with the one hand electrode is it usually misses a float.

You see it isn't sweat that activates an E—meter. It isn't sweat that activates one. It's current. And it is actually being activated by a thetan. And the thetan is not in one's palm. So all you're doing is getting a distant reaction from the thetan himself, and it's liable to miss. And the number of floats which you get on a one hand electrode, and in fact I don't think I've ever seen one. Not a real, wide float. And yet you swap over to two electrodes, my god. You're sitting there looking at a dial wide float. So something like this can come up, or a bug like this can show up. But it's usually a

mechanical bug.

Now that, right at this moment, is in the process of solution as to what type of electrode is then usable. And there are three or four of them been suggested, and we, we'll strap it up. So this... Now that, it was a very big bug, but it never really came forward as blocking the line.

The other thing is, I'm teaching this course against the development of 7 and 8. 7 is all done, OT 7 is all finished. It hasn't been written up at the time I'm giving these lectures. There is nothing peculiar, and I might as well make a remark on this. There's nothing peculiar in either 7 or 8 that violates standard auditing. Nothing in either one of them violates standard auditing. Not a thing. It's the very standard tech you're using right this moment. Carries you right straight through 7 and 8. There's the difference being the targets of the auditing shift, but they're handled, handled exactly the same way that you handle any other grade or level. Do you follow? There's no difference. It's just what different basic. What different combination. What different thing are you looking for. It's that easy. You do, perhaps another little assessment sheet. Do you see? And then you get that, and you run that, the same processes, same everything. It's a different, it's a different target area. Then you also get to more and more deal with the being.

And you are; I will give you this word of caution. It already exists in a bulletin. And it should be in your pack. As an individual comes up the line he has more and more effect on a meter. So the further he comes up the line the more likely you are to get a read on anything he says. Or anything he thinks.

So that you ask him, "Do you have a PTP?" And you get a long read. And then he says, you say, "That reads." He says, "I wa... ' That's why you have to know false read. Because what he thought was, "I don't think so." And that fact that he thought this thought of course act... He's an electric eel, you see, anything he thinks causes an impulse. And that is why particularly auditing people who are on the upper levels, you have to know this definition of a read. And it's a precise definition. A read is what the meter says. What it applies to must be established. It may be reading on the auditor's question, which it usually, fortunately, is, or it may be reading simply on a reaction to the question, which gets you into trouble rather consistently, or it is some other influence has entered in to the scene.

So when a meter reads you have to find out what read. And if anything, even faintly, seems to be out about it, then you have to find out what it is. Not to actually identify what the exact read is, but you say to the fellow, it's very simple. You say to the fellow, "Do you have a present time problem? ' Fall. You say, "Alright, what was that?" It's a cautious question, see? "Oh', he said, "Did that read?" And you say, "Yes. That was a read." "Well I don't know. I can't think of any. ' Read. 'Well, were you thinking something about the question?" "Well yes." Bong. Your auditing an electric eel. See? He, he can punch reads into this meter. And the higher up the line he goes, why the more obvious this becomes. You don't have this trouble with wags. You don't have this trouble with grade fours. You seldom get it on Power. You begin to get it in the area of R6EW, and you sure as hell get it in the field of clears. So you no longer can take a meter for granted. You ask if there's a PTP, you get a read. You can even say, "Do you have one?" He says, ~No, I don't think I do." You say, "Good. Has anything been suppressed?" And you get another read, and he says, "Yeah, well I don't think I have a present time problem."

You see the same read. You say, "Good." Why bug him? Why bug him to death? It's obvious that he's reading on "No I don't have a present time problem", because every time he says this it reads the same way.

So there is the thing of establishing what is a meter pattern of read. Now you're getting into a pretty skilled area. Did you... It consists of knowing the read you just got. Knowing what read you just got, and then comparing the next read to it. We're straining at it here, because it isn't really this important. It's just one of those things that goes by. For instance, an invalidate will get the same read as the item would get. A suppress will get the same read as an item that is suppressed. You'll say, "Has anything been suppressed on this item?" See? "On this item has anything been suppressed?" And you'll get a read. Now if you; the guy said, "Yeah. So and so." Now if you say the item you'll get exactly the same read that you got when you said suppressed. It's almost curiosa. It'll be the same length and the same characteristic of read. This is not very usable in things, but it's just that all the auditor knows is that the meter read. And I impress upon you that you're not going to have this problem in academies. You get it with can fiddles, but anybody can see a can fiddle. You're not going to get this problem down in humanoid levels.

As you move on up the line your guy, your PC that you're auditing in review, you have to then have some idea of what grade or section of PC you are auditing. And you expect this thing to really fly.

Now you can get a person who is in the upper sections in less trouble than you can get a person who is in the lower grades. A person who is in the lower grades has to be, if anything, more precisely and delicately audited. He's in a more delicate condition. But then the meter work is very, is much more precise also. So, you fly the Ruds. "Good. Do you have a present time problem?" See? "Do you have a present time problem?" "Woah, yooo. Well you're very quick on the draw, you know your metering very well, and it's, "Do you have... ' Woah. It read. See? It didn't give an instant end of the line read. "Do you have a present time..." Woom. "Good. Alright, you're auditing somebody clear or above.

If he immediately tells you he has a present time problem, why good. That was a read on present time problem. But if he starts saying, "Well let me see. Uhhh..." You say, 'Alright. Was that a false read?' Or, 'What did that read on?' "Oh what did that read on? As a matter of fact I was watching that fly over on the window. ' That cleans the read. You say, "Do you have a present time problem? ' It's now null. Do you get the idea? So that it's just that little more complex. You're auditing somebody more at cause. And you can make somebody very unhappy if you start calling a bunch of reads that didn't occur. Have you got it? You must not vary on that. And, but this liability starts to occur from clear up, particularly. So I make that point.

Now those are niceties of auditing. They're niceties. The probability is you'd work it out anyhow. But you've got a basic. The basic datum on a meter is, is that the auditor knows the meter read. The probability is that it read on his question. The probability is that it read on his question. You don't pay any attention to any oddity unless an oddity occurred. Now what's an oddity? An oddity is, "Hmm. Present time problem. Hmm." And you say, "Well what are you thinking about when I ask you the question?" A very smooth way to approach it. "Oh, oh yes. I think, 'Christ, I wish we'd get on with it. ' Yes."

You ask somebody, "Do you have a present time problem?" And you get this

read. And with it comes, "Oh, that again." Now a well drilled auditor just flies right into the, right into the old slot. And he says, "Anybody ever said that you had a problem when you didn't have?" "Oh, yes, yes, yes. It's a wow wow wow, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa." "Anybody else ever said that?" Or, "Has anybody ever said that to you before?" You get another read. "Anything earlier?" "Oh, yeah, wow wow wow wow, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa." See? "Alright, anybody else ever said you had a problem when you didn't?" "Wow." See, "Alright. Anything earlier? Earlier similar incident? Similar time, similar time?" "Oh yeah, well hell, it's my mother. Aw, it's my mother. She's always telling me, 'Why do you have, you have so many problems. ' I didn't have any problems.'" Foom. F/ N. Gls.

Well a very skilled auditor, who's very well trained, he goes into this drill just as zzzzzt. See? Very smooth. Now if he had a lot of patter, this is the way it'd sound. "Do you have a present time problem? That reads." PC, "I, I don't, I don't, I don't, I don't think I do have a present time problem." "Good. Is that a false read? Good. That was a false read. Do you have a present time problem? That reads. You get the idea? You could get a lot of stupid patter out of this, so that's why some times when guys ask me for patter, you know, I get a little bit cross. I say, What the hell's the matter with your own patter? You can talk English. '

The only time I get cross with somebody on patter is when he can't distinguish a process from patter. So he starts asking processing questions. He isn't trying to clarify a read, or run anything similar, he asks some dumb question which is a process. "Well, was there anything incomplete about that present time problem?" Oh. Oh no. Now what's he done? The PC inevitably is now going to come up with an ARC break which is probably a session ARC break, but in actual sober fact incomplete is one of the species of ARC breaks. An incomplete action brings about an ARC break, so he introduces this stupid question. He should have said, "Is there an earlier, similar problem?" Instead of that he says, "Well is there..." He's trying to solve this problem. The PCs on this problem and it isn't surrendering. I don't know what he thinks he's running, see? Is he running a grade process or something? And oh, he's gotta solve this problem. You know?

The pays saying, "Oh I, yes, I had this horrible problem. I have this horrible problem. Nobody will give me any candy sticks, you know? And so on. And it's terrible. They've done me in. And etcetera and so on. And yup, rok, rok, rok, rok. ' Well instead of doing what he supposed to do, "Is there an earlier, similar incident?" See? That's your itsa line. He says, "Is there anything incomplete about that problem?" Oh, my gods He instantly is into the zones and areas of liability. Immediately! He's trying to run a process! Second he tries to run a process god knows where he'll shoot the PC all over the track.

If he asks this question, like, "Is there anything incomplete about the problem?", he really doesn't understand that a chain of incidents doesn't tear up until you approach its' basic. That principle he doesn't understand. He doesn't understand the mechanics of erasure. What are the mechanics of erasure? He doesn't dig 'em, so he asks some weird question. You got it) So that the lack of a basic understanding brings him around into a squirrely action, which then gets him into a mess. He thinks it's a terribly important problem. This kid's standing there, the kid is crying, the kid has got a present time problem, so his, I don't know. His helpfulness or his something or other, see, just flips his control. And he comes out with something stupid

like, Was there any time anybody almost never gave you any candy?" Well that, he says let's see. I'm supposed to find an earlier incident. Yeah, that would be earlier. Yeah. "Eas candy been delivered to you incompletely? Think of a problem of comparable candy. ' I know I'm supposed to do something here. Christ. Let me see, what is it?

You get the idea? He, what's his basic? There are only a few of these. It's the mechanics of the chain. It's one of the wildest discoveries anybody ever made. But you have to, on resistive incidents, you have to approach the basic on the chain in order to blow the chain. It's a wild discovery, man. It's first time counts. Now it works even that way in an engram. You get the earliest point of the engram and the rest rolls up like a tent. Very often what you think is a resistive engram is simply because you didn't get to the beginning of the engram. But it'll blow up if you get the earlier on the chain. So you can make the mistake. But it is a mistake. He didn't get to the beginning of the incident. Do you see? You try to run a secondary. There the guy is, at the moment they burned down the house, or whatever it is. See? And you try to run this. And it apparently was erasable, but it just kind of stuck up. And it's difficult to run. Now an auditor who doesn't know that it's the earliest, see? He hasn't got this datum, bang, right there at his fingertips as a senior datum. It's the earliest. It's the earlier. It's the earliest. See? Works that way on a secondary. The earlier point in time. The earlier incident. He doesn't know that, see? So he just lets the PC grind his guts out. You're trying to erase this thing, "Yes, well tell me again." "Well I went up and they were burning down the house. And, god, let me see, I felt very grieved, let's see. I feel very grieved. I felt, I don't know. Uh, um, it's getting very confused. I don't know whether I'm there or here, wohamjm." And the auditor just sits there like a bump on the log. He doesn't either ask for an earlier part of the incident, or ask for anything earlier on the chain. Well what the basic is out there, is he doesn't realize why things erase. And if an auditor, and particularly a Class VII, doesn't know the mechanics of erasure, he's had it. Now he has to know the difference between a release and an erasure. Now how is it? You're actually scolded, scolded, scolded, for going past F/ Ns. You can get shot for going past an F/ N. And then all of a sudden you get a process, it is "Recall bumbershoots", it goes to F/ N, run an engram on bumbershoots. Oh you went past an F/ N on bumbershoots, right? Now anybody who'd be confused about that is gonna be confused about a hell of a lot of things.

We released bumbershoots so that we could take some charge off of bumbershoots, because he couldn't get near bumbershoots unless we took charge off of bumbershoots. So we disconnect bumbershoots, he floats free. Oh great! What was he running? Locks, locks, locks, locks, locks. He discharges the locks, don't you see? Now this is less charge in the incident on bumbershoots. So, bum, bum, bum, plunge F/ N. Great three cheers!

You'd be very mystified if you didn't know about this, 'cause four days later he's all worried about bumbershoots. You'd say, "I released him on bumbershoots. Four days ago, and here he is coming here and telling me all about bumbershoots..." You get awfully mystified, and you could say, "Well gee. This auditing, I guess, doesn't work, or something. It, it, it... I did all this recall of bumbershoots, and god damn, here he is in here again, yip, yap, yak, yak, about bumbershoots. Huh. ' So you say, "Well alright. The process

wasn't flat. I get it. It was an ARC broke needle. Good! We'll run it again. 'Recall bumbershoots. Recall bumbershoots. Recall bumbershoots.' TA starts up. "Recall bumbershoots." TA higher. 'Bumbershoots. Recall bumbershoots.' TA's higher, higher. Recall bumbershoots. ' TA 4.25 now. His next basic is out. He doesn't know that overrun causes a high TA. He thinks high TAs are caused by toe nails growing too fast, or something. So he doesn't knock it off. He isn't immediately signalled "overrun", bong!

TA starts up, zoooooom. "Has this process been overrun?" "Yes it has!" Boooooom, F/ N. You get what I mean by knowing a basic? Now that's a big basic. What is it that causes a rising TA? It's a terrific discovery. You might at least have the courtesy to remember it. And yet in two cases in just the last few days the auditor has just sat there, as nice as you please, and run the TA right up through the roof. And it just never occurred to him for a minute. One auditor took a C/ S, he took a C/ S, he rehabbed sec checks and rehabbed all drugs, and then for reasons best know to the man or beast didn't audit the PC again for two days, picked up the C/ S, didn't himself remember he had done it, didn't review his former session, didn't turn the folder into C/ S. It didn't happen in this group. And ran it all over again. Rehab sec checks and rehab drugs. And the TA started up, wooooo! And he just kept at it. He just kept at it. Man, that session's about half an inch thick. He just kept at it. He just kept at it. Trying to rehab the same thing. Trying to do the same thing. And, watching the TA go right up, and didn't do a damn thing about it. Didn't even occur to him, ooh. I finally belatedly got the folder. And I blew my stack. 'Cause I couldn't find out what the hell. I couldn't find out why is the TA going up on a rehab? And then I found the earlier session, and then I managed to read through the squiggle, squiggle writing, and I managed to find out... Oh my god. He did the same C/ S twice. So he overran a rehab of overruns. Oh no. And never, for one split second woke up to the fact that he was overrunning something. Well where the hell were his basics? Damned important basic. A TA goes up because of overrun. There is no other reason.

I've seen somebody on Power going by this datum, which was extant at one time or another, that they had to ask one command at least. The thing blew up on just clearing the subject of PrPr4. Bong! The meter blew up. F/ N, GIs, so forth. And the auditor asked one command. That is, he started to clear the command, not only cleared the command, but he ran it for an hour and a half. And the TA was going up and up and up and up and up. And he finally came to the conclusion about an hour later, that there must be something wrong. Well the C/ S on it was elementary. It was an unnecessary C/ S. It was simply to "Tell the guy it's been overrun and rehab it." Did it, fwmp, bong! Down it goes. Bang! Floating needle. Starts on 5, then there's no trouble.

Now what was missing there? It's a grasp of data. The datum being that a high TA is caused by overrun.

Now I'll give you another one. A low TA, and I won't use all the key buttons and association, is caused by invalidation. And a low TA is inevitably and invariably caused by some species of invalidation. That is not the button, and that is not how you get about it. But that is the close enough to it, so as not to key everybody in in sight.

The guy's been hit too hard. He's been punched too hard. And that's a low TA. And that's all a low TA is. And a low TA isn't anything else. I can show you a session where a guy was having rudiments put in, and he runs ARC breaks

with three suppressives in a row. He was in a somewhat suppressive area. And, as he clears the ARC break the TA goes from 2, down to 1.7, and it F/ Ns at 2 again. And on the next guy, now he's F/ Ning at 2, now here's the next bird that he's taking up. And he tries to, he was taking this up on a different process, prep check, you see, and TA, he gets onto the next suppressive. And oooohhh. TA down to 1.7. To cognite, to F/ N at 2 with GIs. And then he gets on the next suppressive with another process, and it goes, aaahhh , down to 1.7 And then he runs it out, and pongo. Back up to 2, GIs.

Anybody who is running a TA at 1.5 and getting an F/ N at 1.5, ought to have his little britches spanked. Because his auditing is suppressive. In some fashion or another he's over whumping and running into the PC too hard. All he'd have to do to bring the thing up would just be to fish around. Is it a subject that we're trying to, that's got you going, or is it something that we've done in the session? Oh. See, he can't get it up. The process he's running, it's trying to F/ N at 1.5. Christ. What do you do about this? Well, it could be an ARC broke needle, it could be this, it could be that, the other thing. No. It's just something has run into him with a truck, that's all.

If you want to get the TA up, why, you could ask as crude a question as, 'What ran into you like a truck?' 'What have you just been run into with?' You know? Or, 'What did that guy bop you with, or bop you with?' Crude, see? You know your basic. You know your basic, see? The TA'd come up, (whistle). Come up into normal range.

And then some sad sack who is just perpetually down, low TA, and feels sad about the whole thing all the time, and he F/ Ns with bad indicators. Boy, that's a missed nomenclature if I ever heard one. He F/ Ns with bad indicators. That's horrible, see? You don't F/ N with bad indicators. You go ARC broke needle. Yeah, but if you keep running the process that you're running, the process itself is probably not solving what the guy should be run on, or you've forced an item or process on him. Some action is being too forcefully done, or he's being shoved into a zone or area which doesn't have anything to do with his case, don't you see? And, or he gets on some subject which makes him very sad indeed, and then it's not cleared up and the TA goes down you'd get an F/ N at 1.5. Now a guy who is run this way gives a very interesting aspect. He now begins to believe, after a while, that when an F/ N occurs he feels bad. So therefore, an F/ N is a bad thing to have. Actually computes it out this way. And the remedy of it is just to prep check floating needles, of course. You advise him of the fact that he's been low TA enough times to prep check floating needle. And then all of a sudden it reverts. And something else happens. But it's a standard remedy. Prep check floating needle.

So this, this; you can get anything out of the road by prep checking it. If you don't know what else to do with it prep check it. You don't want to run it on L —1 forever. You don't want to run L4A forever. And after just so many green forms, why you'll have to rehab green forms someday. And so, you've got this situation here. You've got this situation here, that you have to handle something that you don't know how else to handle it, prep check it. Prep check it. Fascinating, you see? Well it's the old, old, you say, "Well that's not done anymore." I'm sure that somebody has said within the last year or so, before this lecture, certainly. I'm sure somebody has said, "We don't do that anymore, ' about prep checks. In fact I ran into somebody the other day who didn't know what one was. It's the handiest, jim dandiest little piece of stuff

you ever had anything to do with. If you don't know what the hell to do with it, prep check it. That's just the rule, see?

Now you can endlessly prep check. There's two actions you can always do, when you don't know what the hell else to do. You've run into somebody who's weird, off beat, god help us. Nobody ever heard of it before. Some, some auditor has audited this fellow in a tub of hot water on the theory that the TA is too high when it is cold. And therefore... You're gonna run into all kinds of goofinesses, don't you see? And you say, "Oh my god. What do I do about this?" Obviously to wrap a PC around a telegraph... What are we going to do about this? There's always something you can do about it. You can prep check it.

"On the incident of being run in the tub of water, has anything been suppressed?" The other thing you can do, you can always make up a list. And there's where your imagination can play around. And the only rule about a list is keep it dimly in the same subject area. Don't have a list that has dental operations and roller skating on it. Don't write up a disassociated list. Your items on the list must be associated. And you get your clues for these lists, by the way, you don't have to pick them out of thin air. You look back through folders and find the PCs comments about this, that and the other thing. And you all of a sudden find out, they always seem to have a little nyik, nyak, nyak, nyak, nyak on the subject of, of banks, or something. You all of a sudden find this guy is a clerk in a bank and he's; you look over this, and you read some of the data out of the line, and he seems to have PTPs about being broke—And so on, and this guy just always seems to have this problem—And as CSS you get tired of this problem. There's something about, he can't pay for anything, and the reason he waaa. You say, "To hell with this." I'll just give you a wild example, see? When you write up a list for assessment. Don't get the PC to list it, because you're doing an S and D type thing, and so forth. The hell with that. Do an assessment.

And you, you say to yourself, "Banks, banking, bank managers, bank bosses, bank organizations, money, cash, checks, coin, silver, gold, copper, paper, checks, customers, clients," see? And you make a little list, see? That's as much as you want to embrace in the matter, because all you have to do is get a corner of it. That's what you don't know about these lists. See? You only have to come in on the edge of the corner of it, and the pc'll take it the rest of the way.

And so you write this up as a little list and you assess it. Perfectly. Bark bark bark, bark bark bark bark bark. And you get it down to that. There it is. It's checks. Checks. There it is.

Alright. And you just unwind that. Now order a prep check on checks. And the god damndest things happen you ever heard of. You move in sideways on this thing, don't you see? Actually it wasn't really checks, it's ledgers. And he'll eventually tell you that in the process, without disputing checks. Actually he's been entering checks backwards into the ledgers so as to make them come out some other way, and he's been balancing his books so that he won't get scolded, not to... not. He's got this hellish withhold on money all the way up the line, only you softened it up. And you're getting rid of his withholds. Now the hard way to get a withhold is, "Have you ever shot your grandmother?", you know? Direct sea check question. Pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow. See? Pound, pound, pound. Easy way to get it, is find the subject or area of the withhold and prep check it. You get the withhold very

nicely and smoothly. That's just a use. Use of an assessment list, use of a sea check. This has infinite variability.

What are the basics then? The basics, is how do you dream up a list? How do you assess a list? And what do you use on the list? Now there's something else you could use on the same list, but you wouldn't go past its' F/ N by using this other thing too. You do one thing or another. See? So you'd say, on L—1 you'd say, 'On checks, you know, has a withhold been missed?' You know? You could run the L—1. But I assure you that the case has to be in pretty good shape to run an L—1. He has to be able to pinpoint things. And on somebody who's muggy—fuggy on something you are much better off prep checking it. You got it? It isn't it's for a lower level case, it's a more generalized subject always requires a prep check. Specific, particular things; the guy just went through Saint Hill. Something like that. Alright, you've got particular little items that you can pick off. Do you follow? Lets get a zone or area.

Now Saint Hill doesn't go back several lifetimes. You got it? Doesn't go back several lifetimes. It just goes back for a short period. So therefore it's L—1 date. But checks, holy suffering Christy Lord knows where it's gonna go. Do you see? So the more generalized subject or the more generalized or lower grade the case also, that isn't similar, your prep check's best.

Now you can add certain buttons to a prep check. Eval, inval. Now if you were to try to do a Joberg, or pull missed withholds on somebody who had a low TA, I can assure you his TA'd go out the bottom because you're overwhelming him. And you also would probably turn on an R/ S and then spend a long time trying to pull this R/ S on some imagined crime. An R/ S does mean a crime, or it can mean an invalidation. It could mean one of two things. Also, dangerously, you can clean the R/ S off a case and leave the crime sitting there and not now R/ Sing. There is two or three instances of this having actually occurred. It's very hard to find an actual live, thief, criminal—type crime, don't you see? You know, somebody who actually took the loot. And then you find out later he did take the loot, and somebody had cleaned, cleaned the R/ S off the case with invalidate. But having cleaned the R/ S off the case with invalidate, then the case, this person went around and stole a thousand, where before they'd only stolen two hundred, and the money is found on them both times, so there wasn't much excuse. You see, you can clean it off with invalidate and find out it was a crime too.

So somewhere on down the track, to make an R/ S, why there is some kind of a crime. It doesn't have to be against the subject or area that you think. But nevertheless, nevertheless, if you start to heavily hammer somebody, and heavily hammer somebody around, you wouldn't be a bit surprised if he had a low TA. Now you, as Class VIII, should simply say, "Low TA? Self invalidation. Low TA? This case is being invalidated. TA sank in the session? PC was invalidated in the session." Got it? "TA was at 2.5 at he session beginning, and sank to 1.2. Shoot the auditor." You don't need to know what anybody said. You don't need to know a thing. Session wound up at 1.2. What happened? You see, your basics. Your basics. TA sinking is the guy being overwhumped. See? Or, left in the middle of an unfinished cycle of being overwhumDed. Something like that. Don't you see? Which would also be an auditor crime. But let's say they weren't running anything very vital, and they start out at the beginning of the session, TA 2.25. You wind up the session, TA 1.5. Well you don't even have to think. Your C/ S on that; you

don't even have to think about it. It is... Write it out. Prep check the last session. Give it to another auditor, have the auditor retrained. You don't even have to think. Boom. The guy was either invalidated with bad TRs, or he was run halfway into something, and not run through it. The session is a false report. An ARC break needle, the idea of GIs being in on it is preposterous. The guy must have been at least propitiative. This is the kind of a grip you've got to have on data. You see the needle going up, see the TA going up, needle goes up, TA goes up, needle goes up, TA goes up, needle goes up, TA goes up. Did you ever notice that the needle goes up before the TA goes up? In the opposite direction? Buuuup. Buuup. Buuuuup. Zuuup. Zuuun. Zuuup. And the auditor keeps on doing this, boy. Hang him. He doesn't know this datum. He won't believe it. He thinks there's some other reason for it. TA going up is overrun. TA going down is invalidation. (Got it) Make and break, open and short, simple, succinct, sweet. There are no differences. There are no variables to these things.

You can appear to have a variable, because you can run an incident which drives the TA down, but the auditor would have had to have goofed like screaming crazy with his TRs not to have let it run out and come back up to normal range. So he had to find an incident where the TA was down, where the TA would go down, and then only partially handle this, Woof it up in some fashion or another, and then falsify his report to leave the TA down. See, it had to be a combination of things would happen. But you say, "Well, alright." Because this excuse will be given to you. "Oh, I don't know." Yeah, well yeah. "You see, we were running an incident on his mother. And whenever we mentioned his mother his TA goes down." "Well that may be so', would be a response. "But why aren't your TRs adequate to run the incident all the way through, instead of leaving it parked halfway through? Why didn't you ask for an earlier, similar mother?" (laughter)

In any event, it's a hell of a flunk. End of session, TA 1.85, PC laughing, GIs in. It's either a false auditing report or the TRs were madly out, or the acts anchor points were being pushed in two feet back of his head. Do you understand?

Now when you get the next session you can do a lot with the session. You can put in the Ruds in or during or before that session, you can prep check that session, you can do an L—1 on that session, you can do a lot of things with it. Those are the principle things you would do, just the ones I gave you. And in the next session it will emerge what did happen. You don't have to worry about what happened, you just know something wild happened. And now if you're interested, if you're that interested in grooving in an auditor, you can look at the next session, which is run by another auditor, and find out what the hell happened to that auditor, and what should he have straightened out. Because he certainly needs something straightened out. So that all non—standard results are departures from basics. All non—standard results are the departures from basics. And that is the moral of my little story.

Now either the guy had his basics, the auditor had his basics, he studied his basics, somebody moved in on him sideways, contradicted the basic, he found some other data, and so forth. Now he at that moment got a departure from standard results. And that departure stemmed immediately from having been moved off his basics. Right?

So, then all non—standard results stem from contradiction or

misunderstood or messed up basics. And it never, never, never, stems from the individual not having been super airy—fairy in the seventh gallery. “You see he really didn’t have the talent for auditing. You see, his father was a clergyman, and his basic training was the challenge. And that is why we have not been able to make an auditor out of him.” If I had a academy D of T telling me that I would take out a little imaginary violin I carry in my pocket, tuck it under my chin, take the little bow, and I would play the little song, “It may be so, we do not know, your story sounds so queer. We hate like hell to doubt your word,” and finish it off yourself. He isn’t teaching his students basics. He hasn’t said to George Aloicious Gulch, “Your TR 1 is just about the most stinking TR 1 I have ever seen, and I want you to improve it.” No, he’s told him, “You see the expression which you use is very important. And when you are sitting down looking at the PC, be very careful of your expression during TR 1, because the expression is very important.” That isn’t what’s important about TR 1. And TR 1 doesn’t take anything in it about expression. TR 1 says TR 1, doesn’t it? And that’s all it says, and that’s all he’s supposed to do. And how he does it is his business. You got the basic. You got the basic of TR 1, you got the basic of TR 1. That’s what’s your supposed to do with TR 1. Alright, you can do TR1 or you can’t do TR 1. Period.

Now somebody comes in sideways and says, “The color of your eyes have a great deal to do... I knew a hypnotist one time that says, “I always handle my patients...” I bet they were, too. “I always handle my patients on the basis of, I say there is something you do not like about me, what is it?” Can you imagine the fellows’ social approach, going around in the neighborhood. Anybody he meets he looks at them, shakes them by the hand, and says, “There is something you don’t like about me. What is it?” Well you know, sooner or later that might become TR 1. That’s how far a basic can go out. Do you see?

I one time... The best TRs I ever turned out in a group of auditors was every time an auditor asked a question about a TR he was read the TR. Now that might have cut his comm, and it might have ARC broken him, or it might have this, or it might have that, but you know they all wound up with terrific TRs. Every time he said, “Well now, in TR 1 does one hold one’s little pinky up, or,...”, so forth. And all the supervisor was permitted to do was to pick up the sheet of TR 1 and read it. Now he could also have said, more delicately, “Is there anything you don’t understand about this, bud? Something you don’t dig about this. What Us it?” “Well, yeah. Why do they have that date at the top?” You know, something like that. Clear it up. See? But what is it he doesn’t understand about it? Not clarifying evaluating on it. Do you understand? It’s that level of simplicity the basic is out. It isn’t because this fellow doesn’t know a hundred and fifty thousand processes. It’s because he hasn’t got enough sense not to ask a process when he should be letting the PC itsa.

The simplicity you are finding right at this line, right at this time, the simplicity is fantastic. I’m sure that you are getting your hands on. Some of you still perhaps a little nervous, the finger shakes a little bit. The pencil I noticed quivers slightly on the page here and there. But these are the things which have been out in this particular unit. It isn’t what would be out in another unit. But they’d be things comparable to this. These are the things which have been out. There aren’t any airyfairy things. Your comprehension of this, that and the other thing is great. Assessing. You should have learned

that in the academy. You've got your cast iron nerves not knowing how to assess. It's EM 24 of the E—meter book. It hasn't changed for years. Sow to run an engram. R3R wrapped up engram running for all time. There hasn't been any shift of any kind in R3R. Engram running, engram running by chains, there hasn't been any shift in it, no change in it for years and years and years. Anybody whose been through a Dianetic course and has gotten himself a piece of data that is cock—eyed or upside down, or somebody told him, "We don't do that anymore." If somebody said we don't do that anymore he would fix it up so that you really couldn't shoot anybody up through OT8. That's for sure. He would be stopped.

So. Guy's got... I don't know how the hell you'd ever heal anybody. How would you ever make anybody well if you couldn't run an engram by chains? I don't know how you have.

Alright, so therefore I can tell you positively that not knowing this cold, then this is what's happened. You've cleaned up filches lumbosis on Tuesday, and he's had it back again on Thursday. And you have been damn puzzled. Well if you go on keying out this lumbosis it's just a key out. Lumbosis is just sitting there. All you've done is shift his attention. You have improved it to some degree. It might never come back again. It might come back again while he's walking to the examiner. But all you've done with this lumbosis is to key it out.

So what's a key out? You have to know what that is. Any time you just key something out you pays your money and you takes your chance, boy. It's liable to be back in the next minute, it's liable not to be back for a hundred years. But it'll be back. Why? Because the basic impulse to manufacture the picture is still there. And at the least whiff, this guy's gonna make the picture all over again. Because you haven't hit its It's something he won't confronts He hasn't owned its He got rid of its And you're sort of parking dirty laundry over in the corner to be picked up some day. And some day he's gonna run something and all the dirty laundry will disappear, as he goes up through the OT chains. See? But, nevertheless, this guy comes in with lumbosis, you say, "Good. Who in your family had lumbosis?" "Well, you see, that's an interesting question. Who the hell did have it? Oh my god, my uncle Timothy." "Do you remember a time with your uncle Timothy complaining about lumbosis?" "Ha ha. Yep. Oop. What the hell? My lumbosis disappeared." You say, "Good. That's it." But hold your breath, boy. If you were to say just one more sentence, or send them to an examiner who is a complete, knuckle—headed idiot. And the examiner knows the guy's an idiot. And he comes up, and the examiner says to him, "Ha ha ha ha ha, how are you, Zilch? Ha ha ha ha, how are you? How's your Lumbosis, Zilch? Ha ha ha ha. God almighty, Jesus Christ!". That's why you've got to shoot examiners who do anything but shell out a piece of paper. As a matter of fact, it's probably the safest system, is to have a booth with nobody in it. Examiners can evaluate with a look, you know? "You again." You know, that sort of a "What the hell is wrong with you?", sort of a look. You know? Maybe the guy's just got a headache or something, "Aaiuh?" Guy says, "What the hell. I must look like him." You got it?

Alright. Now that's a very slippery straight wire wing bing, wow wow technique that I just gave you there. It's as old as 1950, and it works like a bomb on an awful lot of cases. I have seen, I have seen an entire scaled face, completely scaled and scabbed, go completely clean and clear in some

two or three minutes. It's impossible! Yet it happens. Key out. Bong. Gone. But when is it going to come back?

Now, we run engrams by chains. Rat tat tat ta bow, ta boo bow, de de dee... Actually, if any guy's chronically ill, any engram chair you find, or any, really any secondary chain you'll find on a girl, or something like that, has got the illness on it. You don't have to say, "Let's see. What engram chain would I find to find a leg injury? I think we had better run a leg injury chain." Bull! You're liable to get him into the wrong chain. You just run the most available chain of engrams, and of course he is stuck in the most available chain of engrams. And if you know your basics, the engram he is stuck in is the engram he is in, which is the engram which is giving him the trouble he's having, naturally. So if you look any place for the engram, than the available engram that he's in, you're gonna run out something else. And now he's got lumbosis and trumbosis, and pneumonia into the bargain. So it's always the most available secondary, the most available engram. This guy has a tough time in life, you're gonna run secondaries. This guy is angry a lot of the time, you're gonna run secondaries. That's the most available thing. But, you just run the engram chain.

Now he can walk up to the examiner....." What the hell happened?", he says. "It all disappeared. It blew. Something, pft. It blew. Hey. Pain in my back's gone. Hey what do you know? Where the hell's my arthritis? Yeah, gone. Hey! Wowing See?

Now he walks out to the examiner, and the examiner says, "Oh yeah, Joe. Ha ha had your lumbosis! ", and so forth. And he says, "How's yours? Ha ha ha." and walks out.

Now you've erased the impulse to make the chain of lumbosis, by erasing the engram that the impulse was making. And it ain't never gonna come back no more. He can get sick from something else. Do you follow? So I can tell you very definitely. The PC whose mannerisms do not change has never had an engram chain run on him. Well his mannerisms come from the engram chain he's sitting in.

So I watch these PCs that always go ck, ck, ck. And I see them four years later, they've been audited eighteen thousand hours in some place or another, and they go ck, ck, ck. And it made a big mystery for me. I wondered what in the name of god is this all about? And then I find out that people have been saying for some years, "Oh, engram by chains? Ha ha. A person who does that is sort of squirrely. We don't do that anymore."

You get the difference between a release? Release is, he's not going to do it now. It's out. But the basic guts of the thing is what you erase, man. And an erasure is an erasure. Somebody the other day in this unit, obviously didn't know what the hell it is I'm talking about right now, even though it was on an earlier lecture, because he said after he erased the damndest series of engrams in the PC, then he wrote on his report, "He sure looked keyed out." Oh. That's pathetic. You might not get the joke. But if he'd erased the engrams he couldn't be keyed out, because there was nothing left to key out. And there's nothing left to key in, so why would you say he looked keyed out? Do you follow?

And of course, the understanding of the mechanism of clearing and other such mechanisms, must be very, very poor. The mechanism of clearing is simply that when you've erased the basic the guy realizes he's mocking it all up, then he doesn't mock up any more of those things which he knew he was

mocking up. It's a horrible shock to him to find out a little bit later that he's got some pieces of him parked over there that he didn't know, and he'd disowned, and he didn't have anything to do with anymore, ha ha. He blows 'em awful fast, but that's what you clean up as you go up from there.

Now a guy at clear, he feels wonderful. Why does he key in? He's still got body thetans, he's still got this and that. So, you take it apart, take it apart, take it apart, take it apart. And, just today in research I was punching around to find out exactly how you restore total recall on the total track, and so forth, which is one of the functions of 8. And found out how you did it, on somebody who didn't know how to do it. Somebody who didn't have it.

"What did you have for breakfast in 1325 B. C.?" Whole track recall, whole track recall. The same reality level as you recall this lifetime. Well, opened the door to that one.

Anyway, now the rest I'd like to tell you here is basics such as how to run an E—meter. People having E—meter trouble. What, anybody's got nerve, having E—meter trouble, not in this line of country, but somebody must have moved it in sideways and invalidated metering, pushed metering around, got to worrying about metering, what's metering, this way and that way. Got to doing' something wrong with a meter, and then didn't, couldn't put it right again. And there was some misunderstood about it. Something like that. But of all things, how to list and null. That is a killer. Absolute killer if you don't know that. You'd knock a PC flatter 'n a flounder if you don't know how to list and null exactly right. It's an exact precision drill. You could make mistakes in assessments, or from prepared list, in prep checks; you can make all kinds of mistakes. Don't you ever dare make a mistake in listing and nulling. And therefore you don't often order them.

I look through a few folders, it's pathetic. S and D. S and D. S and D. Remedy B. remedy B. have an S and D an S and D and an S and D. Have a W. S and U—type S and D. Ah, bull. It's a risky action. And you only do it when you've really got it set up straight and right.

I was horrified the other day. I had not; I had ordered specifically itsa on the green form. A whole itsa on the green form. Only itsa, similar itsa on the green form. Guy got to environment and did S and D. He did a remedy B. rather. He did an environmental remedy B. If I'd wanted an environmental remedy B at that point I would have said so as C/ S, bov. And you know why I didn't say so? It was because that damnea review folder was about a half foot thick with them. We didn't need any more lists on this case, thank you. So it was itsa, earlier similar itsa.

I ought to give you a drill some time. It's a drill you can give somebody. "Run this whole damn case with a list 1 itsa, similar itsa, with no subject. Run the whole case with a list 1, itsa, similar itsa, earlier itsa, with no subject, to F/ N." This is an elementary drill. That'd make a citizen out of him.

Now you want to know how to run a green form? How do you run a green form? How do you phrase the phrases of the Preen form? Oh, bull. I'm not trying to make a player piano out of you. The green form contains a whole lot of subject matter. And you could do it all with itsa, earlier similar itsa. The whole green form.

Your TRs, somebody had disturbed your TRs one way or the other to a point where you were contradicted and upset about them, and so forth. And how to really get in Ruds. That, nobody had ever learned. Nor the consequences of auditing with Ruds out. And I find with horror that you've been doing solo

auditing with your Ruds out. I don't know how the hell you ever made it. And oddly enough, what the mind consists of. Exactly what is in the mind. What is this thing called the mind? It's such an elementary gimmick that not to understand it is something like, "Explain to me the sidewalk." It's very elementary. There isn't very much in the mind. But a guy is thinking about the mind with a mind, and as he can make many complexities on the subject. And man has managed to, for all the trillenia. And the reason he has made these mistakes the whole trillenia is simply that a mind is a mind, and people have made a lot of business out of mucking up minds. And it seems to be the one thing that you can muck up. And they apparently could get further for their own purposes mucking up minds, they thought, until somebody got around to mucking up their mind. They're not good at straightening up minds, and nobody ever issued anybody an instruction manual with the mind. And nobody ever issued an instruction manual with a body, so that one is prone to make mistakes. But these things were not understood.

And just to give you, just a little rundown of the various things. How to run engrams and secondaries, how to run an E-meter, how to do assessment, how to list and null, TRs, how to really get in the Ruds, and what the mind consists of. Those are the outnesses in this unit. Now there isn't a single damned, airy—fairy anything anywhere there, is there?

So you had to know that you had once known it, and had to get it cleaned up, and had to get your misunderstood and contradiction straightened out, so that you could get it in and play it on the piano. And you obviously are playing it on the piano, and this lecture you'll probably all be thumbs again.

The main trouble with C/ Sing so far has been C/ Sing from stuck opinions, and wishing off one's own case on somebody else. "Well I think this PC must have a lot of trouble with train accidents." You look back in the guy's folder and he has trouble with train accidents, not the PC.

Now one thing I wish that you would get used to doing, get used to doing, is this is an administrative action, which can be done by a C/ S, or it can be done by an auditor, or it can be done in a Qual or in a tech division. But whoever does it, it should be done. And if it isn't done somebody damn well should do it. And that is, keep a tally of all of the C/ S actions taken and executed in the beginning of a folder over on the left hand sheet, so that you know everything that's been done. Now this can get pretty damn corny. C/ S is in order; "Fly each rud to F/ N." Somebody did it the other day, took a break for supper, and came back and flew his rud to F/ N, and it shot the TA up to 4.25. So it can be forgotten within half an hour. Well think of what happens if it's left for six months. Somebody's had a valence shifter. Well it should be over there. He's had that. You try to give him another one and you've had it. He's had his S and Ds. He's had an S and D—U, he's had an S and D this. You can look it over and you can see what S and D he hasn't had. You could give him that one. Do you follow? So it's a highly precise action.

If you don't want to overrun cases, why you don't run things on them again that have been run, so some kind of a tally of what has been run on a case should be placed in the folder, very visible, and should be kept up to date as fast as it is run. Shouldn't be left behind. And that way it'll keep him from making mistakes.

See there were two instances, two cases smashed up, not here, but two cases were smashed up very badly, because when the session was finished

the auditor didn't note down anything on he completed those actions on review tallies. And he came right back to session and did them again. Complete idiot. Wrecked the cases. Smashed 'em, boy.

Alright. So, the general point which I've been trying to drive home, which I think anyone whose been at this any length of time at all is getting wise to, is he doesn't have to know a hundred thousand combinations of something. He only has to know what he knows very well, and the basic elements with which he is dealing must be tightly grasped and used. And there aren't a whole bunch of variables that run in from the side.

There is no... This game has narrowed down to where you all of a sudden don't get a new rule for the game every time you try to play it. You're playing cards, the fellow says, "Oh, red cards. They're not valid now." You've just gotten yourself fifteen red cards. It's not that kind of a game you're playing. These things are stable, and if you don't believe they are stable, why look around at the results you are getting, look around at the results being gotten on your own case and on the cases of others. And I think you will agree that standard tech is highly workable tech, and it is as workable as it is standard and kept standard. And that is the secret of it. The standardness of its' administration, and so on. And it's getting there. It's going like a bomb. And I'm sure that you agree that it is.

Thank you very much.

ETHICS AND CASE SUPERVISION

A lecture given on 9 October 1968

Well this is what number lecture? (Thirteen) Ah ha. And the date? Nine Oct. AD 18. I would like to put a warning on the tape, he said in a sepulchral voice. That's a great word, sepulchral. You ever hear that word? It means from a sepulchre, a tomb. On this cheerful note we begin this lecture.

That, if you have something in affluence you apply the affluence formula. If you have something in power you apply the power formula. If you have something in emergency you apply the emergency formula. And if you don't do this you fall on your heads. It just happens to be in the general nature of things that you fall on your silly 'ead.

Now I have seen a division go into affluence, be assigned affluence, and then slack off and change everything. And it's fall is so free fall that it is practically a rocket assist. It goes down the conditions with a velocity the like of which you never saw. It is the most fantastic phenomena you've ever cared to see in your life.

There are two things you can do with regard to formulas and conditions. Two things. One is to assign the wrong condition. "Well he's been good to us, so we're gonna assign Pete power." And Pete, hell he couldn't make emergency if he had one of these fireman's step ladders.

So we assign Pete power. Now the law there, and it's an operating law, is that he will drop one condition below the condition he is actually in. Let us say he is really in nonexistence. But some manager, some secretary, some executive secretary, wants to be a good fellow. Or gets into propitiation, or something, see? So they give Oscarvitch a condition of affluence, 'cause they want to increase his pay or something, you know? They don't really know what the hell he's doing. He's been sort of wandering around, stumbling on his head. He's really in non—existence. He doesn't even come to work. But he's an awfully good fellow. An awfully good fellow. Holds his liquor. Free and easy with his girlfriends. Something, something. He's really in non—existence.

All you have to do is to assign him a wrong upper condition, and he promptly drops one below where he actually is. He's in nonexistence, really. We assign him affluence. He goes into liability. He now is operating in liability. In actual fact you will now find out he is operating in liability. Very remarkable.

Let us take the affluence formula on just one point, and apply it to a nation. One point. Economize. The funny thing about affluence is, is if you don't economize you've had it. You get in a sudden influx of this, that and the other thing it's usually a lot of, and the tendency is, and the reason why people fall on their heads when they go into affluence is, they suddenly spend it all and interrupt the operation by which they got it in. Or by which they made it. See? And at that moment, whatever actual condition they are in will lower one condition.

So, we apply economy to a firm which at best in danger condition. Firm is really in danger condition, so we start economizing. That's part of the affluence formula. The firm will at once go into non—existence.

Let us say a government is in danger condition. It's in danger condition because the head of the government has to bypass all of his ministers. To get anything done he has to bypass all of his ministers, or is bypassing all of his ministers. He isn't really applying the danger formula, but he's certainly bypassing in all directions, frantically trying to get something done. And so

he enjoins economy. He says he's not going to change any of his ministries. He says he's going to stand by his friends, that he's bypassing like mad. He says, "Our program must go on to victory." While it's already falling on its' stupid head. You can expect that government not only to go into non—existence, but that country to pass into other hands. Not other political hands, but other racial hands. It works. It is true.

Now the reverse occurs. The reverse occurs. But it's just under the same formula. A guy is actually in emergency, and you put him in liability. And he'll go into danger condition. If the formulas of the wrong condition are then enforced he might even drop one or two more down below where he is. And he might actually arrive in liability. Do you follow? Because the longer the wrong condition is perpetuated the more it drops. It certainly drops one. But now, if we don't let the condition upgrade, if we don't do something about it, if the condition is now perpetuated, and so on, he will drop another condition. And another condition. And another condition. So the assignment of wrong conditions brings about a lowering of condition.

There is no way you can assign a wrong condition and get an improvement of conditions. So therefore you have to know something about the assignment of conditions.

Now even my messenger, no proper assignment of conditions. A little bit earlier I had to go out and show a messenger how to turn on a very complicated switch board that she actually should have been checked out on some time ago. And I went around, I told her to do it, she couldn't do it, I went out and did it. She'd already been a little bit slow and draggy for the last hour or so. And I said, "What condition should you assign yourself?" And she thought it over very carefully, and she said quite accurately, "Danger condition." I had had to bypass her to do the job.

Now if my messengers know this, and they are very young indeed this life; of course the one thing they do find out about in the Sea Org is conditions. They find that out very accurately. But actually they often err in the direction of a more severe condition than it warrants, and you'll actually pull it down one from the condition it is in. So anyway, if my messengers know it, why you educated cats had certainly better grab the brass rang.

If you're assigned a wrong condition you are grossly, flagrantly, illegally in error. You will have accepted an illegal order. And you could be comm—eved for it.

I'll show you how bad it is. Somebody assigns you a condition of liability. You accept the condition of liability. You become a liability, if you're not in liability. Somebody assigns you a condition of liability, you do not at once ask for an ethics hearing, you at that moment could be comm—eved for accepting an illegal order. Let us say you were only in emergency and somebody assigns you liability, and you do not now ask for an ethics hearing for correction of condition, and prepare your brief and show exactly what you're doing, exactly where you really are, you now are a liability because you have assisted in the destruction of the ethics system. And you could be comm—eved for it, because it's an illegal order.

You go around tamely accepting conditions which are incorrectly assigned without then asking for an ethics hearing to correct the condition, you then could be comm—eved.

Yeah, but how about the fellow who assigned the condition? Naturally it's his fault. He's cause. His fault. His fault. His fault. No. I'm afraid not. Maybe it

seemed that that's the way it was. He wasn't in possession of all the facts. He's trying to get the job done, something of that sort. Yes, he could be called into it. But once you start comm—eving people for assigning conditions the whole justice system blows up.

The responsibility is on the receiver of the condition. Now if you don't get that enforced in orgs, and if you don't get that enforced amongst auditors, I'll give you an idea. You're C/ S. You're top dog on the totem pole in your area, as a Class VIII. So somebody goofs the floof, but good. You assign him a condition of emergency. He just practically destroyed a PC. He didn't do your C/ S. He's been going around, saying to the other auditors, "Nya nya nya, and all those directions I get when I, nya nya nya." And you assign him a condition of emergency and he actually is in doubt. You assign him emergency because you want to be a good fellow. He's actually in doubt, he'll become an enemy. It's the wildest mechanism you ever saw in your life. He'll drop one. He'll drop one below the actual condition assigned.

Now, reversely, this character makes a small mistake on his administrative form as he hands it in. He displaces a couple of commas, he's assigned a condition of enemy. He doesn't at that moment ask for an ethics hearing, you comm—ev him, for accepting an illegal assignment of condition. Do you follow?

Now, you won't be the one, probably, who assigns him enemy. Somebody else assigns him enemy, he doesn't protest. You're the top dog on the totem pole, you sea a misapplication of ethics, comm—ev him for accepting a wrong ethics condition. And people are liable to get the word. Do you see?

He says, "My gods Life is really tough. Already been assigned enemy, and now I'm going to be comm—eved for accepting the order. Let's see. Let me figure this out now. Oh, if you accept a condition, why you get comm—eved. I get it. Yeah." Well brother, if he's that stupid he is an enemy. (Laughter)

But what you want to do in an ethics hearing, an ethics hearing isn't just the guy appears and fluf. No, you do an ethics hearing by the book. An ethics hearing in this particular instance must be an actual assortment of what the guy actually is doing, so as to establish the actual condition that he is in.

Now you can have somebody, chaplains very often mess up the lines in an effort to cheer up things and keep people from falling off the org board, they sometimes ask for an upgrade of conditions, which should be down graded. Somebody assigns this person a condition of non—existence. And this person gets very upset. This person has just goofed the floof across the boards. He's guilty of moprey and doprey on the high seas. He actually overworked about sixteen seniors and busted up a lot of stuff in the bargain. He was only assigned non—existence. It's obviously a wrong condition. So he, "Nya nya nya nya nya nya." Then somebody comes along, and they say, "Look, he is nattering, so the best thing to do is assign him emergency. ' Now he really goofs the floof. Now he'll go around the bend. Correct assignment in this particular instance was liability.

Now supposing the fellow did all this and then lied about it. And made it impossible for anybody to find it out. Man, his effort of getting the show on the road is so dim and so thin, that he obviously is in doubt. In the first place, a person who lies to you doubts your perspicuity. Perspicuity is a smart word for awareness. He must think you're stupid. Some people are so stupid that they can lie about such a thing that is so obvious, and you have to safeguard yourself against a false auditors' report.

But let us say that the person looked like he submitted a false report. And you assigned him a liability, or something like this, and he actually had not submitted a false report. And he knows this, and he accepts the condition. He can now be commended for having accepted a condition for a false report when none existed. Because he will now go around and natter and splatter and so forth. So as it appears on the surface, you assign the condition as it looks. If the condition is wrong, the condition should be protested to the degree of asking for an ethics hearing. If the condition is wrong, and no ethics hearing is asked for, you should comm—ev the guy. Because sometimes this mechanism occurs. You say, “This was a false auditing report. Therefore I’m assigning you liability.” Or something out in an org. it would be more germane. And the guy accepts it. And he goes around in apathy. He didn’t come in and tell you, “Hey, hey, hey, that’s not a false report. That’s a correct report.” He’s now doubly loused up your lines.

There are instances of fellows, under duress, and accused of murder who then, just out of savageness and protest fully admit to the whole murder. Get themselves hanged. Just to make somebody good and wrong. This mechanism exists. Now you, in C/ Sing, will have to assign some conditions. Sooner or later, if you do not assign conditions, the whirlwind will catch up with you. You can sit there like a good little fellow, and do your job jolly, jolly, jolly, and stay friends with everybody, good ARC, good ARC, good ARC. And all of a sudden find a world of hate dumped on your head. It’s the most remarkable phenomenon you ever heard of. ‘Cause you’re just perpetually assigning the wrong condition. You think him auditor’s a friend of yours who doesn’t even bother to study his TRs to a point where he chops the living, screaming god out of a PC, turns you in a false auditing report, sells everybody on the idea of how you stink as a C/ S because he goes around and says he followed your C/ S exactly, and look what happened. You let something like that exist and every bit of good that you can do in the field will be destroyed.

It’s alright to be in full ARC and little friends, little brother to all the wild. It’s OK. Until it gets in your road. Until it gets in your road. You operate, not on the formula of the greatest good for me and him, you better stop operating in this narrow, restricted area, and start operating in the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics, and then you’ll win.

Do you know that you can be looked upon with contempt if you fail to get ethics in in your area when everything is going wrong? People begin to think something is wrong with you. They begin to think there’s, you’ve got something to hide. They wonder what people have got on you.

One time there was a neglected area. I hadn’t paid any attention to it at all. I knew if anything blew up in the area I had a lot of things to do, and I knew if anything blew up in this particular area I could handle it anyhow, and I wasn’t paying any attention to it. I had a hundred and fifty items on the plate at the moment. And apparently somebody in that area got away with moider. And they were getting away with murder. And some other people noticed they were getting away with murder. And I wasn’t paying any attention to this area at all. And all of a sudden somebody wrote me a very circuitous, covert note, “Does so and so have something on you?” They thought this individual must be under some special protection. They didn’t notice that the individual was so far removed from my post as not to be noticed. But that’s the sort of thing that’ll develop. People begin to wonder.

They know, very often, more about the actions of people than you do. They know that Josey Ann has just got through goofing the floof. They have continued to watch Josey Ann's PCs stumble out of the auditing room and fall on their faces. And be carried off in stretchers to the local hospital. And you all of a sudden assign Josey Ann and condition of power, on the basis of a bunch of false auditing reports. And not even the examiner dared go against Josey Ann, because they figured Josey Ann had something on you. Weird, weird situations can occur.

This is an aberrated planet, and aberrated things happen. So therefore, the ethics presence of a Class VIII, and the ethics presence of a case supervisor must be beyond reproach, must be accurately carried forward, and must be established.

Now as you first establish an ethics presence, you establish it hard. After a while you can be careless about it. But you have to establish an ethics presence hard. Otherwise, you're just gonna be wrapped around a telegraph pole. You're gonna be worked to death. Cases are gonna start falling on their heads. You don't know whether you're going or coming. You say, "What's going wrong? What's going wrong. Well you must better look back to about seven or eight days ago when they carted that PC off to the local horse piddle, and you didn't assign that auditor enemy. Auditor submitted you a false report, the auditor didn't like the person vividly and took that as an opportunity to cut the person to ribbons. Things like this happen. It's an aberrated planet. And you didn't do anything about it.

Well, you're very unlucky if you also didn't find out about it. See, because whether you found out about it or not has nothing to do with whether or not you will accurately do it.

So when you're doing a C/ S you mustn't talk to the auditor, you mustn't talk to the PC. You're actually at the mercy, really, of a false auditing report, and you're at the mercy of a false examiner. If you run into this situation too hard and too bad you establish your examination line on a routing form. You establish the regular routing, the regular examination report, but in an organization they're usually routed directly through to the registrar. So you get a second registrar report. Why they're not going to sign up? So then you've got an auditors' report, an examiners' report and a registrars' report. If you're suspicious about it, why put it on the back burner just as a note over on the side of your desk. But you're gonna ask the ethics officer in a couple of weeks about this PC. Ethics record's OK right now, but in a couple of weeks we're gonna ask the ethics officer about this person. See, we're not sure. Seems alright, everybody reassures us that it's OK, but it's just something... we're a little doubtful of. Write his name on a piece of paper, "See ethics officer", and put a time machine date on it.

Now you could even, in an org which is well run, send it to time machine with a two week date on it. So it'll fall off the time machine to be sent to the ethics officer in exactly two weeks. "Please give me a report on Josey Ann Bates." Sneaky thing to do, isn't it? Josey Ann Bates, up to that moment they have no record in the org. She's done nothing bad, particularly that we can see, but it just doesn't seem alright to us, and people are reassuring us that this is alright and she's been audited in a squirrely fashion, and she came from some famous squirrel group. We're not trying to catch her, we're trying to catch out tech. So we say, "I don't... I don't... it doesn't really seem reasonable to me that all this is all OK. Because look, she's been back in

review here now three times, we seem to each time fix it up but somehow or other it doesn't get fixed up, and we are applying standard tech according to the auditors' report, but for some reason or other it doesn't respond in a standard fashion. ' Now the reason for that is a false auditing report.

Now you want an auditor, you want auditors in a frame of mind that before they will write a false report, they would lie awake all night shaking with terror. You don't want any false reports. That you should make very clear. Do you see? The goof might get liability, but a false auditing report, Christ knows what you're going to assign for that. Do you see? Then you can protect it. Then you can do your job.

Now I'm merely talking to you from a viewpoint of doing a job of work. Every now and then we see some crime come through the lines. Now it seems to be a very, very bad thing to take an auditing report and turn it over to ethics. But the funny part of it is, is I've caught two or three supervisors and five or six auditors, way back, which has adequately explained to me why there is a certain zone or area, why it is having a hell of a time. Now we're putting in a lot of management, let us say, in that zone or area. We try to manage that area. We're trying to manage that area. We're trying to smooth it out. We're trying to straighten it out. We're trying to handle it, and so forth. Well there's another zone and area. And that is that its' tech is out, and somebody keeps its' tech pushed out. And its' tech is very hard out. It is very out indeed.

Now, let me teach you something about tech in relationship to ethics. Although we say this, when admin goes out tech goes out. Tech goes out, ethics has gone out. The truth of the matter is, there is a tech ahead of that ethics. So it's actually, when tech goes out, ethics goes, it becomes necessary, and if it isn't put in then tech goes further out. And then admin goes out like screaming crazy. So when you find an area or an auditor where admin is thoroughly out, you know, right up the line from that, just one step back of it, that tech is out—There's something he doesn't know about tech, or there's something tech—wise mucked up on his case, or he's doing something weird with tech, or he hasn't got the word in some fashion or another. And then right ahead of that you know that he has out ethics. And then you, oddly enough, trace it back a little bit further and you will find that tech was out. See, it's actually a four point cycle, not just a three. It is very true, it is very true that when admin is out tech is out, when tech is out ethics is out. Do you understand? But it backs up one more. Tech had to be out in the first place.

So where tech goes badly out, here's another maxim here, and it's an important rule. When tech goes out ethics goes in heavily and hard. Now I haven't said you must put ethics in heavily and hard. Or that you should, or anything. I'm just telling you. It's a phenomenon. This is a phenomenon. Like, when the sun comes up you can see the mountains. See? There's no more significance to it than that. When tech goes out ethics goes in hard. So any area where you find ethics going in hard, you know tech has already gone out. And then, if ethics doesn't go in hard, why tech won't come in. So it goes out further, and with tech out then admin goes all to hell. It's just nothing but false reports and chicken scraps on old rolls of paper.

You can go into a qual, find that their filing is bad, and all you would have to do; their filing is bad, they can't seem to find a folder; you glance at their baskets, they seem to be full and unemptied, and stuff which is coming in is

in the out baskets, and so forth. All you'd have to do is glance at that, if you know your HCO training. And do you know that you could actually, at that moment, assign the Qual Sec a condition of liability without making very much error? You could assign her a condition of liability for out tech. You see? Admin's visibly out, well therefore tech is out, so you look just a little bit further than that and you'll find out that they should have gotten in ethics and they didn't. But ethics is out. They're in an out ethics situation already, not just lightly. And then, for all that to have gone to pieces, tech had to go out in the first place.

Now when you see ethics going in hard, you also know tech has been out. And do you know that people will try to solve things with only ethics? Ethics in, ethics in, ethics in, ethics in, ethics in. They're sort of stuck on the time track. See? Ethics in, ethics in, where the hell's the tech? Now unless tech followed that by going in, pointless. Stupid even. You can sort of hold the line somehow with ethics, ethics, ethics, ethics, ethics, ethics, somehow hold the line, but eventually it all starts falling to pieces. Because you haven't moved through the cycle. You've now go to get tech in. Sure, put the ethics in, put it in hard. Shoot some people, hang some bodies to the local church. We don't care what. But get in the ethics, see? To hold the situation. See?

C/ S, people standing around, you know, "Yak, yak, yak, you know, well I audited out the... I had a lot of bank, and ga ta dee dee..." And they don't do their jobs, and they drift off in the now—wow, and there's nobody on the sea, that it's all sort of tumble—bumbled and stupid, and so forth. Oh yeah, get ethics in. You're not going to get tech in unless you get some ethics in. You can get it in hard, suddenly and shockingly, or you can get it in on a gradient. It doesn't much matter how you get it in. But you get ethics in. You start assigning some conditions. And when things have gone this bad, brother, it is not a condition of emergency. It is not a condition of emergency because when tech goes out in an area you're liable to have even government flaps in that area. That's how, that's how bad it is. So an organization which has out tech is attracting the lightning right down on the back of Scientology, boy. And you never really have government flaps or anything like this in areas where tech has stayed in. Because there're too many satisfied people, there's too many friends. See? But when tech slips, and it isn't working anymore, then it doesn't seem worth while.

When morale is bad in an organization tech had to go out in the first place. If tech is out, if it's invalidated, if it isn't being done right, if it's non—standardized, if it's shoved all over the place, then you can be absolutely sure that morale will be going out because there is no reason for anybody to be there.

Scientology, badly applied, is nothing to protect. And that's why you have to get tech in in a hurry. And the way you get tech in in a hurry, when it's madly out, is you put ethics in hard and follow it straight up with tech. Then you will find the cycle will go on through, and admin follows in afterwards. And then you have ethics, tech and admin are all in.

Now if you find ethics is having to stiffen up, if you're getting more ethics than you would normally predict, and if ethics is stiffening up beyond anything that anybody thought was necessary, then you know very well that tech has slipped, and slipped badly, and that the reports that you are getting must be; and it follows true. It isn't just a reasonability; it must be that the technical reports you are getting are false reports.

Now you can correct that up in numerous ways. You can convene some kind of a board of investigation or something, and call back fifteen PCs, and have them interrogated with regard to this sort of thing. "What were the results? What happened in the sessions?" And that sort of thing. And all of a sudden something will come to light. You've had a tiger walking all over the place.

These are the situations which you meet. These are the situations which you have to handle. Now a lot of auditors trained on this course will find that they are going back to become the lonely only. The smart thing to do is to remain a lonely only for as brief a time as possible. An organization which does not invest its' money in getting an adequate number of fully trained Class VI's is gonna fall on its' head technically. And then, when Class VII's find themselves in a lonely only it's alright to play god, by all means. It's pleasant. But shove somebody else along to become a Class VIII, because it's a very lonely business being god. He is the most lonesome fellow you ever heard of.

Now you try to hold the fort on your lonely only. All by your little lonesome. Or with just maybe one other or two other VII's in the great, swarming organization, which is very busy, and people tearing in and out of the place, and people with their little ant—like two cent opinions based on data that is so cheap as to not be comparable to any coin on the planet. Including a milroy, which I don't think would buy one corner of one cigarette paper. Their opinions aren't worth shucks. Tech goes out. And you stand there flat footed and let tech go out. And let me tell you, you're gonna have more trouble than you can cope with with a regiment of marines.

Tech goes out, all of a sudden ethics starts going in. When ethics starts going in hard it very often goes in incorrectly. The next thing you know, tech, if not put in right at that time, why, a surfeit of ethics tends to start carrying the organization down instead of bringing it back up.

So your steps and actions, if the organization is in turmoil, if the administration is bad, if people are not doing what they're supposed to be doing, if it's all sort of mucky and mucked—up and you hear people around and they're going, "Nya nya nya nya nya nya, and nya, nya nya nya nya nya", well just don't order everybody to be sec checked. To hell with that. But all that it is is that tech is out. Tech is out, man. How to get it in. That's your problem. How do you get it in?

The solution is put in ethics like a ton of bricks. And then follow right along behind it with good, standard tech! And put it in hard! And what do you know? The ethics come right off of it. Ethics will not lift itself out. All ethics will do is hold the fort while you're getting tech in. If you don't hold the fort at all you won't get any tech in. I can tell you that by experience. Oh, you can be charming, you can be persuasive, you can give them talks, you can do everything you want to, but you have to hold their hands while they're auditing the PC. And you ain't gonna get there because the environment is inadequately filled with challenge.

Man thrives on challenge. One of the reasons why it's dangerous to have an AO in a California climate. The only challenge in it is smog. No slur on California. I'm very fond of California.

But the net result of this is, I'm trying to teach you a lesson which is just as standard as standard tech. It's how do you apply the technology which you've got to the area in which you gonna operate. You gonna walk home, everybody's gonna be very glad to see you, gonna put you on a pedestal,

"You're a great guy. You know your stuff." You graduated and so on. You're a Class VIII! Great! They're gonna agree with everything you say. Next thing you're gonna hear is invitations to squirrel. "Well, Bessy Ann, yes. What about her case? You know? We could have her in specially and you can audit her, and we've never been able to crack her case. You know, we've done all the usual things. You know, you're gonna tell us now that it's solved by the usual things. We've tried all those. We've done all those. And can't we get in Bessy Ann? We can get a lot of money if you can audit her. And we've advertised every place that you're going to audit specially for us." ummm. "In fact we had one psychotic PC whose brother owns the steel mill, see, and we've got that all lined up for you." Well how do you extricate yourself from such traps and get the show on the road? Well, you will assume unto yourself some ethics presence of some kind or another. Now the wrong way to assume it is to give them, try to teach them a Class VIII course in the next five minutes after arrival. Or to impress them with what you now know. They know you know it anyhow. You don't have to tell 'em. What you have to do is an ethics presence. So you have to point out to the people in your immediate vicinity if ethics is out in the area, that ethics is out. And that ethics has to be put in so that you can help put tech in. And you do the maximum you can in order to do so.

Now some EC that is very enthusiastic about making some bucks, but not enthusiastic about running any standard tech, which they may consider a waste of time or something of this sort, may louse it up a little bit. But that's a job endangerment chit, because you as a Class VIII are being counted on to get tech in in your area. So it's a job endangerment, isn't it?

So therefore you're gonna have the terrible problem of, the EC will figure that you are now above them, the Executive Council figures you are now above them so therefore you ought to be stepped on, put you in your place. You're even liable to get in a condition where you get a whole long series of ethics conditions assigned to you because you put up a small argument on the subject that you wouldn't process the brother of the steel mill. The way you solve that, the way you solve that is to insist that ethics goes in, and goes in correctly. Because a Class VIII has to know a great deal about ethics. You have to insist that ethics goes in, and you say, "Ethics is necessary to go in so that we can get tech in, and then we're going to go get tech in."

Now right now I see that when PCs report for sessions the auditors are seldom there. They wander in a half an hour from now. Or don't appear at all, or something. Well thatch an immediate and automatic condition of non—existence, with conditions enforced. Guy isn't there, non—existence.

Somebody's going to start arguing with you about this. Well let me call to your attention that all the Sea Org is interested in, and all they're interested in, is getting tech in on the planet. Now it may sound like we're trying to get ethics in. But that's inevitable. We're trying to get tech in on the planet. We're trying to audit out the fourth dynamic engram and furnish an environment in which it can be done. And that is the general, overall objective of the Sea Org. We're trying to furnish an environment in which the forth dynamic engram may be audited out. And naturally we have to make sure that is also sets audited. Otherwise there would be no point in putting any ethics in.

There is no point in slaughtering all the people in Armenia under the heading that we were putting ethics in in Armenia. Ethics all by itself is pointless. All

mans' justice is pointless, really pointless. Modern justice is a laugh. Just look at the number of times somebody returns to the penitentiary. Guy gets two years for stealing a car. He comes out at the end of two years, within four hours he's stolen a car. So he goes back in for three years. He comes out at the end of three years, he walks out and he steals a car. And then he goes in for ten years and at the end of that time, why he walks out and he steals a car. I mean, this is, this is not an uncommon record.

As a matter of fact it's so bad that it's as much as your life's worth apparently, to arrest a bank robber. His friends just simply get him out of jail at once by force. It's really, really quite remarkable. But all it is, is pointless punishment. In 1835 I think, in Philadelphia, they adopted what is currently passing for a justice punishment and penal system. And they found out that although there were many systems of punishment involved, they found this out by careful observation; one that was used in Philadelphia where the fellow was put in a little cell with bars, was the least workable, and had the most returns. And that is the one that has been used ever since. The modern penitentiary system is found to be the least workable in the rehabilitation of the criminal.

Now the cop should be charged with public safety. The chief of police is obviously responsible for public safety. Ten percent of the people cause ninety percent of the accidents. There is no action ever taken to make sure that those ten percent don't drive, or are fixed up. As a matter of fact, every time you try to put in the program it gets fought. It's just as though people want to see people smashed. Yet it's a criminal action, killing people on the highways—That's manslaughter. And yet nobody takes any real efforts. They want to slow everybody down. Well if you slow all the cars down you put more cars on the road per hour. And if all cars are slowed down then your traffic is so jammed that nobody can drive in it. It isn't really speed that causes accidents. Some accidents are caused by speed. But you'll find out that somebody speeding normally had to speed around the dear old soul who was driving down the exact middle of the highway, so as not to run off either side at fifteen miles an hour.

So public safety, robbery, burglary, sudden death and so on, is the business of the chief of police of an area. Or the superintendent. That's his business. He doesn't even know it's his job. It's not phrased in his textbook. His primary purpose is public safety. He thinks your replying to the fact that little automobiles and bicycles ought to be patrolled more closely. Safety to him is automobile traffic. Or safety to him is something else. So they arrest Luke the Glook, and they send him across the river because the judge got a, his defense got a psychiatrist or something to say he was insane, they send him across there, he gets checked out as being perfectly OK, and released the following day. It's common practice in Washington, D. C. Standard practice. Somebody's caught robbing a bank, or something like that, he goes across the river to Saint Elizabeth, and they release him the next day. Pleads insanity. Sometimes they spend two or three months around Saint Elizabeth, but that's about all. Most remarkable Proceeding you ever saw. Talk about reward of a down stat. If the guy can prove he's loony, why he's not guilty.

Well this kind of drives the chief of police around the bend, but he doesn't, he doesn't really object to this. So they take this guy and they throw him into the court, and a very usual procedure, and they give him a couple of years, or something like that. And then he goes over and he's released on parole,

back on the public, unrehabilitated in any way, shape or form, to do the same thing that he did before, just eight months afterwards. And then after he does it again, why they pick him up, if they find him, and they put him in the court again, and then they put him in the penitentiary system they know, everybody knows didn't ever work, and then he's back on the public again, and so forth. You get the idea? This is the cycle by which all this occurs. This is public safety? That is justice for its' own sake. Not to get anything done.

Let us take putting in justice in a provence in France. I'll, let us say, 1550. Robbery, murder, sudden death is occurring in the provence. Somebody rides in on the place, starts picking up all these marauders and bandits, and that sort of thing, hanging a few of them, pushing a few of them into some other zone or area, telling them to be good, and it all quiets down. Now, let's look, just give you an odd example. That was one of the ways this sort of thing was handled in medieval times a lot. But what's the purpose? There was a purpose then. The purpose was so that the peasants and middle class and aristocracy of the provence could produce in peace, and have the results of their production, and possession of their land, and live lives which weren't suddenly being interrupted by a spear or arrow. There was a point. A point. See? There was a point. You calmed it down so's people could get on with it. And that was clearly thought in 1550. That was very clear think. There wasn't any fumble—bumble about it. Nobody had a dim idea of it. Marauders, operating in an area, reduced the production and fixed it up so the citizens and people of that area could not lead normal lives, and they couldn't get on with it, and there was no production. And it all went to hell in a balloon. So it was necessary to put law and order in on the area so that it would calm down and things could get straightened up, and people who had a right to live decent lives could go on and live decent lives. And there was no question about it. Has nothing to do with modern justice.

You may think that think still occurs, but it doesn't. Justice is put in for its' own sake. Hasn't anything to do with public safety. So they arrest all the criminals in the town and throw them in jail, but in a sort of a sequence, so at any given time there are so many criminals in the population. And then they put them in jail for a while, and release them back in to the population, to take the place of the criminals who've just been arrested and taken out of circulation.

Any time some group starts rioting or causing civil disorder, tearing shops apart or something like that, why you give them more money. Give them more votes. Anybody who was trying to keep the peace in 1550, if he were to look at the year 1968 he'd be kind of pop—eyed. Because for quite a while anybody who tried to stop a riot was arrested. Most remarkable situation you ever heard of. All you had to do was try to stop a riot, if you were a cop, and you went out and tried to stop the riot, why you got thrown in the clink by the federal government. Now I'm not advocating desperate law and order, or anything of the sort, but it's all pointless. Why is there anybody there trying to do anything anyhow, because the riots are just increasing, and nobody goes in and picks up the people who were starting the riots so nobody gets to the basis of the civil engram which is bringing the riot, of which the riot is simply a symptom. Nobody really gets to the basis of it. All they do is start rewarding down stats and chopping the police up, and all kinds of weird, wild things. But there isn't any point in even doing anything about it. Nobody has

any point in doing anything about it. Do you understand?

Justice gets a bad name only when it itself is pointless. And in Scientology justice is pointless, ethics is pointless, if it does not bring in standard tech. Completely pointless. There isn't any reason for it. Why ever assign a condition? To hell with it. Let them go out and lie in the gutter. If you weren't going to follow it in with standard tech, what the hell? Why assign any condition at all?

So, what you've got to look at here is how do you get standard tech in? Well one, you have to know it. There has to be such a thing, and somebody has to know there is such a thing. And he has to be able to demonstrate that that thing is beneficial. And is something that should be preserved. That sounds terribly elementary, but you'd be surprised at the number of people that are walking around in some airy—fairy cloud that don't know that. And then he has to hold the fort long enough to get it in. And, rightly or wrongly, the only test of which is, I still seem to keep the show on the road, century after century. I always hit an ethics area that is an out—ethics area, hard, until I can get those elements straightened up which made it a mess. And that's gone on for a very long time.

It hit an area in Asia Minor, something like this, like a ton of bricks. Bongo! Until I could get it into production. Until I could get it situated, calmed down, divided up, get an economy forwarded, get things straightened out, holding that ethics in hard, boy. Holding justice in hard. Hold it in hard. All somebody had to do was sneeze and that would be that. See? Hold it in hard. This is the way we're going, this is the edges, there we get This is what we're supposed to be doing. This is squared up. And then, pretty soon, there's enough production, enough abundance, enough this, enough that, you start etching it off. Easing it off, easing it off.

You, one, have to know that you have to put it in hard to begin with, and two, you have to know when to ease it up. And you ease it up to the degree that the technology that you're trying to import into the area is functioning. Simple. You ease it up to the degree that the technology you're trying to put in is functioning. It is an exact measurement.

For instance, I'm trying to build up; I'll give you... It goes along with other types of economy. Trying to build up a port in Asia Minor, see? Got nobody but a few squads of troops. No dough, nothing Could build it right up to the stars, just put in ethics, justice, hard into the area, move it up, say this is where we're going, get the agreement of people to go in that particular direction, build it up, holding that in hard, not letting it be knocked over and every time you've got a sheaf of wheat up not letting some bunch of bandits come in and grab it. Square it up, square it up, push it ahead. But all the time there was technology moving in on the area. True, the technology of the arts and human arts. But a technology was moving in. And the technology would build up, people would learn what is was, keep carrying it forward. Ethics, and then as they started learning this, and so forth, ease off. I'd know the job was done when troops were bored to death.

I like to see an ethics officer down to such a point that he searches over the entire area, pitifully turning over a match in his hand which was dropped in the hall, as the only crime he can discover anyplace. Along about that time, why, the conditions are upgraded. That is to say, you don't suddenly start upgrading everybody, but the condition you are assigning is lighter. That is the proper condition for that time. So, there is another rule. It requires a bit

of judgement. It is: The worse off things are, the harder condition is assigned for the same crime. You don't always have a uniform code of justice. When you're going in there as case supervisor for the first time, and somebody says, "PC felt wonderful. Floating needle all through the session so I didn't do it." And when the PC got to the examiner with the needle stuck tight and the TA at four and a half, there is something very wrong here.

Now if you start to involve yourself with what is wrong there at that stage of the game, you're going to be so, you're going to be rewarding a down stat. You're going to be training somebody who is really gonna goof the floof. You don't bother to tell him. You don't even bother to tell him what's wrong. And you say, "False report. You're in doubt." Bong! "Ah, ah, you can't do that to me." "Oh no, not only can't do that to you, if you insist on something else, why we might really come to blows here over this thing."

The essence of the situation is that ethics is out all over the place because tern has been long out, so the only excuse you have to use ethics at all is to get tech in! So it becomes a hell of a crime. The examiner talks to the person as he's examined. It's a non—compliance with orders, liability for the examiner. Just like that. No arguments about it. And the examiner's, he's been on post for a long time, he knows his business, and PCs come in, "Well how you doing? Well I didn't think very much of that auditor anyhow. I'd see... We'll get on the cans here. I don't suppose you're very bad off because, I hope you're OK. You seem to be alive. Let's see now. You had what? At your state of the case? Well. What do you know?" Well he went in liability and he did it the next day, and he went into doubt, and he did it the next day, and he went into enemy. Just like that.

All of a sudden you are liable to have qualms. You say, "Now look. If I'm insisting that conditions of this character are assigned with this violence, the whole organization is going to fall to pieces, people are going to say I came back suppressive. I've, everything is wrong and the whole staff will quit. And this, naturally, it's all going to fall apart. And we've only got six staff now, and..." Let me tell you by long experience that's the wrong line of think. The only reason you have small staffs is because ethics is out. Tech has gone out, ethics is out. And the only way you can actually increase the numbers of staff you have, is to put ethics in hard. You say, well Christ, people won't have anything to do with you if you do that. Boy that is a civilian think to end it all. Do you know the one organization which never has any trouble recruiting is an army. But there's a hell of a lot of manufacturers patting people on the head that can't get anybody to work for 'em. That's interesting, isn't it? An individual feels safe in a harshly disciplined environment.

You forget that a guy wandering around out there someplace is being shot down in flames by people in his immediate vicinity, who are making mistakes and goofing up, loading their hats onto him, and so on. If you look at everything from your own viewpoint only, you will not notice that guys who do not have your altitude, who do not have your ability, do not have your command of technology, are really getting kicked in the stomach. They are much more kicked in the stomach by the loafer, the bum, the natterer, the guy who doesn't do his job, than they will ever be kicked in the stomach by ethics. And they don't, don't feel safe in an environment where ethics is out. It outrages them. It outrages the principles and reasons they're there. And when ethics is out in an area, bad staff stays and good staff leaves. And

when ethics goes into an environment hard, you will find that good staff stays and bad staff leaves. It's just as inevitable as anything.

We just got through sending a Sea Org officer to an organization, to take over as something the organization had never had before. You say we don't have any right to do this. Actually we've got a right to do anything we please, as long as it goes in the direction of trying to straighten something out. Because that organization threatens the whole economy of an area. They over spent themselves, and they messed it up, and it's going to really take some doing to put it back together again. Sea Org officer walked in, started shooting people down in flames, and instantly they had three or four blows. Immediately the rest of the staff united very strongly. The whole organization I think was put in non—existence. They started working all day and all night to catch up all their backlogs. And now we've found out that the three or four people who blew were apparently getting rake offs from merchants in the vicinity. And were putting it in their pockets. In other words, the organization had gone crooked, financially.

Well when the tough guy arrived the good guys stayed and the bad guys blew. Now let me tell you. Had we sent a member of the Bide—a—Hee Goodwill Society, all the good guy would have blown and the bad guys would have stayed. Because they could have kidded her, see? Do you get this? These are sound, hard principles. These are facts. These have to do with homo sapiens, these have to do with beings, these have to do with planets. People do not feel safe in out—ethics areas.

Right now the people of the United States at this particular time and period do not feel safe because riots are liable to spring up at any time, any place. A shop keeper can't call his soul his own because anybody, apparently, has a right to walk in, smash the windows, and say, wI'm a rioter. And this is all because I don't have zilch. Ha ha, ha ha. Therefore, I can break your window, and everything." And some cop tries to arrest him, the COP is immediately thrown in prison for interfering with civil rights. What the hell do you think, what the hell do you think is gonna happen to that economy?

We speak of technology as an economy. What do you think's gonna happen to it? It's gonna go broke, that's whatts gonna happen to it. Its' money's going to devaluate, and be worth less and less. Its' production's going to be less and less valuable. Security is going to be less and less. And people will be less and less happy to be part of that country.

Now one of the unstabilizing things in countries today is the definition of a sovereign power. You don't think that has very much to do with Scientology. It has a great deal to do with it. Because the international law definition of a sovereign power is as follows: That government which can protect the lands and people from foreign aggression is, by fact and definition, the sovereign power of that area.

What did the atom bomb do? There isn't a government on earth can protect its' lands or its' people from foreign aggression. All some slap—happy nut has to do in any part of the world today; with I don't know how many countries have atom bombs; flop an atom bomb at any count y in the world. And there is goes. Booms And therefore, what does that mean? That means that the goverrnments of nations today cannot protect their government, cannot protect their people, cannot protect their land from foreian attack. Because there is no defense against that weapon. They know this, they're unstabilized, they're dispersed, and they know they are fakes. They know

they're fakes. They know they can't protect the land and people. So therefore they're just sort of, tax hungry bums. They're sort of marauders, like locusts. So they don't get in ethics because they think of their technology as something that is dwindling, something that is going, something that's losing.

While you are moving in as a vital, new thrust of life. Your technology is not solidly moved into the community. Your technology is not solidly moved into the nations of the world at this particular speaking. Funny part of it is, I notice in ads and other places, that they're beginning to use Scientology phraseology, and Scientology think, more and more. This is always a flatter. This always flatters it. They've sort of heard on it, on the undercurrent. They sort of think in those terms more and more. Simply preparing the way.

A vital philosophy is always preceded by a gradual change in the area it is being introduced into. The area starts picking up its' phraseology. Starts picking up its' technology, starts getting expressed in the arts, long before the people have even heard of it. But this is a vital new way. It's a vital new way. Justice for the old orders become pointless. Why should they get in justice? Why should they even arrest anybody and throw them in jail? They're just going to let him out again. And if they do arrest the guy, why it isn't going to improve production any. Because there is no... That's gone. We're looking at a dying scene. It doesn't realize how fast it is dying. We belong to a new world. And as we move forward we have our own ways of handling things. And the think that goes along with it is, that as long as any area which we control we can keep tech precisely practiced in that area and not squirrelled in any way, as long as we can keep that, morale will stay up, ethics will be relatively light, prosperity will be considerable, and everything will go along great. But when that breaks down we have to put ethics in to the degree that we have to put it back together again.

But now, as we approach a new area where our technology is not in at all, ethics of course has to go in very hard. 'Cause our tech is so out as to be in a condition of non—existence in that area. And right now we're really suffering from the fact that we haven't taken full responsibility for all mental treatment, all psycho somatic treatment, on the entire planet. We're actually shrinking away from cur responsibility to that degree. And we're paying for it.

It's inevitable then, that area in which you will not take responsibility, that area in which you will not take responsibility is going to kick you in the teeth, bud, to be philosophic about it. But therefore, as you move in, as you move forward, you're moving into areas where tech is out. Books, things like that, would precede your actual contact. And you'll find out people have picked up these books, they've squirrelled, they've done this, they've cross—advised, they've messed it up. The cycle has been very, very rugged and ragged, and so forth, to the degree then that the idea's that a lot of squirrels would have arisen and people mucked up, and you'll be running into guys who are running engrams backwards and upside down, see? And the area's getting muddied up all the time. Right ahead of you, your area's muddied up. So actually it's followed with a wave of ethics. And you say, "Well the public is really staying away from an organization." It works the same way with the public it works with the staff. If you want all the lousy public in the world let ethics go out. All the good public'll stay away from you. If you want good public to move in, put ethics in. The bad public'll stay away and the good

public'll come in.

This is a hard thing to learn, but you can eventually get reality on it. And it goes hand in glove with what you're trying to do. I know very well that people to whom I am talking now and in the future will be facing, time and time again, being a lonely only, having a rough time of it, being argued with about this, that and the other thing. The type of arguments you get into are so nonsensical as to be unbelievable. You know, it's, "Well how do you explain, how do you explain the fact there are more and more people, there are more and more people on the planet? Where are all the spirits coming from? Ba ha ha ha, hat Explain that now! Ha hat Ha hat Explain that! Ha ha. Ha. We got you there I guess. Ha ha ha. Anderson, Q. C., Melbourne inquiry. Complete gibbering psychotic idiot. Up to the gills with R—6. That was exactly, I think, what he said. You think I was just gagging it up, huh?

Scientology must be wrong, because we cannot explain where all the new bodies come from. All the new spirits. Where would all the new spirits come from if everybody had a spirit, why where would all the new spirits come from, huh? Actually, what he didn't realize, this silly ass, he was disproving Catholicism. Catholicism claims there's one spirit per body, so he was asking some silly little kid question that is asked of his own religion, Catholicism. And yet he was busy hanging Scientology because it couldn't... You get the irrationality of it?

The man occupies a perfectly valid position. He's looked on. He's a queens' consulate. Actually he's just a gibbering idiot. You probably couldn't even catch him to get a straight jacket on him.

Birds like that, the society in which you operate, it's awarding down stats, it's got false ideas, things run backwards and upside down. And somehow or other you have to maintain your own level of truth. Now you will not show the wear and tear to the degree that you put in ethics. And to the degree that you fail to put in ethics you're going to show the wear and tear of it. That I can assure you. Now you notice the Class VIII Course is taught in AOs, and is taught by the Sea Org. And the reason for that is, it is an ultimate in stabilizing technology. It is maybe not the last course that will ever be taught on the subject. But it certainly is an ultimate to this degree. It is standardization, standardization, standardization of approach, standardization of application, and standardization of result. And they all can go together. Which is quite a trick. Quite a trick. Standardization of auditing and auditors. There can't be any fire fights and arguments. It also happens that it is the right way to do it. It also happens there isn't any other right way to do it.

Some famous philosopher said there are two ways to do everything. And then didn't add the psychotic and the correct.

So I sympathize with anybody going to North Canyon Station, which only has in it anyhow a Scientology population of fifteen, because his tendencies will be because he is so weak, to do things so weakly. When there are not many of you you've got to be ten times as tough. You've got to be ten times as strong. And you would find out that your area and zone would move up and gather in strength and volume to the degree that you insisted on standard tech. This is quite true.

These are lessons which are not based on my opinions, but are lessons learned across the last eighteen years of trying to relay technology. It is interesting that in those eighteen years, in the practice and application of

the technology itself, it has been relatively simple all the way along the line. What has made it complex is one, there was no language with which to communicate it. And two, people seemed to add to it faster than you could keep it stripped down.

Now, to give you some idea of how tech goes out in your area, you yourself at this stage of the game, undoubtedly have a reality on it. But maybe at some later time no reality will exist on it. You knew you had TR 1, you had TR 1 down sometime way in the past. You had it, that was the way it was. Somebody came along and he flunked you for it, or somebody said that wasn't the way you did it. Somebody said that was the way you did it a long time ago, but that isn't the way we do it now. Something happened that knocked out your TR 1. So you had it once, and now somebody cross questions it, invalidates it, it goes by the boards, and you somehow or other got to reacquire it again somewhere up the line. Well, you're reacquiring it fully, at VIII.

Now one of the ways that is happens is, in the research line two data are stated at different periods of research which seem to be in conflict. The earlier data happens to be correct, the second data is there because somebody remimeographed and misspelled the bulletin. So, somebody comes along and says the second datum is correct. They interpret the material. The material, since time immemorial, has needed no interpretation. Just recently, in trying to teach some materials I found this astonishing fact, that I was trying to tell people it was the simple basics, the very simple basics, that made the auditor. But the trouble with auditing is, it was too simple. And their grasp of the subject was difficult because they thought they were trying to grasp a lot more than they were trying to grasp. And it was trying to grasp this simple thing, and grasp that simply and continuously, and I'll be a son of a gun if the zone and area of trying to apply this didn't say, "Don't pay any attention to basics. What you want to study is the upper theory of the thing."

A Class VIII auditor should be a model of simplicity. He should have a grip on the simple things of life. He should know what he knows, he should know and see those things occur so that there is no difficulty with his head or somebody else's. But this sort of thing can happen. This sort of thing can happen.

It would amuse you very much that a few weeks ago I was doing a case supervision on a folder. And I looked at the commands that were given, and the reasonability, and the reason for these commands, and in reading the explanation of it all, and the folder, I got sufficiently confused that I sent for the original bulletin. And got it in, just to restabilize the situation. It was a really violent outness. But it was an insidious outness. Do you follow? It might possibly, at one time or another, have sounded reasonable, and it might at some time or another have been worded that way. So I sent out for the original bulletin to find out if it ever had been worded that way. It never had been worded that way. In other words, even my data, at this particular point, could be so persuaded, so persuaded that I wanted to look it up. And it's almost unbelievable that I would look anything up. Because the data which you use are so well known to me that it strains my reality to have to tell them to you. And every once in a while I'll forget perhaps to tell you something, because I would never dream you didn't know it. See? I have to think. It's pretty difficult sometimes, to undercut it all the way. "Now let's

see, what don't they know? What couldn't they possibly know?" Very often I have to really dream up a production trying to imagine what to get down to. Now it strikes me... I remember the first time this ever happened to me. It didn't happen to me. A guy was watching a TV demonstration. And he came in and he was absolutely starry-eyed, and he says, "I just found something that you do that none of the rest of us do in auditing. You acknowledge. ' And it never, I never would have dreamed of telling anybody they had to acknowledge. It was just so far beyond my reality that anybody would have to be told, don't you see? So I have a little bit of a hard time scaling it. It's not that I'm trying to undercut it, or talk down to anybody. It requires real skill and real ability to be totally simple. That is the test.

If you want to get a commentary on this read Professor Snorgborg's, or Smorgasborg I think his name is, dissertation on the Implausibility of Electronic Theory. The book is eight thousand six hundred and fifty five pages. It's in several sets. And it won't surprise you that he died because he didn't know how to push his doorbell and get in out of the cold. But boy it sure was complex. So you want to refer people that have complex things, you say, "Well why don't you read Professor Smorgasbord's dissertation on the Basic Theory and Reinterpretation of Scientology Theory? It's a very famous book. ' And send them down to the library to look for it if they've bothered you too much. And keep insisting that it is in the library. And it at least keeps them out of your hair, possibly for some years.

But to be basically, totally simple you have to be terribly, terribly direct. Terribly direct.

Now, the net result of all of this is, is with terrific simplicity you are trying to get forward a very simple, fantastically workable technology. The routine by which you get it in is also very simple. Morale goes out, and effectiveness and efficiency and administration goes out, to the degree that the tech itself goes out. To get the tech back in, or to get it in in the first place, you have to apply very straight, direct ethics. This is followed through by putting in tech. You ease up the ethics to the degree that you get tech practiced in a standard fashion. Do I make my point) And that is actually what it is all about.

Thank you very much.

AUDITOR ATTITUDE AND THE BANK

A lecture given on 10 October 1968

Good evening. (Good evening) We have here the what number lecture? (Fourteen.) Fourteenth lecture, and the date? Ten, ten, sixty eight, or eighteen.

OK. This evening I'm going to talk to you about the art of being an auditor. This of course is totally dependent upon art. There is no rules about it. One has the knack or he doesn't. There's no reason why PCs get well. Rather mysterious thing. It has to do with the auditors' aura. The foregoing... have actually been stated by people who were pretending to teach Dianetics. The general opinion of psychiatry and other mental practitioners of a decade or so ago was that, "Well Hubbard can do it but he has no business teaching somebody else, because you see it's a knack somebody has, and of wf wf wf wf. We have no doubt but what he has found is very good psychiatry, don't you wf waffa waffa waffa waft. What a hell of an insult that was.

So anyway, the net result of all of this is that the general difficulty with which an individual is faced is normally somebody else can do it, he is a good auditor, I wonder what magical knack he has. What is it? What is it? And that's what causes you cats to pick up a bunch of hidden data. You think somebody else knows something peculiar that you possibly may not know. You see? And you see Oscar Q. Zilch, and he seems to get results on the PC, so you want to find out what he does, you see, because you flubbed it. And then he says, "Waffle waffle, yiggle yaggle, buckle, buckle", and he doesn't know what the hell he's doing. And he probably isn't getting results from the PC. He's probably just giving a sales talk anyhow. And the net result of all of that is that mystery about it.

Well, the subject of auditing is first recounted in a book called The Original Thesis. And the rule has not changed between 1949 and now. The Original Thesis is prior to Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health. And I was glancing through it a moment ago and the last editor of it has not punched this up into the caps it deserves.

The reason why auditing can occur is that PC plus the auditor is greater than the PC's bank. The PC versus the auditor and the bank is overwhelmed. Now think it over for a minute and you'll see that the law has not changed in all these years. And you speak about basics. That is the most basic basic there is in auditing.

The PC's awareness plus the auditors' awareness concentrated upon the reactive bank is greater than the bank. Inevitably and invariably. As an individual moves up into the upper OT sections, if he has made it into those sections, then he himself, all by himself is greater than the strength and power of his bank. This is peculiarly true then in the lower grades that it takes the auditor plus the PC as you would might add up ohms or volts or anything else, you know? Like the auditors volts plus the PC's volts are greater than the volts of the bank. Do you follow? It's that, you know? The auditors' apples plus the PC's apples are greater than the counter apples of the bank. Do you follow? It's just arithmetically true.

And if you have the auditor versus the PC, then it is the auditor plus the bank is versus the PC. And he may already be only one grasshopper power, and so it's very easy to blow him down. You can tell at once when the auditor is not with the PC, or when the PC, solo auditing, is not enough to blow down his own bank, because the TA goes low.

Whenever you see a TA sinking in an auditing session it is the auditor is versus the PC. The auditor and the bank are both united against the PC. And the result is a sinking tone arm. Now when the PC himself hits too much area in the bank that is a hell of an overwhelm of some kind or another, this is the solo auditor, his TA goes low. So in an AO you will very soon see C/ S on sessions. C/ S on solo sessions, where the TA taken on a two hand electrode system has sunk below 2, the PC has not adequately made it up through the grades to be greater than his own bank. And therefore he should be audited to straighten out his case, to remove the charge which stands in his road, to repair the grade we missed, to put in the rudiments that were out during all of those sessions. Do you follow? Now by putting in the rudiments, getting the charge off of ARC breaks and things he's had with himself, straightening him out, relatively simple. Nothing very, very complex. It's contained in the phrase at Class VIII, it's just fly each rud to F/ N. The technique that is used is itsa, earlier similar itsa. Complicated, isn't it?

Now if you however have ever seen a D/ N, a dirty needle on the PC in the body of the session, your TRs stink to high heaven. Because the bank never makes a D/ N all by itself. You can, immediately and directly then measure your ability as an auditor of uniting with the PC to handle his bank by the cleanness of the needle in the major actions of the session. Expect a needle to go D/ N in the Ruds. We expect it to. We hit missed withhold it for sure will. But to have this happen in the body of the session means that the auditors' TRs went out. Now his TRs went out is another way of saying he ceased to be with the PC.

Now we can give you the cycle of communication. We can give you all of the various actions which you have to do. But there's one action which remains with the auditor. Is he versus the PC? Is he on the other football team? Is the cowboy somebody in the black hat sitting across the table from him? See? Is he trying to help the PC get through the bank or isn't he?

Now I one time pulled a little series of stunts which were quite fascinating. I took in an HCG every time an auditor was going to audit a PC. I took him aside. And I pulled his withholds from the PC. And then sent him in to give a session. The funny part of it is that those who had withholds from a PC and who did not get them off gave a poorer session than the auditor who did not have, who had just had his withholds from a PC flipped out of the road before he audited the PC. We used to get very splendid sessions by doing this trick. I'm not recommending this trick. This was a research experiment. Because it simply meant that the PC was being audited by somebody whose rudiments were out on the PC. In other words the auditors' rudiments were out on the PC. He wasn't with the PC, he was withholding himself from the PC. Do you see how elementary that is?

Now I'm not saying that is always the case. I'm just giving you this as one little special example. Now you don't have to climb inside the PCs head, although I would expect a Class VIII auditor to be able to audit somebody at four, five feet, without saying a word, and if he really polished himself up well, to audit somebody on the other side of the world without any trouble at all. I'm not giving you anything esoteric. You'll find occasionally in trying to audit a body thetan somebody who has not been up through the grades and doesn't know what he's doing, can't make one move. He tries to make the body thetan move and the body thetan moves him. You know? Ho. He's sort of telepaths the body thetan to the beginning of the incident. That's why

they fall back so easily on patter. It's a wonder they don't pull up a chair on the other side of their desk to have the body thetan sit down in. Pretty queer. But there isn't any real difference between auditing a body thetan telepathically through the material he has to be audited through to blow him, and to straighten him out, and then those body thetans of course are straightened out, oddly enough.

There is no difference between doing that and auditing a PC sitting across from you in the lower grades. As you audit them you are auditing a composite. And the processes which you use are those processes which work on a composite being. The PC is himself. He isn't a cluster, as I've heard some people saying. He is a being, however, who is impeded and cross—ordered by a number of other beings who have caved in and who aren't in control of the body, but are just there. But now that's a telepathic action. Zooom through the bank, and mfafmf, mfmfm. There's no patter involved in it.

Now if this guy is three feet away from him and is called a PC, he merely has the complexity that he's trying to audit a more composite being. And he should be able to make the PC do exactly the things he can make the body thetan do. He should be able to audit somebody in the next county. And why is it that I was always able to tell the auditor what the item would be before the PC listed it? It was no trick. It isn't even a trick of reading minds. But it is something on the order of horsepower. See what I mean?

So we take this fellow. He hasn't been up through the grades at all. He's just a fake. And he, "Oh yeah, well I got all my grades in Brisbane. Ha ha, yeah. Got my grades in Brisbane," and he's been through the Clearing Course, couldn't find anything. And so forth. And it all blew to F/ N. And you all of a sudden get hold of him and he's got a stage four needle, that's going up tick, pow, tick. Ooh. Now the chance that he will be able to audit a body thetan is so remote that you may as well forget it. That's why the grades are arranged that way.

Now very often a person who has been audited well up through the grades gets to clear. There are lots of cases of this. Gets to clear, and he finds out there's some other beings here. You know? What the hell's this? What's this? You know? Well his reality has been raised up to the point of where he knows he's supposed to be, and some of those characters know they're running OT2 out of these beings, and auditing 3 is just a breeze. There is nothing much to it. Do you follow?

This is, this is what's known as impingement and effect upon other beings. Now you will find here and there that somebody has tried to audit a body thetan that he has been mad at. It didn't work! And you get him in review, or something. And you find out that he has actually ARC broken, overrun, busted up every body thetan he had anything to do with. "You... I'll get you. Where the hell... Rrrr! Rrrr!" Nothing happened. Or he got one awful kickback. He's auditing out of ARC. Did it myself way back when. Ran across somebody who was actually one of the R—6ers. And I thought to hell with you, bud. I ain't gonna audit you. And that was that as far as I was concerned. About four days later, why, he showed up again. He was awfully caved in. So I had to pick up the ARC break and audit it out. Do you understand? Auditing requires unlimited tolerance and charity.

Now you get somebody whose writing very evaluative C/ Ses. I reserve the right to say this guy has simply fallen on his head. He has had too much

waggle waggle and bug bug, and so forth. But if you will go back through the fellows' auditing, or go into the intelligence files you'll find out that I'm not picking it up on the air waves. He said it two days before in his auditing session. But you don't find me saying, "This is a horrible bum, this is a dog. He really ought to be shot but somehow or another we will audit him." Because the funny part of it is, he won't respond as a PC if you have that attitude in session. A C/ S could have that attitude, but if he colors the auditors' attitude too much toward the PC, then you get auditor plus bank, versus PC. And the auditing becomes very difficult and very slow. Do you see where we're going with this? See? Well it's elementary.

Now nobody enjoins upon you that you've got to have a halo eighteen kw around your skull, or anything like that. It comes under the heading of the auditor who, the auditor should be able to say who he audits. And an auditor should be able to refuse a PC. He doesn't think he can help him is a nice way of saying he probably has overts on. He doesn't like him and doesn't want to have anything to do with him. Now that auditor auditing that PC is not going to get very many gains.

You're dealing not with an art. You're dealing with a very crystal clear proposition, that the PC can overcome and handle his bank if the auditor is with him, and the PC has a hell of a time when the auditor is not. When the auditor is against him it becomes impossible. Somebody auditing somebody in anger can actually spin them. I had a girl stumble into my office one time that had been audited in anger. Or I think she more or less walked for about, I don't know, something on the order of fifteen hundred miles to get to my office. Somebody'd audited her in a rage. Spun her. She had enough sense to go someplace where somebody could help her. I straightened her out, rather rapidly as a matter of fact. But then the auditor and the bank combined caved in a being that wasn't too well off to begin with. That's why my lip curls at the whole subject of psychiatry, psychoanalysis. Invalidative subjects. Psychology, man is an animal. This sort of thing. Because you see, I know they don't work because they bust the first axiom. It's not the first axiom, but they bust the first datum that was put out strongly on the subject of auditing.

Therefore it comes back to this. What is Class VIII auditing? It is auditing the PC with good TRs. Now, do you sit there and say, "Let's see now. I have to love this PC. Therefore I'm womp womp womp womp womp. You're gonna audit over a hell of a false line. All you gotta have is just willing to help him out, that's all. If you're willing to help him out you're OK. And if you know how to help him out you're very OK. And if your TRs are very smooth they will stem from those other two points. If your TRs are smooth.

Now this is very, very fascinating, and sometimes very bewildering. You say, "Well how would I know? How would I know?" I can tell you how I policed and drilled myself along this line. It might be rather surprising to you that I drilled myself along the lines of auditing. I have had to learn better than any auditor was taught that I was teaching any of the techniques or mechanics, the model sessions, the prep checks, the sea checks, had to learn the TRs better than those I was teaching. Naturally. And that I sat down and didn't drill them out of thin air. But I actually did sit down and drill them. And every time auditing styles had changed, and they have, why I'd drill myself into the new auditing style. Well that's interesting. It's interesting to do.

I was getting good results on PCs in 1948, '49, '50. I was solving PCs other

auditors couldn't solve. Not because I was doing something different. I was running engrams and so forth on them. I was running at a gradient they could tolerate. And I was very willing to help them. That was the main difference I wasn't in any contest with them. I was very willing to help.

Now, what, what was the difference? You can say comprehension of the subject. Well what comprehension is there of the subject? It's the same basics you know now. As cases have gone up the line, and as things have been learned, as grades advanced up along the line, why what I have known has been applied. I don't have any trouble auditing somebody at a distance. The only reason you don't, is it just hasn't occurred to you you could! And when you try to audit somebody into it at a distance, yes audit their Ruds out, and you don't audit them properly. And they very often are stuck on the track to begin with. And they're also being distracted in various ways. But it can be done.

Now you can actually move an animal around on a time track in the wildest, and most imaginable fashion. Not because he's an animal, but because his time track is so different that it doesn't, in the least bit, bring any question about your imagining it. You are not, I am sure, on a greedy quest for bones. Nor are you terrified of your master beating you. Set when we run some savage dog backwards on the time track we'll encounter unmistakably what he is stuck in. It's often very interesting to see what they are stuck in. Most incredible things. And it is so different from a zone of one's own experience that one can evaluate what he's doing, and others. But this, this you could say is trick stuff. No, no it ain't, it ain't. It isn't at all trick. It is about as common as eating a dish of ice cream. Now you say, "Well I couldn't do that. I don't know." And so on. Yes. An individual who is surrounded around by a tremendous number of body thetans, his own case is shaky, his own rudiments are out. When he tries to do something or other he restimulates his own ridges or those of the body thetans in his immediate vicinity, and he doesn't get very far. In other words, he's introverted.

Now because a lower class auditor is therefore impeded, hence his extension is poor, you then teach him by form. You teach him or form that he does so and so, and he does so and so, and then the responses are so and so, and the responses are so and so. You teach him these forms and actions. Now the funny part of it is that no matter how good he gets, these forms and actions are still there. Do you see the mechanics of it are still there: But you've actually given him something that he can do on a communication line. Now I'm not saying that you as a Class VIII ought to be able to run somebody through to OT6, or something of this sort, without ever speaking to him, without his knowing anything about it. This is not the game I'm talking to you about. But sitting across the table from somebody, sitting across the table from somebody, and this is the only point I'm making. If you get any other point out of this, wow. It's the only point I am making. Your intention is actually capable of holding him from moving on the time track. Particularly at his state of case. And you can hold him up and freeze him right on the time track.

You go out and try to audit somebody who is a very wog wog. And you'd absolutely be fascinated. You'd absolutely be fascinated. An auditor has always verbally been able to handle the PCs' bank and make it move around better than the PC. Always. Now you can actually establish a zone of freeze. "Well I'm going to help the PC, I suppose that doesn't register on him." You

doubt he can get back that far into the incident. I suppose that doesn't register, huh? "Well I don't know if I can help you or not. I don't know if I'm doing right." Now get, get what somebody might be doing. I don't say that they're doing this. But think of what they might be doing. "Jesus Christ, I hope I've got this right. Guess I'd better catch up my administration, that's all. I've got to get this this time." And so on. "Well if he doesn't see how nervous I am about this, yes." "Move to the beginning of the, of the incident." If it doesn't register in his voice it's gonna register otherwise. "Recall", let me see, what the hell was the command? "Just a minute. Just a minute. Sorry. Uh, recall, what the hell was it?"

Well now if your actions didn't make him nervous your think also could. You start running on a PC some time the same button that you've just been assessed on. Then you make an effort to stay into PT. And he can't go back track. See, we've both been assessed, let us say, on catfish. See? And you say, "Recall catfish, ha?" And he says, (Laughter). That doesn't mean you should travel all over the time track, it just means that you should be free of catfish at that moment.

Now all I'm trying to tell you is there is a communication line there. It's demonstrable with body thetans, so therefore I'm talking to you in your zone, where you can grab a reality on it, that it's therefore three feet away possible, it's therefore, actually, a lot of feet away possible, and it's beyond range of sight, in actual fact. It is not something one does without knowing he's doing it. It isn't an accidental activity. It is intentional. I imagine somebody could be real kooky and be in some kind of a telepathic—type of rapport, but then you must be in some telepathic report from body thetans 'cause you can see their pictures. Well if you can see their pictures they're communicating with you.

Now you look at somebody who suddenly walks through that door. You don't necessarily see his pictures. Mostly because you don't look. But the point I'm trying to make is here, there is a communication line. And it's not because you are everybody and everybody is you, because that's a damn lie. It is a communication line. We use the MEST universe, and we use verbalization, and we use pieces of MEST to make the communication positive. One of the reasons communication has to be made so positive is elementary. That is because there's so much cross think here and there, it sounds like the Tower of Babel. All you have to do is walk into a crowded room where people are excited or upset, and you get a kickback from it. Obvious.

I used to think there was something terribly wrong with me because I didn't like people around who were miserable or unhappy or something, and I thought this was something wrong with me, you see, that is must have something to do with the restimulation of me, because of that. This is way, way back when. I ran into this, and so on, and it'd make me feel miserable, you know? I'd look at this person, he'd be miserable. And I'd say, "Well god, I must have a lot of misery on my track", and so forth. You see how complicated it all was. You know? I had it all figured out, it must be restimulating some sort of an incident, and it's then therefore wha wha waffle waffle. Imagine my amazement one fine day when my reality had gotten up to the reason I didn't like to see people miserable is because they felt miserable. Very complicated, see? (Laughter) And it was something like fingernails on the black board or something. And then I came up to a point where I was perfectly willing to look at somebody who was miserable. And I

didn't have to feel he was miserable. And I could feel how miserable he was. And if I got in that frame of mind I could also move him to a point of track, you know... Put him in some other point of track. I had a big failure doing this one time with an animal who was barking and snarling and raising the living daylights. And I thought, "I don't like you. I think I'll move you into an engram. Make you shut up." Funny part of it is I did move him into an engram. But the funny part of it was I couldn't move him before the engram. And this puzzled me a very great deal. I pondered on this for a while. What was wrong here? Well it was because I was mad at him to begin with. (Laughter) There was no ARC. I wasn't willing to help him, I was trying to ruin him. Every time I walked by, why he shattered my ear drums with a psychotic lot of yowp, yowp, yowp, you know? And I thought, "The hell with you, see, I'm gonna move you into an engram and shut you up." I moved him alright. He went in, he went into an engram, but then I couldn't move him ahead of the engram. I could restimulate something bad with him, but I couldn't restimulate anything good. I was mad at him.

So there is a communication line. And it is not very airy—fairy. At the level a Class VIII is you will start getting a reality on that communication line. Now you'll get a failure here and there of putting through a positive communication. You wonder why that is, and so on. The waitress won't come over to you, and so on. You start asking yourself what was your attitude toward the waitress when you tried to make her come over there? And all will be explained.

Now, therefore there is this thing called a communication. And it is a communication. Now communication goes on its' own formula lines, and so on. There are various types and ways of handling something. There's permeation, there's communication, there's intentionedness with the thing, and so on. These are all upper OT track facilities and abilities. They explain such weird things as engines run for some people and they don't run for others. And so on. Well the engine runs for somebody else, not because he's got any magic beam on it, because when he looks at the engine he knows, don't you see? And he says, "Well any crazy fool could see that you haven't got the throttle open. You know? You haven't turned on the ignition." You see? But how does he know that so suddenly? Well I'll give you some idea that actually woggle—boggles our own engineers. I can call the shots in our engine room without going into the engine room. And the engines run fine.

Once in a while I give up if it's too far away and the communication line is too bad, and so forth, and I've given the directions too many times, and they really don't get followed, and something else is happening the whole time while they're trying to put the thing out of communication faster than they're putting it in. I'll say, "To hell with it." See, I'm also willing not to win all the time.

Now if you're anxious, I'm not holding myself up as any model here, I'm just giving you a framework, if you're anxious and questioning your own abilities, then you see you've got to win every time to prove to yourself you're alright. See' I've gotta... And this in itself will cancel out a certain amount of communication. Now just in the last week, how many times have you spoken to somebody casually who didn't answer you? You see? Well it happens in MEST communication, which is MEST communication because it's very positive. Well it'll certainly happen on this other communication line. You don't have to prove to yourself you have these great powers. I get angry

sometimes when a piece of MEST won't move. And then I realize what I'm doing. 'Cause that's why it won't move.

Now these, you're moving up into OT capabilities. These are not as complex. In fact they're much simpler. It is the additive of anger, the additive of necessity, the additive of pressing it home, the additive, the additive, the additive. Do you see? Now I can tell you how to mock up a planet. See? Any damn fool thetan can mock up a planet. The action is, it's too easy. You haven't actually scaled your effort down to a point where you can do it again. Do I start making sense? It's the effort and complexity.

Now you can get this idea. Well to mock up a planet, for Christ almighty. Let me see. It's got to have a core, and it's got to have swamp, and it's got to have wuf wuf wuf, wuf wuf, and then have veins and mountains, there's so much water over on the planet. Let me see. Now the proportion of the water should be about two-thirds to three quarters water, and the rest of it would be land, so that the atmospheric pressure, and that should be about three hundred miles, and it should be so, and so on, and... Aw nuts! Any damn fool thetan knows what a planets consist of. You know? It's just... You get it?

Now in studying Class VIII you are actually experiencing this phenomena with Scientology. You've thought of Scientology as very complex here, very complex there. And very difficult and hard to grasp, and there's an awful lot of rules and it's awf awf awf awf awf, and a terrific amounts being demanded of you, and so on. And I hope you are learning at Class VIII level that the simpler it is the easier it is. It's very, that's a funny remark. It's, it actually isn't encompassible with words. It's just, well the easier it is the simpler it is, the things you have to know are very few, actually. And you just do those few and do those in simple fashion, it all comes out alright. It's a thing you experience. It's a thing you suddenly know. That's it. Pow, pow, pow, pow, pow...

Now you can keep a check on yourself how good you are. There is a way you can keep a check on how good you are. The length of sessions is inversely proportional to the ability of the auditor. The longer the session the poorer the auditor. The shorter the session, for a number of actions, the better the auditor. Actions successfully completed, length of time. How long does it take you to get through a C/ S?

Now you say, "Well I don't want this PC because he's tough, and this other PC and he's easy", and so forth. There are no tough or easy PCs. They're just you as the auditor. He's at different levels of case. Some of them are worser and some of them are better. Alright, that's a hell of a way to fail, see? Some PCs are bad PCs, some PCs are good PCs. Nonsense. That isn't, nothing to it. It's not true.

Some PCs are at different grades than other PCs. Now you, when these grades are labelled, they're very often inexpertly labelled. We say this person is a grade four. I have seen some of the woggiest grade fours you ever saw, and I've seen some of the highest tone grade fours you ever saw. Do you understand? And in the highest tone grade fours you ever saw, they were very expertly audited up through their grades, and the woggiest grade fours that you ever saw were not audited on their grades at all. And they were wogs. And somebody'd given a lick and a promise, hadn't even, you know, really, they never even sat down. The worst ones off had never been in the auditing chair at all.

Somebody comes along, therefore the falsity of grade assignment gets in

our road in the estimation of the case. And you are gonna be surprised sometime to find a person who is allegedly at OT 5, who is not in actual fact even at ARC Straightwire. The phenomenon actually can occur. All the grade auditing was done on a body thetan. And he's gone. (Laughter.) It isn't often you will find this.

But actually the difficulty of the case is simply where the case is, how charged is the case, what grades and actions have to be put in on the case. That's all. But that, that's the only difference amongst cases. Then once you get that straight, why you're great. Because yours is not a social response. You're not being responsible for his social conduct. You merely know that after he has been audited he will fall on his head ethicswise if his auditing was incorrect. And this is usual. You get into trouble with ethics if his auditing is out. You could almost throw this. If you want to get somebody in trouble with ethics, why just give him the wrong item on a couple of lists, and let it go at that, and they'll wind up over in ethics all too frequently. You can determine it to that degree.

Now that doesn't mean everybody in ethics has been badly audited. Their life has been badly lived. Very often. Their rudiments have been out too long in life. They are living over outrudiments. And they'll get in trouble with ethics.

Now what, what then, what then is one striving to achieve? He is simply striving to achieve simplicity. He is striving to achieve not a fixed attitude, but an attitude which will not impede the PC from making progress. He doesn't even have to really be helpful. In fact you can get so helpful you wreck the PC. But your TRs mustn't, at least, impede the PC. And now, there's another method by which you can check up your own auditing ability. Back around '62 I was working with this method—it's a very interesting method. If you get a D/ N on a PC while you are handling a major action you stink. I mean to put it crudely, because it's crude. If, after you have left the rudiments, and are into any major action, you were to have appear before you on your meter a D/ N, you stink. Your TAs are out. I've checked this out very thoroughly. I can guarantee this. There isn't an engram known to man or beast that can turn on a D/ N. You can run a person through engrams by the hat full, and they won't turn on any D/ Ns. The read might tighten to a bit as he thinks the think, but actually it just flows along. It never goes D/ N. The only person it goes D/ N on is the auditor.

It works like this. You can check it up. You can check it up yourself. You see a little tick of the meter, you haven't given it a chance to go D/ N. It all of a sudden goes tick, you did something or other, and there's that tick. Now you can get in the way of the PC doing this, too. But if you were to ask the PC at that moment, "Did something just happen that upset you in any way?" The PC would say, "Yes." And it'd blow off. You can keep track of your own TRs, man. If, in TR drills, the needle dirties up in any way whatsoever, the auditor is goofing it. If any D/ N turns on during a drill you've goofed it.

Now if your ability to audit, your willingness to help the PC are there, the PC is not an unmanageable, unpredictable thing. It would not be good to do so, but you could even set yourself up the problem of pushing him through it with his reds out. As a matter of fact, the per eat auditing session is one in which the auditor is not even faintly int~ uded into the pcs' attention. The PC is totally unaware of the auditor or the environment, and is only aware of his bank and his action. And that makes the fastest session. The most expert

session are that one which has the maximum gains. Not aware of the auditor at all.

So if the auditor's trying to show off, or do something or other that is interesting, or interest the PC, or all kinds of kooky things the auditor could do, they're all simply distracting. So the best TRs are those which distract the least, and get the action done the most smoothly.

So if an auditor's willing to help the PC, and if the needle remains clean and flowing, you haven't got anything out. The PC just gonna go along just great. That's your own self check. I give it to you as...

It's all very well to have other people blowing down your necks, and things happening to you because of this, that and the other thing, but the truth is, the truth is that you are probably your own most savage critic. Probably your own most savage critic. Matter of fact I, possibly you could look forward to the time when the auditor goofs in the auditing session, when he ends off the session, why he runs out and jumps overboard. (Laughter)

The upshot of it all is simply this. That if you yourself do not have an awareness of what you are doing, and a critical eye of your own actions, it is improbable that you will ever improve. You can be persuaded, however, to have a critical eye towards your own actions. One is not trying to introvert you. Anybody who learns to audit in this school, the Sea Org school, is never likely to let go of it, or be scared of anything when he finishes it up. Because we are now at the moment down in the ancient civilizations, and so on, it is quite amusing to realize that we are also practicing the stoic philosophic school. The stoic was able to endure.

Now with that preliminary there is a thing called auditing presence, there is a thing called auditing intention, and there is a thing called TRs, and the conditions of the session are those which I've just described to you, and are in actual fact no greater than those I have just described to you. They do not exceed those things I have just described to you. There aren't a hundred and fifty nine thousand others. Those are the conditions and attitudes of a session.

Now when you add to that a meter, and when you add to that administration, you're making a sort of a one man band action. Correct? Now if you had any difficulty handling an E—meter, or any difficulty with an administrative action, you are, of course, detracting from the amount of cool invested in the session. An auditor has to be a sort of a one man band. He's got a meter to run, and he's got administration to keep up, and he's got a PC to handle, and he's also in charge of the whole environment around him, which many auditors forget. And as a result it is a multiple of actions.

Now let me tell you how you make a multiple of actions become simple. Is you learn to do each one perfectly and then learn to do them all together. For instance, just to put a ridiculous line on it, if there was any difficulty, sometime you eat these eskimo pies and things like this, and they're very hard to eat on a summer day, without Going them all over your shirt. They melt. When you bite the chocolate, why the inside squirts. Requires a bit of skill to eat an eskimo pie, so as to one, be able to eat all of the pie and not leave part of it on the ground, and to keep your shirt clean at the same time and not get it all over your face. That requires a certain amount of skill.

Now it requires a certain amount of skill to fire a sub machine gun. To get any accuracy with a sub machine gun it usually has to be supported with two hands. One sights along it in some fashion or another. He does this, that and

the other thing. But if he was going to be doing something else at the same time he had certainly better learn how to handle a sub machine gun rather easily. So, if you could learn how to eat an eskimo pie and fire a sub machine gun with deadly accuracy into a target at the same time, without getting any eskimo pie on your shirt, without shooting anybody else but the target, and all the time with tremendous aplomb. You've got an action there which is less complicated than auditing. You have to recognize this, the fact you've got several things to do. But a thetan can do several things at the same time. If you don't believe it, hold up your hand and look at it. Have you any idea of how much, how much think and action and complexity that requires? I suppose you think your muscles do it, or something. If you're not very far up along the line you will. You'll think, "Well I flex my muscles, and then I..." and so on. How is it that you could bring up your hand and open it? Why does the thing happen to open? Do you see?

Now you've educated yourself into believing that you have to have this hand in order to open the cover of something. I don't know what's wrong with you, because you can just as easily intentionedly open the cover of something with intention. Except you have to be able to permeate the cover to the degree that you're willing to permeate your hand. That... I've given you some stuff out of 8. Actually this is all the trick there is to moving MEST.

So at first you would say, "Oh my god. How would we reverse the polarity of the Empire State building?" In other words it seems to be a big problem. It would seem to be very difficult, and so forth. But in actual fact it isn't until you recognized the difficultness, not the difficulty of it, but the complexity of it and the simplicity of doing it, are the two things which you recognize simultaneously, and at that moment you could do most anything with the Empire State building.

This is all germane to auditing. In a Class VIII auditing there is then a style. It's an effortless one man band that goes like the mischief and gets it all done and does it all very simply and brings it all right out at the other end. It adds speed and a deftness to the ability one already has. But it also requires that one recognizes the simplicity of what he is doing before there's real speed and a deftness suddenly come to one. There isn't very much to know. And that's the trouble with it. It's almost too little to know. So it's hard to grasp. The feeling there must be something more to it keeps intruding on the fact. And all of a sudden fuff... you do it. Very easily.

Now so much for the attitude of the session. The case supervision of the session is what is audited in the session. That is what is done by the auditor. And there are certain standard things which make Class VIII Class VIII. And that is that you insist on nothing short of perfection. We leave the ground of "the auditor got away with it". We leave that utterly. Almost to we don't care what the final result was, if it was done wrong it was wrong. There is no optimism, because I can show you in the long run that every session that is done wrong gets a PC who falls on his head eventually. Your errors of session multiply. And they multiply and they are very, because you're auditing smoothly you're auditing quickly, something like this, and all of a sudden you make a bungle. Baaa. You're the guy carrying a flask of TNT in your hip pocket. Nearly all soup men in oil fields drink it in tea cuss and that sort of thing. They think it's TNT soup. They handle it in the most wild and peculiar fashions. And they faint if they see anybody else even going near it. They themselves know they can handle the stuff. They themselves don't worry

about it any. But they recognize that if they have dynamite, the soup, it is very explosive.

Now you're auditing rapidly, you're auditing with intention, you're already auditing above the ceiling of the person to resist the auditing. You already are in a case state that can put a person almost anyplace you want to put him on the time track, just by plain think, and then you flub. The only answer to it is you gotta be perfect. If you're gonna audit with that much velocity you're gonna have to audit perfectly. There must be no flubs. So it is flubless style.

Now when we look over, when we look over a well done folder it might seem rather mysterious what is in the folder. We see a C/ S, something on the order of, the C/ S on this particular one is, G/ F, green form. And you do a green form to first F/ N. You don't do a green form to the second F/ N, the third F/ N, the fourth F/ N. It's done to F/ N. So it's your case supervision is only necessary G/ F to F/ N. Now you haven't seen too many green forms being handed out, and the real reason you haven't seen them handed out is most people coming in have already been green formed up to their teeth. It is not the green form is out of style. They've just been green formed to their teeth.

Now you actually, as a person starts to hit the upper strata of auditing where he has been badly audited early on, you start at once to be cautious about lists, about getting him to list. I'm not talking about assessments. You start being cautious about getting him to do lists, and so on. That's good C/ Sing. You can run all the damn lists you want to in the lower grades, you see' But you start getting cautious about lists, particularly if you don't have the PCs full listing background. If you could go back to the basic list on the track and correct it, that would be great. But you very often can't do that. Sometimes it's above the level and ability of the auditors you have auditing for you, to go back and correct the first list ever made on the case.

And a list, then, at the upper levels been done too often, becomes a risky action. You're putting the PC at risk. All he's got to do is get a couple of wrong items, and he'll throw into restimulation the earlier list. So you, as a case gets on up into the higher levels, the continuous ordering of a G/ F, G/ F, G/ F, G/ F, G/ F, to hell with it. He's had G/ Fs running out of his ears. Do you see? But it's a common action. There's nothing wrong with it. But you have a tendency, if you're doing C/ Sing, to look through a folder to find out how many G/ Fs this character has. You know you haven't got the full folder —You never do There's always part of it in Spokane. You look through there and you see lists. Here's a great list. Oh, that was a good one. Oh, dear god. Where the hell did this list come from? (Whistles.? Jeez, I never saw that in this folder before. I have just opened this folder at random and I have found a one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, a sixteen item list, which has been nulled down to the fifteenth or down to the twelfth item, and it had left in one, two, three, four, five, six, seven items reading. This is listed by the PC, not a prepared list. And it's a squirrely list. I wouldn't know why anybody would have listed it. It's give, quote "me" unquote a name. And it's a sixteen one list. He's had the PC write sixteen items, and one, two, three, four, five, six, seven stayed in. And he gave the PC one. Ahhh.

Now, when you're doing case supervising work you look into these things and you very often see this sort of thing. So, you give some sort of a C/ S

along this line. You know that you haven't got the folder. The person's been around for seven years and this is only two years ago. It was only last year, actually. And you think you've got... That was the earliest list. That's the earliest list in this folder. The person's been around for ages. So, obviously it isn't the earliest list on the case. Now we probably could correct that list. But now we're going to get into some kind of a fire fight, because that's gonna restimulate this, and it'll restimulate something else, and it probably wasn't in restimulation anyhow, and the case has long since more or less forgotten that list. Do you get the idea? He we start correcting a list which is a late list, and then we try to correct something else, and we look through the case and we find that the green form on January 27, 1967... God. Look at this green form. LOOK how far it went. Didn't F/ N. This green form was not run to F/ N. Now that's something else you could restimulate. Now you could run a green form, but here's a backthere green form that didn't F/ N. Here's a list that is absolutely kooky. See? You're getting locked out as a C/ S. Those are very ordinary actions. See? Listing and nulling, green form, ah boy. We start canceling them out. Get the idea? Here's green form after green form after green form, list after list after list after list.

The way we actually approach the thing is, go back to a time when the case was running well. How was the case running well? Well the case rehabbed like a bomb on the twenty fifth of September. See? F/ N, F/ N, F/ N, F/ N, F/ N. Good indicators. All kinds of F/ Ns all over the place. Apparent Gls. TA was normal action. So we aren't gonna correct back any further than that. Get the think? We're not gonna correct back of that. We're not gonna find something wrong with the case in 1962. If we are, we're gonna find it on a generality. And so, we get a procedure of, we take the area, now we've had green forms, there's a flubbed green form, there's a flubbed list.

Let's say this case does run into trouble and it's starting to fall on its' head. Now we've gone back to the area where it was running well, and it comes forward into another area and it isn't running well, and it's a little bit difficult to figure out why it wouldn't be running well. Common error is the case doesn't F/ N anymore. All of a sudden she stops F/ Ning, TA goes up, something happens. Now we haven't got this area. Now we're being denied our normal repair weapons. There's listing, to do an S and D, to do a Remedy B. something like this, it's starting to get locked out, you see, by earlier bad listing. We haven't got the earliest lists. We don't know what one's in restim. You get the kind of a case supervisor problem you're being set up with? Now all problems of this character come under the heading of corrective problems. The correction problems. So case supervisor problems fall into these two characters, and one is corrective, and that's corrective of the auditing, and the other one is advancing of the case. They're two separate categories. You can't correct the auditing without advancing the case, but they are two separate categories. So all case supervisor actions come under the heading of corrective of the auditing, or advancing the case.

Now picking up and running out a psychoanalysis of 1895 is not corrective of the case. 'Cause their, it's the case. So that an assessment of resistive cases has a couple of items on it, which is audited over out Ruds or grades, and continuous overts on Dianetics and Scientology are the primary ones, that are corrective. You have to correct the case now. Somebody's goofed the floof. If the case got here this far, boy, and it's still reading on those two things, I wouldn't give you much for the auditing it had. Reading on one or

the other of those continuous overts on Scientology and nobody picked that up? Audited over out Ruds or grades and nobody picked that up? Ah! So, you've got a corrective action of the auditing, or you've got remaining, or almost all of them, just advancing the case.

Now a case supervisor can advance cases by grades, or he can take an action to get charge off so the grade or action can be undertaken. That sounds funny. But it isn't funny and there's nothing very complex about it. And the case, somehow or another, has gotten to OT 2, and doesn't find any on 3. This simply means the case is too charged to be where it is at the time it is. Now the case wasn't brought up right. That's for sure. So, you might write up something on the order of, "Check the lower grades to see which ones have been run or not run." And the order would be, they would appear like this in a case supervisor folder. It's, "Fly the Ruds to F/ N", that's any rud, first F/ N you get on the Ruds, "Fly the Ruds to F/ N." And there's something I could tell you about that. Actually the guy could have a PTP and he won't F/ N on an ARC break. You should, by the strength of your magic eye, actually make him F/ N on it, but the truth of the matter is if he's got a PTP or a missed withhold, he really doesn't F/ N until he gets to it. So if the PC F/ Ns on an ARC break you are very sure that he hasn't got a PTP or a missed withhold. Do you understand the rationale about it? So if he doesn't F/ N on ARC break don't shoot somebody for it, because it's because he's got a PTP or a missed withhold. If your auditor was absolutely cracker jack he could make him ARC on it. He could make him audit. He could just put his Ruds in. You know? Pffft! Ruds in.

The guys' confidence is such that his Ruds couldn't be out. You know, this kind of thing. 'Cause a rudiment, actually, is something the guy thinks is in his road.

So anyway, the case supervision of such a case will be to fly the Ruds to F/ N. See he's at 2. You look back to the folder, so you don't find much in the way of rehabs, and you say, "Fly the Ruds to F/ N, two, check, rehab or check lower grades." A rehab or run to be absolutely correct. Lower grades you can say, "Check lower grades." Which isn't rehab them. Maybe he's had too many rehabs, but you're fairly sure that there's one out. One or more out. You could say, "Check or run lower grades." Or, "Rehab or run lower grades." It'd be two different case supervisions.

You think this guy, this guy, oh you can rehab somebody half to death, don't you see? So to avoid all the rehab you want him to check these things. Now there's several ways he could do it. He could actually take a list, a list and assess it from the lower grades, and find one that read, if the list would communicate to the person. But the other day we had a little kid, and he'd had several lower grades run on him, and I'll be a son of a gun, nobody'd ever taught him the name of the lower grades, and of course he wasn't a Class VI, he was only eight, and the auditor got in a hell of a fire fight with him, because the kid thought he'd been run on one process while he'd been run on another process. The whole difficulty is that the kid didn't know the names of the processes anyhow. The auditor'd just asked him the questions. Now the auditor, to check up the lower grades, asked with the process names. And so the kid didn't know what he'd been run on, and got into an awful confusion, and dropped out of session. I noticed Vixie barking at him, so I imagine his Ruds are out. He probably has developed an ethics record by this time.

This, this would be a common action. You say, "Something's wrong." Alright, so this comes back to you again, this comes back to you again. There was some charge came off. And you want to get auditors used to just making fall; long fall B/ D type actions, so that you can see how much charge is coming off. You know? On their work sheets. And it didn't take off too much charge, hut it took off some. The fellow had cognited on the fact that he had an ARC break while he was running a service facsimile, and he got the right service facsimile hut he had an ARC break at that time. And the auditor cleaned up the ARC break at that time. He got something off on the Ruds, and he got this bit off, do you see, on having an ARC break, then they run the service facsimile and that's it.

(Sigh) And this is what you're gonna be faced with case supervising some time. The TA was at 4.5 during the whole beginning Ruds and it didn't F/ N. Now, high TA, overrun. Now you have a pat process listing what can be overrun, it's absolutely packaged. You do the same thing with it. You can run it all you want to, any time. It has no limits of any kind whatsoever. You could even be running it up at 9. There is no limit on it. Because if there's nothing been overrun, it simply F/ Ns. And if something has been overrun it's something that's come into restimulation since the last time it was run, don't you see? It's not like a listing process. It's just a bunch of items that you're, you're finding something to audit. So you could do that. Certainly that TA is up. And it comes back to you again. And the TA is at 4.5. And there isn't anything that the fellow thought was overrun. Now that's a wonderful opportunity to do something else. Just because the PC couldn't confront it or think of it, is no reason it isn't there. Something has been overrun.

Normally, in this current civilization at this particular time, I can tell you at once what is there. LSD. LSD—25 is the first compound. Distributed by psychiatry to make drug addicts out of people. To show them, give them an idea of how it feels to be insane. Hecome very popular. Or, it's pot, marijuana, cannabis indica is the prover name, or cannabis americana. The proper name of marijuana, whether grown in India or America. Hashish, which is simDly a solid substance made out of cannabis indica or cannabis americana. All of which looks like tumbleweed growing in some back lot. Very easy to come by. It's one of those. It's one of those. Or it is some medical preparation, or it is some drug which has been administered to treat 'he person for insanity, or it's a biochemical cure, or something of this sort. And the individual thinks that he's been released someplace along that line.

Now you understand, you did the usual to begin with. You asked, "What has been overrun?" But you didn't get to first base with this. It'll be drugs. It'll be drugs. And you'll rehab 'em. And the tone arm behaves and the guy runs great. Those are just standard remedies. First you suspected, you see, that some auditing action was out. That is the easiest and closest one to handle. You couldn't find an auditing action that was out. Or you couldn't find one that was grossly out. Or the one you found out wouldn't straighten out. So, it's a life action. It's a high TA, so something has been overrun.

Now the TA is so low that the individual can hardly crawl. And I've tried to give you some subjective reality, not because you have low TAs, but I've tried to give you just some handling experience—And also, because it works on anybody. And also because you should do it before you; you actually should do it before you do a full rehab. It is your LX—1 process, which is simply an assessment of a prepared list, and then you get the down stat

type of charge off the case. When he thinks he's been a down stat. And you run some engrams to get rid of that, run some overt engrams so that it won't key back in again, or won't be dramatized. And a lot of charge comes off the case, and then you can do a full rehab action. And you can get much more out of the full rehab action. That's just in the interest of getting charge off the case.

Now notice that is a life action. That's actually a case gain type action. It doesn't have to be expressed. But it's a case gain type action.

Now let me show you how you could really foul it up. Because what I've told you is relatively simple. Now I can show you how you really foul it up. Got a high TA, a high TA, so we do an LX1 and run it, without putting, and forget to put in the Ruds. This would be gruesome beyond belief. The guy has a high TA. Well you think that's impossible that anybody would do anything like that? No, I assure you that in past years it has been almost fashionable to believe that the next grade would bring the TA down or up. That's how gross tech can go out. "Oh well TA's at 5. If we give him Power why that will bring it down." Oddly enough Power is actually adequate occasionally to bring it down because it hits some overrun in the process of running it. And it does come down. And that gives somebody a win. But this is one of those wins that has cut somebodies' throat. Because the next one won't come down. It'll just go up through the moon.

No. Your TA must be floating before every major action. That is something that seems very new. But you must float the TA before every major action. The TA must always be floated before a major action. Well the think, get this little think on it. You could say, "Well Christ. If you float the TA before a major action why do the major actions" Well that's somebody that thinks his target is a floating needle. What he actually wants is a discharged case. And a floating needle floats on a release, so that if you comprehend the definition of release, comprehend the definition of erasure, comprehend the general definition of the bank, what it's all about, it becomes very obvious. A persons' reality is, goes up in direct proportion to the amount of charge he gets off his case.

There is some charge which has more quality than other charge. Charge taken off on the grades has more quality. Oddly enough, any charge taken off over enough centuries would probably discharge the case also. The rule is still there. So, you're monitoring against this. The guy bounces out of engrams. A guy can't come close to it. Therefore you want some kind of a discharging process before you send him into some major action. 'Cause he's in need of an assist. He's bunged up like a fire drill. He can't even approach the grades. He can't approach these next actions. So you have this whole little class of processes by which you discharge a case. You can do various little things by which you take charge off a case. If you were to do a category of relatives, just to give you, this is the routine you see. Yes, the prepared list and the prep check. That's one of the methods of taking charge off a case. Do a list of all the different types of relatives an individual can have. There's usually every little girl had a favorite aunt, or something, who will show up as an ally suddenly and mysteriously at the last moment. You know, something like this. So let's do a list of relatives. This individuals talking about family, family, family, family, family, and so let's do a list of aunt, uncle, grandma, grandfather, father, mother, and so on and so forth. Now we're either gonna get an ally or suppressive out of this. We don't care what,

see? All kinds of familial names. And then just for Portmanteau, you know, just for a grab bag and throw one in like friend.

And then we assess it, just standard assessment, and we prep check it, just a standard prep check, and the case starts blowing out. Guy says, "Great sessions" He doesn't realize we're trying to set him up to run something. We can just barely manage to fly the guys' Ruds after a half an hour of sweat. Case is too charged. We are undertaking major actions. So either the other earlier actions that have been undertaken on the case were badly undertaken, and didn't discharge the case the way they should have, or the individual is piling up more charge than anybody has a right to. In some fashion something is going on with this case.

You actually don't have to know what's going on with the case to the degree that you think you do. All you have to know is, let's get some charge off before we do anything else. Let's make this guy easy to fly. If we can't fly this guy easily, aww, let's work on it a bit here, huh? Let's do this, that or the other thing to straighten up. Let's take some charge off. Let's find some charge. Where is it?

So, you'll find yourself case supervising, doing this. Where the hell is some charge here? Of course you're up against the fact that most of the things you see in an auditing session have already been discharged.

Let's go back to a green form done by Mazie Gulch of Dry Gulch, South Dakota, who always is dry gulching PCs, and we're liable to find something very interesting in here. overts. What type of overts does this PC have? What does this PC specialize in here? Oh, a bit here. Yes, he has a lot of ignores... Well what do you know? He ignores dispatches. Ahh, good. Let's make a little list here. Administration, business, organizations, posts, orgs, we'll get some charge off this guy. Assess the thing and prep check it. He says, "God, how did they know?"

So you're trying to find some charge so you can take it off, so that you can undertake it and get in Ruds easily and undertake major actions. That's clever case supervision. That's not clever correction. That is case advancement. You're not correcting the case to that degree. You're trying to advance the case. We're trying to set this case up to run the next grade. He'll get some real advance on the next grade. But we don't let him fumble into the next grade. We wouldn't let somebody go into the Clearing Course who wasn't in pretty good shape on R6EW.

Along with that we have a program where actually you fly the Ruds before you permit somebody to audit solo. He's got to come in and have his Ruds flown. And he's studied the material, got it all taped what he's supposed to do. He's got to come in, and get his Ruds flown before he's permitted to solo audit. And then he's got to turn in the first session to the C/ S and get a C/ S on it, and get his next C/ S before he can do his next session. And then very few people will be getting into trouble. It would only be the dishonest bloke who does seven sessions without a C/ S that wraps himself around a telegraph pole.

But you get what the think is? So, on the one hand we're trying to advance the case by taking off charge, and we're doing it in an auditing session wherebv we're permitting the individual to confront and handle his bank, because of the assistance of the auditor. And we can take off major charge in an auditing action so as to set up a case so he can handle it in solo. If a guy can't handle his case in solo he had better have an auditor. Do you follow?

These are the different attitudes of auditing. There is on the one hand, the planning of it, the putting together of it, and so forth, and then there's the application of it. These are two separate zones and areas. But a guy who can't apply it well is not likely to be able to order it well. And these are the two separate zones and areas that Class VIII has to be expert in. Thank you very much.

AUDITORS ADDITIVES, LISTS AND CASE SUPERVISION

A lecture given on 11 October 1968

Well I forgot my notes. Which lecture number is this? (Fifteen.) Lecture number fifteen, and what is the date? Eleventh of October. That brought you up to present time. Eleven October AD 18.

The subject of my lecture this evening is auditors talk too much. It's impolite, but it's the first discovery I made about auditors when I was first training auditors back in the late '40s. I did train a few, experimentally, and along the line, and I found out they all had one frailty. They said too much.

Now, when a C/ S gets a session that looks nearly perfect, and he gets it, and he says, "Great", and then a couple of days later the PC falls on his head, something has obviously happened in the session which wasn't recorded. The most frequent thing that hastened in the session is an auditor additive of comment, or attitude, which is additive to the business of auditing.

Now it isn't necessarily slight. The additive can be fantastic. I'll give you an exact, direct example that is exact and direct. The auditor asking for ARC breaks, not noted in the report form, but the auditor asking for ARC breaks says, "Now, if you knew anything was wrong you wouldn't hold it from me, would you? You wouldn't refuse to tell me, would you? Now you've, you're giving me the straight dope?" That F/ N's an ARC break needle. What you see on the auditing report is ARCU, CDEI, something like this. He was gentling an ARC break and apparently indicated the thing. And then that craziness ensued. That isn't in the report.

A C/ S is actually at the mercy of the auditor attitude and additive, because the attitude itself is also an additive. When you look at an auditing session, and since my lecture yesterday actually you're to be congratulated on the org 8, you floated nineteen out of twenty one to the examiner, which is fantastic. So, thank you. (Applause.) Thanks very well done.

Now. The business of the smooth TR is simply to put across to the PC, and keep the PC interested in his own bank and his own case. So therefore, the auditor who would say, see the PCs looking for an ARC break. All of a sudden he shatters with this, oh well now, you wouldn't hold anything from me would you? Yeah, you're really telling me the... He hasn't got the foggiest notion, don't you see? The auditor as a personality isn't there. Bang! All of a sudden the personality intrudes. What does the PC try to do? He tries to hold it off. Stow it. And he parks himself to that degree in the session. Do you see that?

Alright. Now. Let's take another one. Let's take another one. PC says, this is also an actual. On the auditors report it reads, "What do you do to make others wrong" PC says he doesn't do anything. F/ N. But the PC, an hour or two later, and the following day, was found to be fantastically upset. Really fabulously upset. After an auditing session the PC is upset. What the devil is this? He's supposed to run his service facsimile, supposed to have gotten a bunch of F/ Ns. What's he doing all upset? Well somebody could say, "well the technology doesn't work." You know? Hmm. Look, the technology works, but somebody just worked too damn well. What actually transpired in that brief period between writing down a question about making others wrong and what is noted as "PC says he doesn't have any was something on this order." You say you don't have any? Ah, come Ant. Come off of it! Come off of it! Come off of it! People have hundred of these things! What do you do?" An ARC broke needle.

How would you like to have that blow up in your face in a session? Totally unexpected. Totally unreasonable. Now when it goes so far as just this. The PC has a cognition. He says, "You know, I don't think I have that problem anymore." You know? He's looking at this. He thinks that's great, you know? It just F/ Ned, and so forth, and the auditor says, "Oh that's great, boy, that's great! Glad to hear it. Boy, that's really with it!" Whew. It said F/ N there, the cognition is written here, but what happened right afterwards? See?

What it is, is a distraction. A sudden distraction. And a session is supposed to smooth out the PC. What happens to the PC if enturbulance is run into it? So what an auditor says just before the session, during the session, and right after the session, in those three immediate periods, which are additive to the actual business of the session, are all additives of a highly useless, derogatory, backwards nature. They're all for the birds.

An auditor who has to be interesting, who has to think he has to persuade the PC, who does this, who does that, actually is building up on top of the top of standard tech a bunch of additives which prevent it from working. That line of action has the C/ S at its' mercy, because it isn't recorded in the report. You can get a report, which apparently looks OK, and from that standpoint, and if you've not sending people to the examiner you've just about had it. Then what you get, you hear from the doctor, or you hear from somebody else, or you hear from the family, or hear from the registrar, "Jukes was here last week. And when he came in he said he was signing up for fa fa fa fow, and you know, he hasn't been back." "What's the matter?" You look at the session. There's nothing in the session that indicates anything. Why?

See, he came to get smoothed out and got roughed up. Well what roughed him up? He put his attention inside. You know? He looked inward, and somebody forced his attention forcefully outward. And just about the time he started to look inside, somebody flipped his attention outward. So, he "goes out of session". That is the commonest source of out—of—sessionedness.

Now a rough TR is one thing that tends to. But it is not actually as near a session destroyer as the additives, the comments. Why comment? See, why comment?

Now some auditors think to be agreeable they have to laugh with the PC. I never do. PC is not aware of me anyhow. He wouldn't know whether I was laughing with him or not laughing with him. Besides, I haven't got anything to laugh about. It's his joke. (Laughter.) I've had PCs chortle and burble, and giggle and cognite from one end of the session to the other while I was sitting there not with any expression on my face. Now it's rather difficult to assume a no—expression. You do have a face.

The next point of evaluation, you have somebody who is ill—intentioned in some fashion or another on the examiner line. PC goes to the examiner, and the examiner looks him over and says, "Oh my god. What happened to you?" Pays feeling great. Actually maybe the examiner has a very bad case of myopia, and he's trying to see what PC it is. Something like this. And the examiner squints and looks at the PC... And the PC thinks there's something wrong with him. And it kills the float.

So there is a subject called no—expression. There is a subject. But this is normally what you will find back of the false auditing report. It is the auditor additive.

Now there's another thing an auditor can do, god help us. There is another

thing he can do. Is to fail to give the next command. In other words, he's not there at all. Now this can also be deadly. When you have somebody who's very green auditing he is liable to chicken. Get scared. And he sees he's put the PC down the track in some fashion or another, doesn't quite know what he's doing. All of a sudden the pays face turns red, or something like this, and he goes... He freezes. Now when he does that the PC then has to extrovert, take control of the situation, and somehow or another come out of it. But he's been put into it by another being, and he has to come out of it by himself. So he actually doesn't make it. To that degree he doesn't make it. So it hangs him up on the track.

Now all of these actions act to hang the PC up on the track. The additives, the comments, and on the other hand, the failure to state. The PC comes into session, the auditor all of a sudden forgets what he's supposed to ask for, and sits there and looks at the PC, and tries to look in his papers. He doesn't put in any R—factor. He doesn't say, "I've got to see here what I'm supposed to do", because it'd be too derogatory of his attitude, or something, and he might sit there for a minute or two without saying anything, racking his wits out. The PC goes half way around the bend because he's expecting something to happen that doesn't happen. Or, right in the middle of a crucial situation the auditor fails to follow the same patter that he has just followed. Engram one, pattern correct, engram two, he blows it. He tells him to go earlier and then in locating the incident, his patter blows up. He forgets to ask for, well he forgets to ask for the date. Forgets to ask what it is. What does he see? Forgets to ask for the duration. And then just says, "Go through it." Now that would be a maddening situation. Do you see? There's an infinite number of varieties by which an omission could also rough up a PC. So auditing, along with standard tech, is that thin, narrow path through being there enough to get the session done, and not being there enough to put on a vaudeville show. Do you see? This is the one thing that is usually hardest to teach.

If I were running an activity where I was very suspicious, and I could be more suspicious of sessions than I am sometimes. My level of trust is too good. But I would actually put it on a slow play tape recorder, which is a voice actuated tape recorder. So that the entirety of the session would run off on tape. Something of this nature, then it could be checked back. Now I wouldn't necessarily put this on as a constant action, but if I had one PC, if I just had one PC fall on his head after he was audited, and I got a report in which seemed to be a well done resort, and the PC promDtly fell on his head and so forth, I would be thinking in terms of listening to that session. I would then want a spy system, you know, where a microphone can be taped, or I would want that... Now these, these spy systems can be escaped. It's a simple matter. Just never use the auditing room that's bugged. Yes, it's happened. Three auditing rooms had microphones in them so that sessions and auditors could be checked, and then they were never used. Nobody ever seemed to give a session in those rooms.

Well at once one should have become very wary, because it so happened at that particular moment the session were very, very, very additive. The reports looked great and the sessions looked like a clown show at the circus. A lot of yik yak going on. Several cases messed up, and so on. It was by auditor additive. So it isn't slight.

Now, one of the ways an auditor additive can occur is with C/ S. An auditor

who is auditing his own PC, he doesn't have a C/ S around, and you will occasionally be in that position, is already breaking down on C/ S. In the first place, he has talked to the PC. In the second place he knows the auditor. So his C/ S is busted on two counts. But there is a thin way to get away with it. And that is merely to make a rigid rule never to C/ S during a session. Never, never C/ S during a session. Write up your C/ S before the session, follow your C/ S rigorously and religiously. When you get to the end of the C/ S end the session. Your next C/ S, write it up dispassionately as though you had nothing whatsoever to do with it. Even cuss yourself out. But if you hold that, you hold that as a very, a very sound, rigid principle, you won't get auditor additives into your session, which is to C/ S at the same time auditing is occurring, because nothing can be more confusing, and it can lead you into an immediate and direct Q and A. You excuse the Q and A on the basis that you've changed the C/ S. Do you follow? And gradually these two things merge, until you become almost educated in Q and A. "We'll just audit the PC on what he needs right now. Let's see. ' And you sit down.

Now the PC himself is distracting. He's somebody to hold on a line. And if you want to deliver all your sessions into the hands of the PC, why then just never C/ S them. So before the session, if you were doing this sort of thing, before the session you would look over the folder, and you would write up your C/ S as a good C/ S. That's what we're gonnado. When you go into the session that's the C/ S you execute. And when you're all done with the session, with that C/ S done, and you write up another C/ S before the next session. And you just win. You just win, win, win. You'd just be absolutely fascinated.

It gets this kind of an oddity. Somebody comes in and says, "Would you audit me?" And you say, "Yes. Just a minute. Where's your folder? I'll get your folder. Yes, come back in fifteen or twenty minutes, and I'll rive you a session." Get the guys' folder from wherever it is, go through the thing, figure it out, write down your C/ S from the folder. Deliver your session. Now the one, the one type of session that isn't true in, is when it isn't a session, it's an assist. Somebody comes bunging up to you, and they just got the railroad rail run through their brisket or something of this sort. You had better know the C/ S for assists so well that you simply go into that and don't do anything else. If it's very handy, the scat where he was hurt, you're going to do a contact. If it's not very handy, you're goina to do a touch assist. If he is at all auditable you are going to run him through the engram of the incident. If it gets heavy and sticks you're going to go to the earlier incident. Earlier, similar incident. That's all the C/ Sing there is.

As far as Ruds are concerned you could make some little gesture at trying to put in the Ruds, but you don't have to fly anything. You understand? Because he's got the PTP. You're looking at it. He's actually in the rudiments. Now you ordinarily wouldn't run a rudiment with an engram. But ordinarily a guy like that isn't in a position to run the engram on. You can do the contact assist, you can do the touch assist, there's very often on a severe one there's got to be some medical patch us of some kind or another. Now when he comes back, remember this is not an assist, this is a session, now you're going to fly the Ruds, and you're going to run the engram of injury, or earlier, similar.

Now somebody's just lost their brother, or something of this sort, and they come in to you crying, and they've got to rush off to the funeral or the hospital or something like that. I assure you there is so little you can do

about it that the more you try to do about it the worse off you're—a—gonna be. Let them handle what they've got to handle, when they come back, formal session, secondary. Earlier similar, secondary. Those are the actions which you take. If you don't take the two actions which I've just given you, a lot of guys are going to hang up. You'll see people going around in grief. Very upset. You ask them, and somebody, somebody ran recall it or something. Keyed it out. They didn't erase it. And it keeps keying back in again. You see this guy all bunged up, and you say, "What's the matter? What's the matter?" "Well" he says, "about two or three months ago I broke my leg." And you say, "Anybody ever run the engram?" "Yes. I had a touch assist." It's actually the formal... Entirely different thing.

So that there is a formal auditing side of this, and the C/ S for that is very exact. You go in, you do just that. You do what you're supposed to do at the moment of emergency. You don't have to fly the Ruds. Contact assist, or it's a touch assist if the objects and so forth aren't available. You bring 'em around any way you can. You have them tended to by the plumbers. Give him a shot of morphine, anything like that if they're in agony. And then when they have progressed and they are not in a state of physical shock, why they can stand up to run an engram. But by that time they can also stand up to flying their Ruds. Do you follow?

So later on, when you run the engram or the secondary, you're not doing an assist. That's just a session. Do you get the difference between these two things? So an assist, you can handle the apparent PTP that is in front of you without a C/ S, if you always know what the C/ S for it is. And I've just given it.

Now. If you want to commit professional suicide it's to badger, badger around with somebody without a set up C/ S or a case study in front of you, because you're liable to run into some very tiger—ish situations. I'll give you an idea. You say, "Well he just mentioned this, he just mentioned his brothers' death. ' Something like this. "He just mentioned his brothers' death. But this secondary's never been run. I'll run it." Ahhh. How, how, what were you doing? Well, you say it's OK because it F/ Ned, and I'll just add in, and I'll run this secondary here, and... You don't know if that case is going to fly or not on this subject. You don't know anything about it. Let's take a look at this.

Now I'll give you a few little tips of one kind or another. In doing C/ Ses, in doing a C/ S you should be far more careful to set up the case to be audited than an auditor ordinarily would be. You look for places to take charge off of this case. Let's shave this case down. You look for symptoms and signs of a very overcharged, or special—type case. Somebody carts you in a six inch thick review folder. Ahh! Resistive case. You don't immediately say he's been badly audited for the last two years. Because the law of averages are that some time during the last two years he has run into an auditor who could audit, and if he'd run into an auditor that could audit he wouldn't have it six inches thick, it'd only be three inches thick. Do you get the idea? So obviously, if all this period of time nobody's been able really to pack up this case and figure out what it is all about, why in that length of time if nobody has, there's something very, very, very peculiar. And the thing that is peculiar, this you have to keep in mind. The thing that is peculiar is standard tech is out on it.

There's a dear old lady. I think she even wore, you've heard me speak of this

old lady before. She even wore the little bonnet with the flower off the top of a long stem. And when she walked, the bonnet flower bobbed. She was the most precise, prim, proper little old lady you ever saw in your life, and nobody could get to first base on her case. I think her tone arm was a dirty tone arm. And nobody'd ever been able to pick any withholds or overts off of her. What we used was the exaggerated overt. Which is perfectly valid. It works. It's perfectly valid. Somebody won't give you up his overts, and so forth, you... It's a rather harsh, but perfectly valid, way of pulling an overt. You multiply the overt. What you are trying to get them to confess to is so much more horrible than what they are, than what they are guilty of, do you see? But you can actually make up a list for the auditor. "Have the PC questioned on the following points. Murder, bank robbery, desertion, child slaughter, bigamy." See? You can put down a list like that. Horrible. The little old lady said, no, she wasn't guilty of any of those crimes. All she'd ever done was commit adultery on her husband for the last forty years. With all of his friends. And it blew the case sky wide and handsome, and it rolled beautifully. What was wrong with the case? The Ruds were out. That was all. But this was one of the most resistive cases in a whole area. It was a famous case. Ruds out. And so they go. So they are.

And in your C/ Sing, in your C/ Sing you want to get some kind of an estimate of how, how tough is this cookie? You can write up, you can write up and broaden, enormously, the seven types of cases. They ought to be called, by the way, special cases to your PCs. People like to be special cases, not resistive cases. But you can write a very, very large assessment sheet out of those seven resistive cases. Furthermore, you can assess it sectionally. You notice the first time it was ever assessed the former therapy read once and then went out. And out of valence was the item. Well now you could have another assessment done, or you could just grab the brass ring as you went by and assume also that there's former therapy, and your next action is former therapy. Run the engrams of former therapy, you already got the assessment out of it, see? It fell on the first one.

Now, if you wanted to be more positive about it, you could take a whole assessment sheet of just former therapy. You see that it read once. Now you can broaden this. It slashed once and then went out, so there's something there. Now we can broaden, and we can list any kind of a former therapy that we can think of. And we could shake out of the hamper the exact type of former therapy it was. Now that would be important, because you see some former therapies are engrams, and some former therapies can be rehabbed. Now in hypnotism and yoga, and several other analogous practices and so forth, there is a rehab available. Furthermore, drug therapy, under sedation for a long period of time and so forth, is very often rehabbable. So, that's already on the list, drugs. But it might not come up under the heading of former therapy. People, this personal say, "Well I never took drugs. I was just under morphine for seven years in the general hospital. We see this all the time. So you can do an expansion. You can do an expansion. And what I told you earlier, in session you have got, in a session, only to touch the corner of something and you can slide in on it. It's as though the bank flew little, tiny flags out to the side. And you can see these little flags. And your job is to try to find one of these little flags and slide in on it.

Now, you saw, for instance, the guy, the guy has sciatica, or something of this sort. And this, you're not trying to cure his sciatica, it's just an index of

case. What the hell's he doing with sciatica, or whatever it is? What's he doing with this? He's a grade three release. He shouldn't have a psychosomatic illness. You get the idea? I mean, that's your think. "Hey, this guy's been audited. He shouldn't be doing that." There's something goofy out, here, some place. Alright, let's see if we can pinpoint this. Now all you're really doing is looking for an area of charge. You're not trying to process against a significance. You just want to discharge this case. When this case is sufficiently discharged you couldn't care less about the flat feet of humanoids. That's why I'm very insulted when the medicos, and so forth, say, "You're busy healing." Nobody's interested in healing bodies. But you take a fellow who is, who is ill in some quarter or another, I can assure you that there's a sweat deal of charge available in that area. Do you see? The case is heavily charged. It's aberrated in some fashion. So your job is, how do you discharge this case as a case supervisor?

Now your first and foremost way to charge the case is send him up through the grades. That's your first and foremost way to charge a case. Next grade. He's made the grade, good, send him onto the next grade. Great. Now let's say he has had these grades, according to his record, and he's still got lumbosis. Now you should get curious at this point as to what this is all about. Because what it is, actually, is that a grade is out some place, or a rud is out some place.

Now, theoretically you could put in the Ruds ahead of the sessions. You could also put them ahead of a major action or an engram in life, you could also put them in at the beginning of track. You could do all sorts of weird things with rudiments. But it is a very, very touchy situation, I assure you, to start running back Ruds which are not limited in the command. Now you could put the Ruds in for the last session, if you said the last session. You could even put the Ruds in, in the last few sessions, by saying "Lately". See? "Lately have you been audited over an ARC break?" Lately. Otherwise, you're liable to dive clear back to the beginning of track or... You can actually earlier similar, when you start putting in Ruds earlier, you can actually do an earlier similar, clear on back to god help us. Now you could say the date of the engram is 1862, and you could say, "Just prior to that incident what rudiment was out?" Now you're stuck with it, because you're gonna have to say earlier similar. Earlier similar, earlier similar, earlier similar, and oh my god, you're going to have to start running this case on nothing but a rudiment, clear back to the beginning of track. The case you're running it on is in no shape to pick up an ARC break ahead of Incident 1. He's never even heard of a body thetan. You see why it's one of these things like R2—12. You hardly dare trust it to anybodies' hands because it works so fast. But it isn't, this isn't a matter of trust. It's simply a matter of the second you start putting in Ruds on earlier similar, you're liable to get a rud hung.

Now the only thing you can do with it is earlier similar, you start putting Ruds that far back and you're getting the whole track PTP, the whole track ARC break, and this is going to be run on a case which isn't prepared to run anything like that. And the case'll fall on its' head just sure as hell. A case runs just below the level of its' available reality. The current reality of the case demonstrates how much charge you can set off the case. What is the current reality of the case?

Now a person who is at low, down in the lower grades, and so on, he maybe has many, many things wrong with him. But he has no reality on of any kind

whatsoever. It wouldn't even read on the meter. Do you follow? So your safest C/ S is on something that will read. And therefore you take the assessment.

You can actually have some fellow who is going around on crutches and you say, "What is wrong with you?" And he could tell you, "I've got an ear ache." And you could say, "Well then, something wrong with your legs or something like that?" "Oh well, that. Yeah that's, that's just nothing. It just, it bothers me." Well if he never got well physiologically, and after something or other, there's obviously some terrific charge on the case or body that is holding it that far out of line, and your task as case supervisor is, is it available?

Well it's only available if he has some awareness of it. And the way you measure his awareness is with a meter. Now you can look all the way through a folder, find an awful lot of blunders, and have somebody try to put these blunders to rights. Particularly on somebody who wasn't trained. You try to put these blunders to rights. You know them, you've seen them in the folder. You order foolishly as a C/ S to go through all of the persons' earlier grades, and do all of the auditing, and point out all of the overruns and BPC in all of the earlier grades, and you're liable to find the auditor you're C/ Sing for in a sudden fire fight with the PC, under the heading of invalidation. The guy thought his lower grades were great. So that is why you take these little assessments. Just let me teach you that.

You can see what's wrong. Is it real to the PC? The way you measure whether or not it is real to the PC, is not what is the most wrong, but what is the most real to the PC. And so you write up an assessment. Now you know very, very, very well that this guy goes out and wrecks cars. This seems to be the thing he does. This is a life manifestation. Now you, from your viewpoint, are very foolish if you're trying to, going to get him over wrecking cars. If that's the goal you set as a C/ S, why to hell with it. But the symptom of wrecking cars shows you there's something very obsessed about this fellow someplace. And it's no magical one button. It's just some kind of charge, and it'll eventually come off in one way or the other. But it shows the case is very, very heavily charged, because he seems to talk a lot in his sessions about cars, and wrecks, and you know, it just seems to be coming up. Well, let's do an assessment. Let's write up. So you'd write up an assessment like, "Cars, drivers, policemen, highways." Just get a whole bunch of... "Motors, speed" you know? "Rest." Anything you care to put together, and then have your auditor assess this and then he assesses it very nicely, and he comes out with one that is reading.

Now that is not what is the most wrong with him. It is what he has got the best reality on. Now you could do an L—1 on it, you could prep check it, you probable could even find an engram chain on it. More rarely, if it indicated as such, you might be able to find a secondary chain on the subject. There's a lot of things that you can do with this.

Now you've got his item. Now you've got this item. And this item doesn't mean... It's just an assessed item, it's from your list, it isn't the make or break of the case, but it does show you a zone or area of available charge, which when bled off the case will leave the case less charged up, and with a higher level of reality. And the reality and awareness of the case increases in direct proportion to the amount of charge off.

Now the case supervisor's trying to solve things like this when the case doesn't seem to be able to do what is asked of him. He doesn't seem to be

able to do these things. He's... Well it's represented by a high TA. Somebody has been audited up through the grades.

Here's a typical case supervisor problem. And you'll go ahh when you see this one. See? Something like this. A guy is a, if he's a grade three, lower grade three, his TA is at 5, and he doesn't much like auditors. And he's come in for a session. Now what's this? What's this? What the hell is his TA doing up there? Well, your first action, of course, is to take his folder if you can get your hands on it, and you take his folder and you go back to a point where the case was running well and the TA was not extreme. Now you can come forward from that point and you can find some clue as to what went on. It isn't necessarily, however, an auditing overrun. It isn't always auditing to blame. The guy got married twice without getting divorced.

So that you in actual fact now, in coming forward from that point, it could be as corny as this. You found out that he didn't have any trouble getting F/ Ns last January. But so help me Pete right now, wow. This is stuck McGluck, man. He's parked at high 6. And no parachute. What're you going to do with him? Well you know, you can run one of these lists which isn't a listing question, but which will give you an item. Now when you use a question like this it's a border line thing. It might list to one item. But it also might not, because it isn't a proper listing question. But you can still do it, and it won't damage the PC any, providing somebody doesn't try to horse around with it. So the auditor that does it has to understand that it's not a one item list, and he's not supposed to do anything with this thing. He's just trying to find out what reads. What happened since January the twenty eighth, which is the date of the session in which it read. What's happened since January the twenty eighth date? And he tells you this and he tells you that, and he tells you something else, and tells you something else, and all of a sudden something reads.

Without even discussing the matter of overrun, a prep check on the thing might very well knock the TA down. But you certainly have got to set this case up. This case has done something since then. Something has happened, and if you don't set the case up you'd better damn well not run four. And this is where your expertise comes in. This is where your expertise... Now expertise is very standard. There's nothing much to it. The only thing you're really trying to do is find an area where charge can be removed from the case and remove it. Now you obviously have to remove it with a process the PC can do.

Now, all of a sudden, we find this guy, and we do an assessment of seven cases, or we do this or that, or... On lower grade PCs like that the common action is a green form with itsa, similar itsa, lists forbidden. And it rubs down, and it finds zones and areas, and before it F/ Ns, however, you're liable to find another zone or area which wouldn't F/ N, because the process is not, not beefy enough. And you find some interesting things have gone on.

Now it gives you another zone. Because anything down toward that F/ N, before that F/ N, if it's on another subject on the green form, which leads to it, is of course C/ S bait. Do you see? Now you could do an itsa, you could do an itsa, early similar itsa on a Green form, carry it on down the form. The thing doesn't go F/ N all the way through the form. You say, "Oh my god! Now what do we do? Because we have just run out of ammunition Well your first thought is the form was badly done, very badly done. And your second thought that it was badly done on the first page. So therefore you look over

all this carefully, and you could now establish a little assessment that can be done, which reestablishes your suspicion. And it's little items that come off the green form. You can have these assessed. Which one of these was out? Which one didn't the auditor set? Ha ha. You can cross play this. Do you see what I mean?

And one of the most fantastic things is somebody with some, some withhold like drugs. Drugs can shoot the TA up; The guy got up to grade three, and then all of a sudden, for some reason or another, he met some of his old pals that he used to have trips with and he's busy... He used to smoke with them a lot, and so on. And just talking to these birds. He doesn't take it up again. He'll tell you quite truthfully, "No, I didn't do any." But just talking to these characters keyed in. He keyed himself in. Of course, obviously it's a rehab action.

So, I'm just telling you the various categories of entrance. And it isn't very tricky. It isn't very tricky, because the law which governs it is, is you find an area of charge on which the PC has reality, and audit it with a simple action. Now, you can find an area of charge on which the PC has reality, and get it audited with a simple action. And now you can find, and there is another area of charge where the PC has reality, and audit it with a simple action. All of a sudden the case is sitting there with an F/ N. That was all you were looking for in the first place. You say, "Run grade four." And we were not interested in all the tortures of the damned he was going through as to whether or not he was going to tell the auditor, we aren't interested in the depth of the ARC break he had with his cat. These things are not of interest. The actual interest in the matter, first and foremost and right straight across the line, is simply and only that you mustn't start a major action without flying the needle. And this is gonna be one of our big problems. You don't think so. But this is gonna be your major case supervisor problem, because it'll be to you, with great urgency and emergency, that all cases are brought. You immediately get nothing but the tough cases. The easy cases are wrecked independent of your interference. (Laughter.) Right away you've got rough cases. "Yes, what about this folder, what about this folders" A foot and a half thick. And grade zero.

And you follow the same formula, go back to find a time that the case was running well. Try to find out what happened to the case from that time forward. Do some simple action that will establish it further and get charge off. And your whole action is find a simple action on which the person has reality. Have something on which the person has reality, perform a simple auditing action on it and get charge off. If that didn't work, then you try to do it forward, if that didn't work, you wanna find some action, some sphere where the PC has reality, perform some simple action which gets charge off the case, and then see if you can push it. Do you understand? It's just a case of bmp, pow. It's a case of hunt and punch actually. Now it's not very hunt and punch, because you're using standard actions to do all this, and you must keep firmly in mind this one thing. Is it's the case that's variable, not the technology you're applying. And man, these cases have got an infinity of complexities. Infinite complexities. What people can do, and how they can get messed up, and what thinks can get cross wise in them, probably couldn't be computed on an IBM computer:

Now it looks so big and so complex that you could confuse the postulates and stuck ideas and incidents and experiences of the individual, with the

very simple actions you have to work with. You see? They look so simple. They're so easy. And your most progress you're going to get on the case is the next grade. If the case is to be put on the next grade, you've got to be able to fly the needle, with GIs. If the PC is in such a state that the needle won't fly, there is something wrong. There is something out along the line of standard tech. He really didn't get as far as he got. Or something weird has happened in his life to key him in upside down and backwards. And it is your job as a C/ S simply to see that no new next grade or section is started on him unless the needle flies easily.

Now I will go further than that in the OT sections. I will monkey around with a case until it blows out of its' head. This hunt and punch around with the case, until he finally exteriorizes. Now what am I doing? I'm just hunting and punching around. He's gone, that... Now actually I could get him up to 7 and make him do 7 and 8, and all of that is great and so on, but he actually should have blown out of his head at about 5. See? He should've blown out of his head at 5 or 6, and if he hasn't blown out of his head at 5 or 6 then there's an earlier section out.

Now there's probably an... We can't go back and put the case ready to fly and then do the earlier section, 'cause it's done. Now what are we going to do? See? Well it did get him a little bit further, and so on. But I would be, I would hunt and punch around until I took enough charge off the case. Start taking it off directly. An assessment of exteriorization, death, release, beating it, doing a bunk, leaving, responsibility, possessions, bodies. Do an assessment. All of a sudden, pang! Death. This individual's got being out of his head associated with death.

Now look at the number of things you could do with this. Obviously can't get out of his head for some reason best known to somebody. He's still got something, or somebody or himself, has got some kind of a stuck death. So you could actually run a chain of engrams of death. I mean, elementary. Now you can vary that. It's how can you bypass the F/ N? You could key it out by recall, you could run the overt, you could run the motivator. Usually run by key out the recall, run the overt series to F/ N. See? Recall to F/ N, overt series would then be the last action. See? Recall to F/ N, motivator to F/ N, overt to F/ N. There's three F/ Ns available on the same material. Then see how he's doing.

Well, let's see we get a report something like this. "We assessed out death, and when I tried to run a death the PC said he, actually he went back down the track, TA 1.2, and wasn't able to find anything. And however he felt good about it. But actually there weren't very many good indicators in at the end of the session."

Now what's that told you? What you know now, huh? What you know? You know that the knuckle-headed auditor didn't make a correct assessment. That's what you know. You had your nice little list, and all of a sudden he gave you an item that was in some fashion forced to read. The one that would have read is the one on which the PC has the greatest reality, and he obviously didn't have very much reality on this because he couldn't get back and run anything. Do you follow? That's your think. So you know you've got a mis-assessment.

We had one the other day. Damndest fire fight you ever cared to see. Ran something like this. "I gave the PC the first command and told her what we were going to run, and she said, 'You know, I didn't understand that at the

time it was assessed And so, I told her what it meant, and then I said I didn't think we should run it. But she said that it was alright to run it, and so we did." And it's one of those "Do not send to find for whom the bell tolls." An assessment because of non—comprehension. Which gives you a clue that your assessment should be checked. Now if you give, now let me teach you a little bit of piece about assessment. If you assess something, and then send it to the C/ S, and then the C/ S says to run something on it, when you start to clear the command, if you find out that he didn't know the item is your face red. Because you assessed against a misunderstood. The PC couldn't have even dimly been in session or interested in what was going on, because all he hung up on and read was the fact that he didn't understand you. So it must have been a very corny assessment indeed.

The thing to do in such a instance would be to quick, like a bunny, get the misunderstood off, reassess it. Almost cruelly on the basis. "Now are there any other..." When you've finished the assessment, "Are there any other words on this assessment you didn't understand?" You know? Stick it back in the folder and send it back to the C/ S. You know, it's an "Is my face red" type of submission.

But that is the correct action, not to run it. Because look at the mechanics I'm trying to teach you here. The reality of the PC is totally violated. A PC that doesn't understand what some very simple word means. Well actually, you're actually auditing then in a zone or sphere of "What was that?" Is that in the direction of reality? It's in the direction of total unreality. So you wouldn't dare audit such a thing. It would be horror beyond horror. You wouldn't dare audit such a thing.

Now you say therefore there ought to be some sort of a drill on which we go over the whole list, and take us each one of the words on the list before we assess it, in order to clear if on the list there are any misunderstands. No. Instead of that we don't inspect before the fact any where along the line. We ask the person, we can ask the person before we run it. Now the reason why you don't hang up PCs and give them the assessment is, they walk off and self audit it. You've given him the item, you've given him the item "dog chains". You didn't do anything about it, and then you finally say, "That's your item. Your item is dog chains." So you get it mixed up with listing and nulling. Then the PC goes out of session saying, "Dog chains, dog chains, dog chains. Yes." They come back the next session, it's overrun already, and then you overrun it. See? You set yourself up to fall on your head.

If you trust the auditor completely, and if you're not having any assessment trouble, and auditors can do the assessment, the actual act of C/ S is, "Assessed list fow fow, or assess the following items, take what reads and...", prep check it, list one it, do what you will do with it. Find an engram about it, you know, whatever you're going to say about it. See?

Now the proper auditing action is after the assessment is done you do the action at once. And then the person says they don't understand that. 'Cause you try to clear it with them at that time, which is proper auditing procedure. You've got to clear the auditing command. And they say, "Yeah, well I meant to tell you I didn't know what that means." You say, "Thank you very much. Thank you. We'll clarify what that means. Yes, that means boaga boo , so fwa fwa fwa , that's something you lead a dog around on. That's it. Yes. Now we're going to do an assessment." (Click, click, click, click.) Assess it out again, and you find it now comes out entirely different. Not the other one

that read, because what you were getting were latent reads on top of the misunderstood. Now you'll get the one on which he's getting a reality. So your assessment is always assessed against the pcs' reality. And the only reason you do an assessment at all is to get close to where the pcs' reality on the situation is.

You can look in a six inch thick folder, and you can find it in this six inch thick folder there are eight thousand nine hundred and sixty two auditing errors. Now, question is, I've already given you an example of this. You start patching up the list but he didn't have any reality on the list being wrong. It's also something a trained auditor has to do to patch up a list. He's got to be very skilled on the laws of listing and nulling to patch up a list, otherwise he'll dog breakfast the list, again.

So your safest action, I then showed you, is assess a list. Auditors, auditing, sessions, reviews, you know, any word that you could think of in regard to this. Then you assess it. Now you've got the pcs' greatest reality. Now you run that on, and you'll find that the PC gets some charge off and it starts straightening out.

Now how many times could you do this? Well I don't know. It's almost an infinity of times. It's not a limited action. Now the funny part of it is, that limited actions only occur in the presence of out TRs. Almost any action becomes a limited action in the presence of bad TRs. Bad TRs, auditor additives, auditor omissions, and so on, add up as nice as you please. You limit the processes. And you can audit a guy so baaly, believe it or not, that the simplest process in the book, right here, this...

Now I've suddenly given you a no—comm bridge and changed to an entirely different subject. But it is relates to this. Because I've been telling you how to C/ S and so forth. Now I'm going to tell you something else about it.

I started in to tell you that the C/ S is a bit at the mercy of the additives or omissions or the rotten TRs, and so forth, of the auditor who is auditing for him. And that might have left you in a slight puzzlement exactly what is the extent? No, you're not puzzled about it because you have a reality on it. You think you understand it. I got news for you, you don't. This one you have to learn.

This is very upper level material. This is level 7 and 3 section material. So therefore, you go trying to teach somebody this and you're gonna wrap him around a telegraph pole if he isn't already up the sections. So I give you warning. What you want to do is put it into peoples' heads that they mustn't add, they mustn't do omissions, and they've got to have good TRs.

Now I want to give you the reasons back of this. The reasons back of this. It is under the heading of the anatomy of an overrun. The anatomy of overrun is a very interesting anatomy. You would say, "Well, it's been run too long, so it goes up. That's great. That's very simple. But that is the overall mechanic of the thing and the overall appearance, and the overall datum. What is actual fact happens? Why is an overrun an overrun?

Well I can give it to you just one, two. At some time or another the PC decided to stop it, and from that point on it is getting overrun. And that is all an overrun is.

Let's take a series of engrams. The individual you're running engrams on the track. It goes more solid, you have to get earlier similar. Why do you have to get earlier similar? Because you're running down a chain of incidents where he has already got the consideration that it's already gone on too damn

long. You've got to go back and get the incident where he first decided it had better stop. You don't in actual fact get the first incident on the chain. It isn't there.

The first experience he had in this particular line of country he didn't stop. It was alright for lions to jump on him. He didn't mind it. Thought, "What the hell?" So the lion jumped on him and chomped up a body, well he just mocked up another body. To hell with it. A body, easy come, easy go. So what. After a while he start deciding bodies are very important and lions shouldn't do that, and so on, so he decides to stop lions from jumping on him. And now we have a chain of animals leaping upon bodies which goes on for years and years and eons and eons, and you start tracing this thing back. And it goes into the millions and tens of millions, and hundreds of millions of years ago. How the hell did you ever get a chain like that? Well it's running back to somewhere in the vicinity of the original stop.

It's "This type of action must cease". That's what he has determined. This type of action must cease. And that is the point which you have to get out of it. And that is why in the materials of 3, you get my instruction to get the stop out. And in ninety percent of the time if you don't take the stop out of 3, it is already a bit late on the chain, and it won't blow. Other incidents and actions have happened before that. So wherever we look on the track we find this is true. And that is the datum which compares to all the other datum, and is the datum which makes engrams stick, makes them go more solid, which makes things overrun.

Alright. Now let's take the rudiments. Now this is very interesting. In actual fact it is impossible to put in the rudiments too often. That's theoretically. It's theoretically impossible to put the Ruds in too often. There is no limit on the number of times you can put in somebodies' rudiments. Yet, you will look in a folder and you will sometimes see this. ARC break, up TA. Overrun, down TA. Well how the hell could that happen?

Now let me give you an exact way it could happen. At fifteen minutes before lunch the auditor starts a two hour session. He just has time to get in the Ruds. He gets these Ruds in laboriously, they go to lunch. And he comes back from lunch, he sits down, and puts in the Ruds. Ah, but the PC expected a major action. So he stops the auditor putting in the Ruds. And up goes the TA.

There's a folder kicking around which runs like this. It's actually criminal. It's fly each rud to F/ N, and then; and it gives about six more instructions; so some time just before supper the fellows flew each rud to F/ N on a PC who does an awful lot of itsa—ing. Alright. Just before suDper, flew each rud to F/ N. Took a long time. You might have known the PC. It always takes a long time to fly a rud on this PC. The PCs gabby. Took a break, went to supped came back, and once more flew each separate rudiment. Didn't even just check 'em. Flew each separate rudiment. Even then it took quite a while to push the TA up, but eventually the TA went up to 4.25. On putting in rudiments. What two things happened?

Now the PC could have had all the work she'd done to get rudiments in invalidated while waiting for something major to hasten in the session, or the PC simply was trying to stow him from putting in the Ruds. So the pass invalidated or the PCs trying to stop. The PC invalidated, TA goes down, trying to stos, TA goes up. So a C/ S knows at once whether or not the PC was overwhelmed by invalidation in some fashion, or knows whether he was

so rough and crude and dull in his action or was doing something so stupid the PC was trying to stop him. PC trying to stop him, TA goes up, TA down, invalidation and overwhelm. You got that?

Now in the first place, what the hell makes one of these chains? You're already aware that you're mocking everything up. How come this damn chain can stay there? That's curious, isn't it? Well, it's out of 8. Actually it's the exercise of permeation for control. Control by permeation. And if you want chairs to tip over, and that sort of thing, without having a hand laid on 'em, of course you'll permeate them and tip them over.

So let us take now this guy who had the lion jump on him. And he's got a long chain of being destroyed by lions, fighting lions, shooting lions, and he's clear, for god's sakes. And you start dredging around and all of a sudden you find this wild chain. Having to do with lions. Well let me tell you the exact circumstances of how that chain came into being. It used to matter, it used to didn't matter a damn. And then one fine day he decided he was tired of getting bodies mucked up, or lions mucked up, or something. And so, as the lion leaped through the air he permeated the lion, he permeated his environment to control it in order to stop the lion. This is very successful. You can stop things this way like a bomb. There's no trick in this. It's done by permeation. And, you're just every where at once. You know? Well it freezes, or it does something else. Or it goes off in the other direction, don't you see? You can make it do what you please.

Alright, that was great. That was great. And then one day a lion jumped on him. The frequency, the length of the track, permits the most unlikely incidents to repeat. There's sufficient variation that you finally you'll get on one of these points again, somewhere up the track. So anyhow, the lion jumps on him, he permeated the lion stopping him from jumping, and at that moment a lion jumped on his back that he hadn't noticed. This caused a dispersal. He thought he had the environment under control, and there was a piece of the environment he didn't have under control. Which causes him to shift his attention from this lion to that lion. So this lion hits him. And he loses his body anyway.

Now on that failure chain he will have already got the basic of stomping lions from jumping on him, and now you get a can't stop lions chain. Now the damn fool will keep on going through this permeation act long after it doesn't work. And it gives him a chain of pictures. Quote, unquote, "pictures". They're very funny looking pictures, they're very thin pictures. They're mostly energy, frozen. Do you see—the mechanics? Well it takes a distraction to put him into a chain of loses. And after a while he doesn't permeate things, but he still does permeate things, and he can't understand why, after he walks out of the room he has a picture of a phonograph. Do you see? Well, that failed, so he doesn't take responsibility for the action any more, but a thetan can permeate anything anyhow. And it's often a surprise to me that things in my vicinity don't move. But my body will move, my hands will move, but that doesn't move. That's 'cause I'm holding it still why my hand moves. A thetan is very clever. See? And you have to be careful what you permeate. There are many things you shouldn't permeate, obviously. You had better stop permeating. I suppose somebody who has done that, and so forth, has a whole chain of invisible pictures. Refraining from permeating.

But regardless of all of that, I'm telling you this mechanic, which is simply a

mechanic, the mechanics of handling things, because it was a distraction which gave him his first lose on stopping. Up to that time he didn't care whether he stopped things or not. Now he becomes frantic about stopping. And it took a distraction like, he stopped, he permeated the lion in front, and turned him around in the air and sent him somewhere else. Right at the same time the lion; he was going to do this, you see? Right at the same time the lion hit him from the rear. So, he starts for this lion, stops this lion, and he gets this lion, but he hasn't got this lion under control, and he gets so confused he didn't know what the hell lion he's trying to control, and it's by distraction. And you'll find then that distraction is an interesting point to handle in the PC. It's handled just by discharging the case. But an engram which has got distraction in it, if you were really gonna run this thing out come hell or high water, regardless of how late it was on the chain, will really hang you up. Boy, you really can sweat as an auditor trying to run out this engram which has distraction on it. Do you see?

He almost, he was running the car into a tree when another car hit him in the side. Brother, you try to unwind that engram and you're generally going to have a ball. It's going to take earlier similar, do you see? Why? Because it's got the failure point has been dramatized in it, which is the distraction in it. Do you see? It's a whole chain of distractions. And to get down to the earliest distraction is some times a bit of a trick. There's too many conflicting forces to rationalize. Do you see this?

Now we come right back to what I was talking to you about in the first place. What do you think about a distractive auditor in a session? That's interesting, isn't it? If that was his first point of failure to permeate and if it's dramatized on him at the same time he's trying to introspect and handle his bank, and he's been distracted in some peculiar fashion by some idiocy. Actually his tolerance of distraction is fairly high. He isn't scared to death. But interjected comments, evaluations, invalidations, the auditor not taking care of the environment, a gale of wind starts coming in through the window and the auditor doesn't go over and close it, you know? Any one of these things which causes a distraction in the session, doesn't necessarily ruin the PC, because there isn't anything really violent happening with the PC. But is sure sort of hangs him with a session. And he can't get on with it. The reason he can't get on with it is because it's got the element of distraction. The unpredictability. And there is where the importance of TRs begins.

Now have you got the whole mechanism? I suppose the auditor not saying anything is, he was counting by that time on a lion tamer to reach out with a noose and grab the lion, and the lion tamer one time didn't grab out with the noose and grab the lion, and it was an omission, so omission becomes distractive too. He expects something to happen and it doesn't happen. It's plus or minus side of the ledger. Do you see then the essence of smoothness, of predictability of doing what the auditor is supposed to do in the session? Not adding to it, not subtracting from it, and carrying on with the actions necessary to resolve the case? Now part of the actions necessary to resolve a case are the auditor auditing him.

Now I'll give you another little piece of this. It's the auditor plus the PC, versus the pcs' bank makes it possible then to audit pieces of the pcs' bank. So therefore, for you to do an assessment of what the PC should go off and audit, is bonkers.

Let's look at this again. You do an assessment on a list which you now give to the PC, and you tell him to go off to his solo session, or something, and do this L—1 on wuf wuf. You assessed it. Now his reality then is always increased in the presence of an auditor. His reality on his bank is increased in the presence of the auditor, because he's got that much more attention he can put on his bank, right? So therefore the assessment will go deeper than he himself, all by himself, has reality on.

This gives you three or four phenomena which sometimes make you very curious as to what happened. A PC walks out of session and says something entirely different happened. If you look on an examiners' report sometime, this PC maybe has been audited for half an hour, and the PC comes out and tells the examiner, "All we did was assess a list." Trinity—god, the persons' list... "Yeah, we assessed a list, but there were about fifteen other actions present before the list was assessed."

Well, what was being done before that, is this is a negative gain. What was done before is no longer important to the PC. It's erased, they're gone. Not important. PC doesn't comment on it. But the list hasn't been run yet. Furthermore, it's been assessed by the auditor, so the second the PC walked out of session, if the PC was given the item, the PCs liable to walk out of that session overwhelmed. 'Cause he got the item and it was actually not the reality level of the PC. It was the reality level of the auditor plus PC. The PC safeguarded was able to confront the bank enouan to inspect what was going on. But the PC all by himself couldn't. You got that?

So it enters into this equation. So there are many rules the auditor plays in auditing which he really doesn't really suspect. He actually increases the reality of the PC during the session. The PC can become much more aware of his own bank. The pcs' pictures in running engrams are liable to be far brighter, go brighter, when the auditor is auditing him. Then some auditor or other, I do a C/ S for him. The C/ S is to run some engrams. I intend it to be audited on him, and so on. And he goes off and audits himself like, wow. You see I already have given him a C/ Sed action so it isn't likely that he'll run into this on his own volition. I'm already undercutting his reality to some slight degree by making sure that it's correct, but nevertheless that it's pushing the case a bit. And that's supposed to handle the situation. Well, it's audited. He goes and audits it on himself, he wraps himself around a telegraph pole. Do you see why?

So, the auditor can be a definite liability to the session by additives, or subtractives from the session. He can actually provide sufficient distraction to key in or hang up the PC in the session. He can make an unlimited process actually appear limited, because the PC is busy trying to stop his doing it, which then gives you the whole phenomena of overrun, because the PC has already decided it's overrun. I think Ruds are overrun, TA up. See?

Now a PC isn't aware he's doing this. He's operating, however, to do this. Or, on the other hand, the auditor in there pitching, sitting there just doing his job routinely, nothing very magical about it. He says what he has to say, he's got his TRs are in, he gives the auditing command, he gets them executed, he follows through and does his job right straight on through, actually has enormously increased the reality of the PC as he moves on up the line, and so has permitted him to confront parts of the bank and handle it that he never under gods' green earth all by himself would be permitted to do. So there's a very plus and there's a very minus to the situation. And there's a

lot to be gained and a lot to be lost all on the same subject. Have you got a better idea of what sessioning is about? (Yes sir.)
Alright. Very good. Thank you very much.

STANDARD TECH

A lecture given on 12 October 1968

Well you will be very happy to know, brethren as we are assembled here together, that we have to bow our heads in prayer for none of you at the moment since you've already gotten, each one of you, a well done. Now all you have to do is get your 85% on the final exam, and in any event you can make your airline reservations for the sixteenth or the seventeenth, whatever aircraft you can get on.

What lecture number is this? Sixteen. Fifteenth? Sixteenth. Gee, I though you'd slipped, or I had. Sixteen. Lecture number sixteen. And this is twelve Oct. correct? A. D. eighteen. And the subject of this lecture is standard tech.

I do not envy you going almost single-handedly into an organization at this particular state of affairs, and having dumped on your lap what you dumped on my lap when you arrived here. (Laughter.) But I'm afraid it is that exact situation.

Now what you lack, because I've been too busy with your folders, you lack a big chart which gives you the A, B, Cs of C/ Sing. You lack that chart. I've not been given the space, nor the time to get you together with a big C/ S chart. The, a great deal of the auditing which you have been doing is OT section auditing. Nevertheless, the simpler actions apply to the lower grades.

Now remember that you've got to be backed up by the examiner. Very often a session will look OK to you if you don't look at the examiners' report. Now it's quite remarkable, but those sessions which were done today, I think all of them it is reported, got to the examiner with an F/ N. The whole, sweeping lot.

Now when you're really hotter than a pistol they come back to the next session with an F/ N. They'll not only get to the examiner, but they come back to the next session. That's asking a lot, but I'm telling you that it's quite a triumph to get all the guys to the examiner with an F/ N.

Now you must realize that if the report looks absolutely flawless, and by the time the person gets to the examiner, he's fallen on his head, that you have a false auditing report. And the most likely two things that have happened is the auditor talked too much, and the auditor didn't talk at all.

It isn't really that he even did something else. It's just that he did too much in the way of gib, gab, gab, gab. He got the PC distracted and upset, or he just didn't give him the commands. Now the other type of additive you can usually spot, because it's very often in the auditing report. "Do you have a present time problem? What postulate did you make that gave you that problem? What counter postulate was there to this. Very good. Then give me a problem of comparable magnitude to it. Fine. Alright, good. Now invent a problem. Good." You know there was actually a folder around that's got that in it? From a Class VI auditor. Wow! And of course the PC just fell on his head. Well that was easy to spot. Don't you see? That's easy to spot. The hidden one is all of the stuff that didn't get into the report.

Now you can very often tell all the stuff that didn't get into the report by the time of the session. The session is one and one half columns long, but consumed two hours. It doesn't make any sense at all. How could they have only one and one half column of work sheet, and worked at it for two hours? See, that's impossible. So therefore that's a false auditing report. Just obviously on the face of it.

Now you are to use the examiner to investigate this sort of thing, and you

can ask your examiner to ask the PC things. So you send the folder back to the examiner, and you say, "Examiner, get the PC in and ask him..." Do you follow? So then the examiner, and you just, you can even make together a little, a little form. You can mimeo a few forms off, you know? What you want the PC asked. See? You can get, you can get another point of view on this. You can get the examiners' point of view.

Now don't think that the examiner has to be very skilled. People think they have to put Class VIs on, or something like that on the examiner post. No, all you want is an honest person on the examiner post. He doesn't even have to be trained in tech. 'Cause what's he doing? He's reading a meter, he has to know the state of the needle, and he has to be able to write the language you're auditing in. He also has to know that he must not make an evaluative glares and sneers, and he mustn't ask a lot of silly questions, unless he's been told to ask some questions.

Now when you, you can have a PC brought to the examiner. You get this auditing report back, and you say, "Oh my god, what the hell is this all about?" And you're trying to figure out what the hell. It's this thing within two hours. And you have one and a half columns of work sheet. And it didn't seem to work out. And the guy got to the examiner with a D/ N and the TA at 5. What in the name of god happened? He left the session three minutes before with an F/ N at 2. but now it's at 4. What the hell is going on? What is going on? Alright, well you don't know, so don't hang yourself up in a mystery. Any question you have about it, write out the questions and get the answers from the examiner. You don't call in the PC. You send the folder with some questions down to the examiner. Examiner calls in the PC, asks the questions.

Now you normally will get these things just on a straight examiner form. That is an additional line I'm showing you exists, don't you see?

Now, if you've got five, six, seven folders, which have appeared to you totally well done, and the examiner report was great on them, and you notice all of a sudden that four of these five are back in review within about forty eight hours, what do you do about that? You convene a board of investigation, or a comm ev. 'Cause brother, you're dealing with false reports. It goes straight onto the ethics line.

You can ask the ethics officer to interview these people. It is the least action you'd take. And you can convene a board of investigation, because your neck is out a miles. Your neck is out a mile. People suddenly start accusing you. You see, you get the condition you don't assign. That's the horrible part of it. If some guy's in non—existence and you don't assign nonexistence, first thing you know you're in non—existence. It's a weird, it's a weird mechanism. And it happens. It's actual factual.

So therefore, if you get the thing stacked up, now don't go around grinding your teeth and snarling to yourself quietly, and so forth, just put it on the ethics line very forthrightly. What the hell happened? And you will just be amazed at the grossness of the error it took.

The auditors, all of a sudden, were writing all of their reports long after the session to make them look good. There's a collusion with the examiner. Something weird has gone on here, see? And the faster you cure it the faster your tech lines are going to work. So you just are alert all the way along the line when you're doing C/ S work to these oggilty—boggeldy weirdities. And don't you try to get weird to solve the situation on tech lines. These oggilty—

boggeldy, what the hell is this? A guy has Power, 5A, three days later he's reported sick. Well you know the items of 5A are out. And although it looks good in the auditors' report, it might even have slid by the examiner somehow or another the fact that he fell on his head in any way shape or form. He got sick, he turned up as an ethics case, something like this. You know treaty a false auditing report.

Now these are the fine points. These are the fine points of being a C/ S. Where you have to be clever in being a C/ S is avoiding anybody pushing you into a position where you give unusual solutions. 'Cause every time they goof they'll ask you for an unusual solution. You're being asked to dig them out of it after they haven't done anything they should have done. Only they won't tell you they haven't done anything they should have done. So you could easily push yourself into a situation where you are being required to give unusual solutions when all you really are dealing with anyhow are false reports. So any unusual solution which you give, which is, which is based on a false report, will just wind the guy up in another ball. That's what I mean when I say take it easy. Take it easy on your "He's got to be audited this afternoon." This thing looks sour, looks like something unusual's going to have to be done, and so forth. Well you can have the PC called in and re—examined on a set of questions. On the basis of that if it doesn't true up you can turn it over to the ethics officer. You don't get any satisfaction there you can turn it over to a B of I or a comm ev. Do you follow? When these situations become consistent you make it a B of I or a comm ev. Don't let anybody get away with it. The next thing you know, you'll be doing your nut. Now I'll let you in on something. It's only the lousy sessions that consume C/ S time. It's only the lousy ones. It'd be interesting to look at the time dates if you knew the exact sequence of times, if you took a bunch of my C/ Ses you would find that the well dones take about two minutes. And the lousy ones take up to half an hour. So, that I would be able to get through a tremendous stack, and I have done as many as forty six, forty six cases, C/ Ses in one evening, with great care every line, don't you see? And the lapsed time was about ten hours. Now the funny part of it is, is out of that ten hours the easy ones didn't consume an hour of it. And the rest of the whole time was in trying to unravel the lousy sessions. And it's interesting that right at that state of time, not your folders but another zone of folders, and so forth, were being filled with false reports. And that was what was the trouble. There were a great many additives in the sessions which weren't being recorded. And very shortly I alerted, looked up, and got ethics in with a crash. It straightened out. It will straighten out. It'll all come out right now.

But when you find yourself then with C/ S consuming too much time, and it's rust a hard job plowing through this, know then that you're dealing with out tech and false reports. You just are. You could actually stack up the folders that are probably false reports. It didn't make any sense. You told him to do something Monday, and Tuesday it comes back as apparently done. And Wednesday, why the case is misbehaving most remarkably, and that hasn't worked, so you say something else, and it comes back to you on Thursday. And this TA is way up and everything seems a bit awry. Well the first thing it tends to do is shake your confidence in what you yourself are doing. You can get into a "what the hell", you know? I have. "What in the name of god is going on?" Perfectly valid sessions, they're all written up beautifully. Only those sessions didn't take place. Do you follow? Now that's pretty gruesome.

That's pretty gruesome. But somebody can throw you an awful curve this way.

Now there isn't any unusual remedy for the situation. A certain percentage of this sort of thing will happen, so you simply take care of it that way. Any time, you make it rule, any time you're asked for an unusual solution you turn it over to the ethics officer or the examiner. You get a note from an auditor. "This person is waf waf in waffle waffle waffle, and yowf waf waft and you've already C/ Sed the folder twice let us say. Two times, and it's waffle waffle waffle waffle. Don't you go waffle waffling. Your line to that PC is being cut in some fashion or another, and you'd what not or will not know until you get some further information. So you, the least thing you can do is turn it over to the examiner and have the PC interrogated.

The next thing you can do, maybe after you've done that, a second action is turn it over to the ethics officer. Let him look into this. What's the ethics records involved here? See what I mean? In that way you'll stay out of trouble. It'll all go smooth as glass. Standard tech is in or it's out ethics. Do you see? You can't get standard tech done while ethics is out. Somebody's giving you false reports, somebody's getting away with murder, and it's just amazing. It's amazing what can happen. Amazing. You will find all kinds of weird things. I've been through all this in organizations all over the place. I don't think there's anything much could happen that hasn't happened in infinite variety. I've had tremendous numbers of wins, tremendous numbers of successes. But some of these points really stand out.

One time I found that the D of P couldn't possibly aet much done. Yet there were thirty five auditors on staff. But there was very little happening. And you know I found the registrar was scheduling the PCs. They weren't being scheduled by tech services, they were being scheduled by the registrar. And the registrar would schedule them this way. A person would come in, and the person didn't, wasn't even asking when he should be audited or when he shouldn't be audited, and the registrar would just automatically volunteer, "Well how much time, how much spare time do you have?" And the person would say, "Well I don't know. I'm usually free after seven o'clock in the evening." "well very good. Let's see. Eight o'clock Thursdays. How is that?" Every Thursday they were going to have a one hour session.

See, here was complete out—administration. Well nobody could run that HGC. It was impossible. They had to have this vast number of auditors who didn't have anything to do. They didn't have anything to do because no PCs ever showed up. In processing at any given time there were eighty or ninety PCs. Well my golly. You would have figured that thirty five auditors would have cleaned up eighty or ninety PCs in one awful rush. They would've been out of work by Thursday, don't you see? 'Cause the sessions weren't all that long. But it was so fixed that an auditor was only about doing an hour worth of work every two days. They could have gone on this way for years. And they also could have gone completely broke. Do you see?

Now a situation like that makes it impossible for a C/ S to keep anybody busy or live. So this is the other side of out—admin. Now you, in the first place, don't care how much time that PC hangs around, as long as when he is to get a session he gets the session, and what happens in that session is what you said was to happen in it. And then, you take a look at the session, and then the next time he's to get a session, somebody brings him in and gives him a session. In other words, your tech services is operating against the

action of C/ S and the availability of auditors. Pongety pongety pong. Well that's all an administrative action.

Now it can go the other way around, where you have somebody else entirely, who is completely out of a zone or area, who's doing all the scheduling that hasn't anything to do with anything. You know? It's all being scheduled by the HCO Exec Sec. And therefore you can't get people audited when they're supposed to be audited. The less days you leave a bad 5 out of action, the less, the better. If you've got to correct 5A, or something like that, and you want it corrected now. That evening, if possible. So somebody in tech services has got to be on the ball and be able to call in whoever it is.

So they have troubles. So, tough. That's tough. You don't care how much trouble they got. You're whole action, you're whole action is getting the C/ S done. Getting the C/ S done, and getting the case gaining. Do you, do you see? So your administrative play, you see, falls in against the tech. And these two things are coordinated, one against the other. Now you don't want tons of auditors sitting around on PCs who are falsely and weirdly scheduled, and so forth. The scheduling of PCs is very much in the hands of the tech services. And it's very much under the orders of the C/ S. Just recently, believe it or not, in another zone I had two PCs who just plain goofing it, boy. They were goofing it up most gorgeously. And another PC who was pleading that he should go to the hospital and have his throat cut or something. And he had this as a thing. And, you ever once in a while go into a hospital and you ask some of the patients. "Well I'm going to have an operation, ha ha heh." So you say, "Is anything wrong with you?" "I don't think so. Oh yes, I; ve, I've got something. I don't know what it is, just something. I had something else last week, but they're going to operate on me." Guys are just dramatizing, see? So I was ordering these people to be audited, and audited now. And boy, you would be surprised at the amount of force and pressure I had to bring in to get them audited, and the guy who was pleading to have an operation, they didn't get around to him. He went over, and the next thing I heard, he'd had his operation. Ah! One useless hole.

So you see, tech services, and so on, can fail to back you up. The auditing doesn't occur in terms of time when you want it, or they are trying to force you to get the case audited in some speedy fashion or something, to suit the convenience. You don't care how inconvenient it is for the PC. You get it? You don't care how inconvenient it is. You don't care how hard tech services has to work. This is to hell with it. You understand? And if it's a matter of straightening that case out carefully, you want that case straightened out carefully, and you want to watch every step of the case as it comes along the line, to then the ratio that the less trust you have in the auditor, the more actions and the more times you want to inspect it. Why sell down the river everything from zero to four? If you're going to sell anything down the river, let's sell the Ruds. Let him goof the Ruds. Let him goof a little assessment of some kind or another. Why sell a grade down the river?

Now this is all part of setting the case up to have the major action done. And you as a C/ S have the job of setting the case up to get a major action done. Do you understand? So if there's any insecurity on your part that the case isn't going to be set up for the major action, and somebody's just going to slap—happy the major action on through the lines, bah! At that point you start putting on the brakes. See? Fly the Ruds. And give him any. Give him anything. Don't give him a grade. So you fly the Ruds and... Don't give him a

grade.

So there's two ways you can use little prep checks and L—1's and things. (Laughter.) In actual fact, in all respect to this class, I haven't been doing that just to give you something to do. I have used them meaningfully to set the case up better. But I wouldn't, I wouldn't think twice about it. Assess the following. And we've seen some, way back here that the PC was once a bank cashier. And seems to have failed at it. 'Cause it's back in some kind of a withhold he was giving. But when he was a kid he didn't want to be, he wanted to be a banker, but now he tells he better not. Because so on and so on. Well good. Alright. Alright. You got some clue. We don't care where they got the clue. You can even issue interrogations to get clues. You saw me do it recently. "What is your state of OT?" And I picked out the physiological illnesses and audited straight in the direction to set the guy up, to bring up a section or zone of his case which must be holding him down from exteriorization.

Alright, now I gave you a drill on this, see? Now that isn't a standard form to amount to anything. But you can call it a standard form. You can make up these forms. "What careers have you followed that you have failed at?" Turn it over to the auditor and get it assessed. Prep check it. What you gonna get? You're gonna get the rehabilitation of a failed purpose. The guy is immediately going to be less tired. Well when you know when these things are the interplay is very simple. Once again under this heading, you're looking for a zone or area to audit so that you can test fly this PC. What's he gonna do?

So you never want to hand out major actions. "I have come to Saint Hill to have Power. I'm going to want my Power processing." "C/ S, he's going to have his Power processing." Alright, somebody's going to try to tell whoever is C/ Sing around there that it's really not necessary to C/ S the folder before he gets his Power processing, because after all he hasn't had any Power processing yet. You don't know where this guy is within seven miles of being set up for Power. Power only works like a bomb, and only works fast.

I'll show you how you can save time. It only works fast when the PC is set up and pointed. He's got to be all straight as a die, and then send him through Power, and pongo! You really get results—I've seen a PC completely change his character when he was set up for Power and had Power.

Alright. Now a PC who isn't set up for it, it doesn't even change his ARC breaks. So your proper action is to make very sure that anybody coming in for Power, has his folder at once turned over to C/ S. And that the folder, whether or not you are the C/ S or not, just make sure that the folder is turned over to C/ S. And then they would test fly this guy. So we take some completely unlimited process, you know, like assess a list, prep check it, do L—1 on auditors, anything, you know? Assess a list, auditors, auditing, yowowowow. Do a list 1. Brrrrrr. See? Item by item, item by item, item by item. To F/ N. Well Christ, you can tell by the length of that list how near he is to being acceptable for Power. The auditor, it didn't fly until item fifteen. Wow! This case is charged up like a galvanic battery. I'll bet you he has not even vaguely got his grades. It was hard to do, don't you see? You could look over on the assessment, and that all seemed a bit difficult. But they managed to finally settle on 'auditing'. And then the L—1 on "auditing went the whole page. Each one reading. Oh wow! Now do you see as a C/ S you have an estimate of charge? How charged this guy is. Bow long does it take

him to clean up his ARC breaks? How long does it take him to do this? How long does it take him to do that? It takes him a long time, case is heavily charged. Doesn't take him very long, case isn't heavily charged. It's elementary.

Now supposing the case has "been rehabbed" in Keckuk on all grades. And your first action of a prep check took all morning and half the afternoon to get it to F/ N. Well I wouldn't, I wouldn't say your auditors TRs were any good doing it. But this is against, also against the fact that you must be dealing with a, a very charged up case. So alright. Let us rehab or run ARC Straightwire. Not as you've been getting ARC Straightwire to four. Fly the Ruds, rehab ARC Straightwire or run. Get the folder back. Boy, you're now liable to find the damndest things you ever heard of, see? Well we actually, actually either he didn't know what ARC Straightwire was. There was somebody that told him he was once run on a recall process, and he couldn't remember very much of the auditing. And it didn't F/ N. The TA hasn't gone up terribly, and nothing bad has happened, and so forth. Now you're left with a riddle. Has he ever been run on ARC Straightwire? Hell now if the case is charged up you know at once that he hasn't actually gone up through the grades. There's something missing on the grade line. Now if you don't trust the auditor too much you're going to make that; you're not going to throw away the whole rehab. You're gonna get ARC Straightwire rehabbed or run. Fly the Ruds, rehab ARC Straightwire or run it.

Now, if you really didn't trust she auditor at all you would say, "Check the state of ARC Straightwire and send me back the folder." Now from that data we could determine whether or not to rehab it or run it. So we could say, "Rehab it." Or we could say, "Run it." Do you follow? You could, you could slow it down to that, that almost nowhere. So the amount of action which you assign to be done is proportional to your confidence in the auditor in turning in a result and a factual auditing report.

And the action can get very damned complex after a while on this sort of thing. You can say, do this, do that, do the other thing, do the other thing, do the other thing, only god, they don't have a ball, see? Because auditing which is administered quickly without any chance for any intervening PTPs or anything like this, really flies the guy. But also, auditing which administered very badly is better done in little pieces, so that you can straighten it out before it all goes sour. Do you follow?

So this is the degree of approach, the degree of approach in case supervision. Now what you audit, what you order to be audited probably is occupying your attention. It probably is. I can turn you a chart out. I've been too busy working with your folders to give you a chart at this time, a chart will be in existence at the time anybody is listening to these lectures. And it's just an A, B, C proposition. One of the reasons I don't get busy on it, and so on, it looks too simple to me. The simplicity is so simple, and I see people bongle—binglina around on this. Well, my god. What could they possibly be flooring about? You know?

And yet I see, I see early on in the Org 8 Course and with other experiences I've had recently teaching this, the most complex damn C/ Ses you ever heard of! People, you know, they, they look at the—administrative blunders of sessions as something that must be remedied. I don't know why they have to go back to 1962 to get a comma corrected. What the hell is going on? Don't you see? I mean, I'm very puzzled about what is this surer

complexity I suddenly see in my lap? And it's interesting, that for OT cases, for OT section repair and so forth, it's interesting that nearly all or your suggestions here, toward the end of this course, are dead on. See? You're calling your shots dead on. And the only place I am in disagreement with it, is I find another piece I can take off. And you didn't quite see that I was heading cases for exteriorization by discharging them. So I was looking for another piece I could take some charge off, before I'd finally let it go. See? You get, you get what I was going, see? 'Cause I'm actually trying to set you up for 7 and 8. And this, this is really the auditing you're getting. I'm just setting you up for that.

It isn't, it isn't that it's terribly far to go, or anything like that, or that you're in bad shape, or anything like this. But in numerous instances we have actually been able to bring about exteriorization and all that sort of thing. And I've been working on that, and so on. Well this is not necessarily the target that you will find a lower grade case working toward. What he thinks is wrong with him, what he thinks is wrong with him will be of one or two categories. He isn't total OT in the last ten minutes of the first session, you know, so that gives him a lose. And it was totally unreal to him. He wouldn't even know what the hell an OT was. But it's usually he's measuring his gains about whether or not he worries about his wife. You know? So all of his gains are measured against something like this. Or, in the morning he has, his foot hurts. And after he's been audited does his foot hurt? See? This kind of thing.

So he has a tendency with his terrific complexity to start backing you into the field of healing, or something. And your stable datum, your stable datum on that is, is the case will right itself by you simply finding any available charge. You don't find any available feet. You just find any available charge. Now I've tried to teach you a few times. Somebody comes in with a cold, or somebody comes in with an ear. Do you follow? Alright. Now I say, I say so and so and so and so. "Find an engram or chain and run it. First available that you can find. Just any engram chain that you run. Any engram chain you find on this case will have the ear on it." Do you follow? Yeah. So it's, it's so... So it's any available charge does anything. You see it's that gross. And in doing case supervision and in auditing, and so forth, you don't have to grope around to find the head or the bottom of the pencil. It's just what I've been trying to teach you. It's where can you get some charge off? How can we get some charge off?

Alright, if we can get some charge off of the guy, well we can straighten him up. If we can't get any charge off we won't. There is no magic button which makes a case well without taking charge off. See, all magic buttons, they might be awfully magic. But they will depend on the amount of charge they got off' the case. Do you follow that? That's, that's the whole of it.

Now there's various things that actually mechanically render this, that and the other thing. Let's take an out of valence case. A case that is out of valence is already heavily charged. He'd have to be heavily charged. Now the exact mechanics of this are very, very interesting. And I'll let you in on one little series of processes.

You may or may not know that Power processing, in its' entirety, was synthesized by myself without using it on one single PC, and with having no subjective reality on it of any kind whatsoever myself, because I was already clear. It is one of those wild tours de force in the field of that. I set up what a

case will be in the state of, and then figured out what it would take to bring about certain exact end phenomenon. And then wrote up each Power process, and then wrote up the three 5A processes on the same thing. Without a single test, without a single case, with no subjective reality on it, I didn't have any case that could be run on that. A little bit afterwards, to give you a laugh, I decided that I should probably be run on some Power processes to get a subjective reality on it. And about two commands later I was wrapped around seven telegraph poles. It did not function, boy. Because I was already clear. And I've noticed this before. When they try to rehab Power after clear, when they try to run Power after clear, it normally throws a guy into a rag bag, because his case is not in the shape that it takes it. So it's sort of cleaning a clean, it makes him look for things that aren't there, there are computations he no longer has, so to try to run them, he sort of has to mock them up, and when he does that, why he says he doesn't quite own them. And it tends to make them solid, and you're liable to put him in the damndest black mass you ever heard of in your life. And then you're going to wonder where it came from.

But below clear, Power was totally synthesized. Every single step of it. And then, I wrote up the bulletins of Power, and they were all experimental bulletins, and put people onto Power, and did my first Power cases, and so forth, and they all came out like that. And I was watching it like a hawk, because I was doubly, trebly critical of it, because it'd been totally synthesized. How the hell did these end phenomena be so exact? He so right on? See? They were perfect, on the line. So that was the way they were supposed to behave, and that was the way they behaved. And it wasn't because I was saying so, because I was saying they shouldn't behave that way. And they went right on up the line. Bong bong bong bong bong. And we had Power processing.

Now, this is an interesting tour de force. Now there is another zone where this has just occurred in the low TA case. In order to teach this first Class VIII Course I had to know what a low TA case was. I knew what a high TA case was. But I had to solve, once and for all, what was the low TA case, so I could give you the hot dope, because that would make a zone or area in doubt, which was in the technique which would continue to worry you. Now I could handle a low TA case at OT 3, because it's forced into one position or another by body thetans. Either the body thetans are gone and he's still standing back thinking they're still there, you can do various things at this, but I had to know the identity of this. Well first it could be cured, more or less, at Power. Pr pr 6 has a tendency if run exactly correctly, to cure a low TA case. And it cures a few of them. But I had to find out exactly what this was. So I sat back and I figured out exactly what is a low TA case. Exactly what is one? And I want to teach you this exact mechanic, because this was totally by synthesis. I hadn't had a low TA. Don't know anything about them. No reality on this of any kind whatsoever. So I had to figure it out from scratch.

And here is the basic background of the low TA case. Now let me show you here, let me show you here what we will call a time track. Now, this time track here is wide, from the bottom up, in terms of time. We don't care what gradients they are. This is the actual time track in which he would be in valence. You got it? He would be in valence. OK? Now, at this low point of the time track we have an area where the individual has had an incident on his own time track, which is so gruesome that he has gone into the

behavior I have seen on some preclears. Some preclears desert their own sphere and action to a point where, in the engram, you pick it up originally, you find they're a little girl in the crowd at this execution, and they can't quite tell what kind of an execution it is, but they're a little girl in the crowd. And you run it through the next time, and you find out that there were actually a post on they think maybe, the gallows. And then you run it through again, and you find out they finally discovered who they were. They were the headsmans' axe. And it's a beheading.

And then you run it through again and you find out that they're the headsmans. And then you run it through again, and so help me Pete, there they are on the block and down comes the axe. In other words, they've gone out of valence successively and repeatedly, further and further out of valence. You got it? That was because they wouldn't want to be that, they couldn't confront being there, and so on. Now that experimental data is from way, way back. Way, way, way, way back. 1952, and so forth. So I would action, "What the hell is this low TA?" I know when the guy goes out of valence. I have this much check on it. When he goes into valence of a body thetan, or he goes out of valence, he goes into a low TA. Well what the hell could this be?

Alright, well what it was is he had this horrible experience. And he moved off there, off the time track. He moved from here over to there. He went. He says, "To hell with being that guy. That guy gets into trouble. I'm somebody else now."

So there he was safely over there. Now that experience then keys out and, you see by a dotted line here, he comes back onto his own time track. And then he lives for a little while on his own time track, and then one day somebody's selling headsmans' axes or something, and he goes flip. And actually he goes back into that incident. It's a lock. He's now out of valence again. Do you see? You got it? And every time you have a lock on this you charge that up some more. Charge the basic incident up some more. See? So that's another bar. Another bar on the side over here. See?

So now he comes up the line again, and he comes all trustworthy, and everything is fine, and he thinks life is gorgeous, and everything is OK. And all of a sudden he gets himself into... He finds himself standing on the platform of amongst a crowd. And he says, "Oh my god!" You know, reality break. "Ahhh!" Break. No where to go. Another lock. Puts another one on here. Down on this basic one. See? We'll try to label the engram. And this is lock one, the first time it happened, lock two, the second time it happened.

Now he comes back over here more cautiously. But when he runs into a little girl like the one in the crowd, he goes bango! Out here, out of valence, which is lock three. Got it? Each time it's takes him longer and longer and longer to come back onto his own time track, and to be himself. Do you see? And every time this happens, there was lock one, lock two, and lock three. They're adding up charge down here.

Now after a while, down here in the engram, the guy, that thing is just so charged up with locks he couldn't get anywhere near it. He just couldn't come close to it. So that if you tried to get it by normal engram running, he just wouldn't go near it. And anybody who even faintly invalidates him, he's in such a state after a while, anybody who faintly invalidates him drives him out of valence. So his tone arm goes down.

So on such a person invalidation knocks his tone arm out of sight. That

means that there is such an incident as this on the track. It is so neglected that even though he knows he's mocking things up and so forth, he doesn't even know enough about it to know that he's still mocking it up. Do you see that mechanism?

Well I figured this all out synthetically. This is all synthetic. Cause I don't have it. So what I did is I put together a whole bunch of words which when assessed would make a guy have the idea of moving on his own time track over to there. Overwhelmed, driven out, wiped out, anything you could think of, whereby he was gone here, and appeared over here at the engram.

Now when we assess that, this is the way it, this is the reason it works. When we assess it by, wiped out, overwhelmed, list LX1, when we assess this thing, why we get the basic postulate that's got him over here. We've kicked the edge of it. It's something like boy I don't want there to be anymore of that, whoa... And which comes under dislocated, see? Or denied, or some... He's expressed it in some fashion, do you see? And now, here's the oddity. In order to run this engram, or get near this track, we have got to discharge the locks off the top of it. So we recall being whatever assessed. And that wuf wuf, that puts as you see these big X's, that knocks that off. Then that also knocks that much charge off the engram. Now we find the engram of being, he goes right there, and you get the engram wiped out. Now all of a sudden he can get into valence.

Now just to make sure that he isn't also hung with the overt, you can also run the overt chain of engrams, doing each one past an F/ N. That is to say, you've got an F/ N on the locks, you got an F/ N on the, on the motivator engram, and you can get an F/ N also on the overt engram.

Well by that time all of this slide out of valence every time I turn around is cured. And then he can get back to as—ising his own time track, because the trouble with this guy is, is every time he goes out of valence or is the least bit invalidated, he can't get any case gain. The auditor sits into the session, and slightly invalidates him, he slides out of valence, and therefore he doesn't as—is what he's running. So it won't F/ N. He actually ARC break needles. He's just dead body. You got the silly mechanics of this?

Well, apparently that's the way it is. That's exactly the way it works out. The wildest thing you ever saw in your life.

So this type of action is as part and parcel of discharging a case. Do I make my point? (Yes.) Now this was an important zone or area of discharge, because I found there was some people that even though you did a four rundown, nothing much happened. So we had to figure out, because that coordinated against the fact they were low TA cases.

Now the odd part of it is you can do this exact action at engram level. Now this really puts one into your hands, boy. That takes a case that's all the way down there at the bottom of the grades. Well you can undoubtedly run it again, up along the line someplace. It will have changed. But this actually will run clear down at the level of Dianetic engram. So you've got a powerful tool in your hands.

So you find this guy and he just can't seem to make it. And he's got a black field, and he can't see anything. Well of course what he should do is get OT 3. But as the chances of running OT 3 on him without proceeding up through the grades is so slight as to skip it. You couldn't do anything with it. He'd look at you incredulously. He wouldn't believe anything about anything. But you can do this. He'll run very shallowly, he'll probably stay in this lifetime.

The engram will erase. He won't have any real idea of what's happening. But boy, will he discharge enough, and all of a sudden he isn't the black field case. Now that's your rough case. Not necessarily the case with the black field, 'cause he intends to be very often high. But they're alike overcharged. They alike don't as—is. But if you get your low TA case, that's the one you use. Got it? I tell you, it'd work on either one of them. But it's your low TA case special. Any such put together as you see in LX—1. And the handling of it is one, two, three, four. And you know exactly what it is.

Alright, now let's take another case. Let's take this, well let's take what used to be the black five. There's the invisible one too. See? But there's the black five. And he's way up through the roof. And he's reading at 5 on the TA. Now that comes down, ordinarily, on the process, "What has been overrun?" Rehabbing each one.

You're going to have your heart broken here and there where you give that process out, because somebody's liable to just make a list. The worst you'll see on it is, they make a list and they don't even put down what read, and they don't rehab any of it. And they've made you your list. You could even explain it to some guys and say, "Now look. You list what has been overrun this way. What has been overrun? It is not a legitimate listing question, it merely gives you an assessment. It's a sort of a, of a horrible thing, which lies between listing and nutting and assessment. See? It's neither fish nor fowl. It is simply an auditing question which you happen to write the answers down on. That's all." You could do the same thing. You could write the answers down to level zero. See? And, you'd find one agreed and another agreed, and it wouldn't come out to one item. 'Cause it's not a listing question. But you can use this.

So, the PC is asked, "What has been overrun?" And then he lists, and he gets a long fall. Maybe he lists the first one, and it doesn't read at all. So you don't touch it. And then, long fall, "Alright, very good. Peeling potatoes." You simply rehab peeling potatoes. And you know, I've seen the most complicated rehabs recently, and I suddenly remembered that the earliest rehab bulletins, and so on, have not been condensed and rewritten. There's too much tech in those things. Those, they contain the actual complete steps of a rehab, and a rehab does go that way, but it isn't that hard to rehab. It's just how often was he released on the subject is all you need for a rehab, and it goes F/ N and that's it. So you don't have to follow those, those early, early rehab... Remember, those were back written just about the time I was synthesizing Power, and for the first time found that auditors had been overrunning F/ Ns. And experience since that time has brought more data to view, and the data which we have brought to view is simply that it is only necessary to ask them the number of times they went release while doing something. And they F/ N. particularly if you make them count up the times. It's very simple. So you could, you could actually overrun rehabbing if you get it too complicated. And the only reason people don't rehab, and why it had to be trickily rehabbed, is because the rehab itself was hard to deliver to the PC. So it's been very simplified. "How often were you released?" See? Count the number of times. "How often were you released that didn't F/ N?" Or, Were you released? Didn't F/ N on that, so count the number of times. ' And a guy counts the number of times, and all of a sudden you get an F/ N and that's it. And it's an elementary action.

Now while you're doing that you have to watch it, 'cause there's one thing

that you don't at this time do, is you have to watch it to make sure that your TRs remain in. You watch it. Because you see, you could rehab operations or something like this, and get an ARC broke needle on it, and not notice it. But an ARC break needle's very easy to establish. Because you've got bad indicators with it. Alright, rehab bad indicators with it. Why just ask if there's an ARC break or something, in connection with this subject. It's as easy to do as that. And, you put in the Ruds before the release. And it then flies. And the actual mechanism which you're using is, if you, you know, it won't rehab or something like this, and the F/ N is an ARC break needle, there's trouble here. Some kind or another. Just put in the Ruds on the subject. And that's quite allowable, because it's on that subject, so it limits it.

Now when you try to put in the Ruds, if you put in the Ruds generally, something like this, made me cough to think about it. If you put in the Ruds, something weird like this, "In living... You know, "In living... Before, before living, was there an ARC break?" Enough to make anybody cough.

Now this is a silly one. See? You see, you could ask the guy in any limited way. So in the taking, in the taking of ether; he's an ether sniffer or something. And it won't F/ N, something like this. And you could ask him, "Well, in the taking of ether was there any ARC break or something like that?" Because you've limited it. And actually what you'll do is put in the ARC break, and so forth, and you'll get your F/ N probably on the ARC break. To hell with the ether, it probably doesn't have any F/ N in connection with it. Do you follow? So that you can slide and get yourself sideways out of a rehab by putting in the Ruds in the vicinity of that rehab. You got it? So you don't get caught in a trap of having a no F/ N. I know it's, it's rather... It's, is it a going to?

I tested this out one time on the subject of death. Well it was obvious that any mass existed because there had also been a release. It's true, because it makes a sort of a GPM. Freedom, trapped. Do you see? It's a sort of a GPM sitting along here. So anyplace a guy's got a lot of mass he must be comparing it to a release. So in any area of mass there's a release available. Somewhere in it. Now it takes considerable glib auditing skill to all of a sudden say, "Da da da da, been released, and so forth?" "Well yes." You get a fall on it. The only reason it's hung up is there's also a release in it.

You ask this fellow, "Well now, you say you were taking kerosene for kicks", and then it releases, and the needle doesn't move and nothing happens, and no, no there isn't anything to that. It's all the same. Well don't try to force through a release, 'cause there is none. There's gonna have to be some needle action, but if there's mass there there's also a release there.

You can ask yourself if this guy is so stuck in the stuff, how does he also get to here? 'Cause he is in PT. He is in present time. Well how'd he get here? Well he must have moved out of what he was in. See, that, that's quite, quite obvious. So of course if he moved out of what he was in he was stopping it, because it was overrun, as I gave you in the last lecture, so he has the mass, which he's got a stop on it. But remember he's still here, he isn't there. So obviously you can find a release point. Do you see? There's nothing much to this actually. But if you sweat at it too hard you get him up to stopping it. And you can get the stop point and then it won't release, and the TA will go up. So it's a rather slippery action.

So you count the number of times, or something like that, and you don't sweat at it very hard. If it won't release it won't release. And you're going to

run into this sooner or later. Find somebody who won't release.

Now there is a way that you can still get a release on it. You say, "Well did you take anything earlier on the track that was similar to kerosene?" "Oh yes, yes. We used to take balderdash in the old days. I just remembered. Yes." F/ N. "Thank you." You can get yourself out of that one. Because the overrun is so overrun, that the releases are no longer available in it, don't you see? But these few well chosen approaches to the subject give you a road out.

So, we do what has been overrun. Anything he'd list can be rehabbed. If it reads it can be rehabbed, because he's no longer stall with it. So there is a release point which is registered in it. All you got to do is make it do its' release point again, and he'll come off the obsessive stop. He'll cease to mock it up . Now if it's driven down to an ARC break needle by this it will be because there's roughness in the session, normally. But you can now put in the Ruds with regard to it, or the session, and it'll rehab. And if it just won't rehab at all, then you just think, "Well what was similar to kerosene earlier on the track?" And you can rehab that, and that will rehab kerosene. Do you understand? That's a very simple action. You've probably been amazed to sit there and watch those F/ Ns happen so fast. Well it is a tribute to your smoothness as an auditor. But you're going to have a grade 2, a Class 2 trying to do this for you, and so forth. He will really be sweating. And he'll be saying, "But how could it?" You know? "What if it doesn't? What if I don't get an F/ N on it?" That will be the question which you will be having to answer. And the answer is, "Well you better had." And you just tell him to ask for, if it was and how many times. And if he can't do it, to cease and desist the session at once and knock it off. On the first one. Don't let him go through twelve of them. If he can't do it he can't do it.

But the mechanism of it can be so exaggerated, and there can be so much data on it, you know? Wow. You have to have the idea however there is such a thing as mental mass. The mental mass is there because it's hung up on the track because of a GPM. The guy did get out of it. One, he was released before he got into it, and two, he was released when he got out of it. And in the middle of it someplace he may have been released a half a dozen times.

So anyway, the net result of this is, that you have a lot that you can do. Now after the guy's gone along, I mean in C/ Sing you've got a lot of it. When a guy's gone along in auditing for six and a half months, and he hasn't had a session for that length of time, and he comes back in again, and his TA is up and so forth, the probability is that there's an overrun in between. And "What has been overrun?" is a completely unlimited process. You're just trying to find out what can we rehab on the case. So the guy puts the item down, the item reads, the auditor rehabs it. Do you see? "What's been overrun?" "Weighing fish baskets." "Very good. Alright, is there a point of release on your weighing fish baskets?" "Oh yes." F/ N. "Alright." "Oh yes." No F/ N, "How many times?" "Ff ff ff ff, one, two, three, four, five, six, every night. Every night there was a moment of release, I would leave work." F/ N. "Thank you." So you're getting off those overruns, one right after the other.

So, discharging the case with anything that would handle throwing him out of valence, it's your LX—1 approach, and they can do more than one of those. That's your low TA, that, he R/ Ses easily by the way. A low TA case also R/ Ses easily. And then your high TA, your high TA is overruns, and it is vital that you rehab them. Now your normal TA, your normal TA might be just

nasty tempered or something. But he is readily solvable. Readily solvable. But you still might have to discharge this. So setting us a PC to have the arades run gives a gain on the grades, the like of which you never heard of before. Wheee!

Now it's a shame to see somebody use the grades to take the TA down, or something dumb like this. Oh, I've seen it done. I've seen it done. It's a shame to see somebody who has come through the grades, and all he's handled is his current PTP. He's actually worried about getting back to Keokuk, and all you see in the arade responses is "Getting back to Keokuk." "I could talk about getting back to Keokuk, my wife will worry if she gets back to Keckuk," it's a service facsimile, "I could make people wrong by not getting back to Keokuk." So the case isn't set up. So you can always get an estimate, not on a personality analysis, but you can always get an estimate. The length of time in session, the thickness of the review forms, and so on. And the number of actions which you take is proportional to the numbers of actions which have had to be taken. It's a direct coordination. So you know immediately it's a resistive case.

Now some people are going to resist like mad, having a resistive case run on them, because they thinks it's an evaluation. So you can call it a special case. But it doesn't mean anything. It just gives you something else to run. And in a great many of these cases they won't solve even vaguely before you pound right through on that resistive case. That's your real resistive case. Boy when you do the assessment on that thing, and it says "former therapy", fall, fall, fall, fall, fall. You're liable to find something on the order of, when you're dealing with the public at large you're liable to find wild ones. Nothing can... Guy's in scientology in fairly good shape, but boy you can find some wild ones in people walking in off the street. They, after every session they have to go see their priest to get their throat cut, or something, you know, it's a crazy business. You know? They can't have, sometimes only learn about it. They can't have a session on Saturday because then that's when they go to see their orthodoptrist or something. And you say, "Who's this?" And then you find out he goes to a person who puts his feet in a machine and turns on a bunch of electricity in order to straighten out the bones. And this is the general somatic which you've been trying to handle on the case. So you can get some weird ones going. And they are interesting. And you can get very involved with these people. But actually he's doing something else, he's mixing therapies. That's for sure. But when you find these things are out, why you can correct them one way or the other.

But when you get right down to handling the actual C/ S of the run of the mill case, the only thing you're trying to do is get enough charge off so that it can run the grade, and then boy, will it make a gain. And there's several ways you can do that. I haven't enumerated all the ways that you could do it, but they're equally simple. They're all the simple idiot order of things. Like you do a little assessment, you prep check it. You take things like, well items connected with his profession. Do an L—1 on it. Now what determines what you do on it is relatively the mood you're in. You say, actually I'm not gagging with it because there is a determination on the thing. One of the reasons you prep check the thing as it comes through, one of the reasons why you prep check it as it goes through is one, the action is easy to do and it's totally unlimited, and you feel that the item is suppressed or is pushed down. The reason you do an L—1 is you feel that he's upset about it or ARC

broken concerning it. You got it? There is, there is a reason behind the two things. I'm giving you a gag, I should be careful of my gags.

Now. But they're simple things. And they can apply to anything. Now you've got, in the, there are several things which have won out well. Trying to pull a missed withhold by force and duress and so on, is very often, winds you up in the soup. Very now and then, because you may be going up against a low TA case, invalidation involved gives you R/ Ses all over the track. Or something dumb like this is liable to occur. Did it ever occur to you to prep check the missed withholds? They'll come out just the same. You discharge it to a point where the guy is willing to look at it, because he's sort of out of valence on the whole subject.

So your best answer to hard to pull missed withholds that you can't get out, and that sort of thing, your best answer to it is actually a prep check, rather than an auditor pushing him up against the wall with a pistol. And a prep check works very well on it.

Your upset conditions are ordinarily best handled with a, upset conditions are best handled in ordinarily actions, with an L—1. Or some species of list like an L—1.

It can be handled in two ways. One, while the PC is upset in the session, it can actually be assessed by general assessment to one item, which you then give the guy as what is wrong with him in the session. That actually can be handled that way. To handle a session ARC break that you don't seem to be able to get to first base on. That can be handled that way. And that was actually its' first reason for design. Couldn't talk to the PC anymore, but you could still assess it. And you could go tearing down the line, get the one that was left reading, indicate the by—passed charge to the PC, and you with just absolute magic, the pc'll just cool right off. That can be handled that way, can be handled in auditing with an "On or in sessions has... ", and then just take that line and clear it. Take the next line and clear it. Take the next line and clear it. Those are the two methods of handling an L—1.

You can always take any list and assess it. Now the one thing that is adventurous to do is to assess a green form. That has proven very unsuccessful. A green form is very successful. It's handled itsa, earlier itsa. On cases that do not have very many remedy B's or anything like that, they haven't had S and D, something like this, they are connected to a suppressive or something, such hatting of that is best handled by an S and D with a W. with your withdraws, unmock, stop assessment. Which one is it, and then you do that remedy B. Now, and that's done by listing and nulling, of course. I said an S and D. It's done by just listing and nulling. Now your remedy B. if environment beads, if a guy hasn't had too many of them, and so on, your best bet at environment and so on, is, in actual fact, a remedy B, new style, and what you've got for your student who can't seem to dig it, is to find out what : the hell subject he's trying to dig while he's trying to study Dianetics and Scientology. It works like a bomb. You have to find the former subject and what is misunderstood in that. In other words, the study remedy B.

Now you can also take the Dianetics remedy B and you can run it on an psychologist. And if you're ever gonna teach him anything you damn well better had. And you handle it the same way. This doesn't seem to, this hasn't been too heavily stressed, but you could take "In psychology...", do

you see? Why, "Who or what's been misunderstood?" Something like this. Then you take that item and you're past, but you wait a minute. We're already handling the guys' past. No, no the guy's got some earlier subject than psychology. See, there was some earlier subject already hung him up. So you could say, "In psychology who or what's been misunderstood?" And you'd get an item and then that straightens out the subject for him. A sort of a remedy A with regard to psychology, you see? Or you could make it a remedy A, and you get something, and you get an answer, and then you list for the earlier subject. It was earlier in psychology, and then you can find out what was misunderstood in that. So there's several ways you can play this cat. It's all the same thing, it's all the same action. So that we take a psychologist, he comes in. He's unable to understand what we're doing, he can't dig it any way or whatsoever. You can run a remedy A, as though he's studying psychology. Do you see? And get his misunderstood off the field of psychology. And then he can study this. But that didn't work. So you do the deeper one. Do you understand?

Now, your rule in case supervision simply follows this. Is, the reality of the case is proportional to the amount of charge off. You want to undertake, if possible, the simplest possible action. Undertake the simplest action available and don't undertake the deeper action until the simpler action has proven ineffective. And then you've still got a shot in your locker.

Now the next thing about it is, is all cases going in to review, or something like that, should be run on some such formulization as a green form. You'll never find out what's wrong with him. But you'd have to teach people to run the whole green form with no lists, before you could trust them with it. Otherwise you're gonna run us fabulous numbers of remedy Bs, fabulous numbers of S and Ds, get into all kinds of fire fights all over the place. Do you understand? You'll get over—reviewing, only because there's listing on the green form. Do you follow? Then you don't ever permit anybody to even—send anybody over and say what Qual should do with them. No. Do you understand? I mean, some organizational executive cannot send the whole staff in for sea checks. Cannot send the whole staff in for disagreement checks. Cannot send the whole staff in for, you got it? To hell with that. 'Cause it causes the case supervisor infinite trouble. He's got more cases to straighten out now than you can count. So you've had given too many sec checks.

So therefore, you make it a firm rule that nobody can order Qual to do anything, and then to do that then you have to hold Qual to a green form. And then you'll have to force Qual never to run a green form past an F/ N. And then don't let them list. Because that's the one they'll goof up the most. And then teach them itsa and eariler itsa.

Anyway, do you see the hang of it, the administration and the general handling of the case supervisor? (Yes.)

Alright, very good. Thank you very much.

THE BASICS AND SIMPLICITY OF STANDARD TECH

A lecture given on 13 October 1968

What's the lecture number? (Seventeen) Lecture number seventeen. And the date? Thirteenth of October AD 18. And this is one of those, what day is it? (Sunday) Sunday. Well I guess Friday the thirteenth came on Sunday. Alright. OK. Actually I've told you everything you need to know, and I have no notes, and really I'm just filling in time because I like to talk to you. Our problems are all before us, really, as we finish up, come to the end of the course. They're not behind us, in front of us. For the excellent reason that as case supervisor, and with your course supervisors, we faced at the beginning of the course if anything less trouble than you face. So I am trying to make it as easy for you as I can. And trying to give you anything I know which might make your lot a little bit simpler.

And the main thing that makes life rough is the apparency of a failure of tech. An apparency of the failure of tech. And that's what throws it all out of line. That is the one thing that throws it all out of line. Whatever else might be thought to go out of line, that one for sure throws it out of line. The apparency of a failure of tech.

Now I say the apparency of the failure of tech, because it always is just an apparency. There are many reasons why tech doesn't go in, but they are all under the head of it isn't applied. Somebody gets reasonable. There's a false resort somewhere on the line. These are the two chief sources of how an apparency of failed tech occurs.

In instruction or supervision of courses a supervisor can be so enturbulative that he can actually invalidate the straight data and then, because the straight data is gone, pull into line a great deal of squirrell data to take its' place. And we have seen that happen before. A remark like, "There's no reason to study your basics. What you want is the upper level theory." That's completely bonkers. There isn't any upper level theory. There is basics. And when the basics are in it's in, and that's it. The main thing about it is, is you are working with and trying to get auditing results from and trying to get coached actions out of people who are so overburdened with confusion, that whenever you try to put in a stable, simple datum, a lot of confusion is liable to fly off. It's the old Problems of Work, confusion and the stable datum. So you try to teach somebody, now look. Confront consists of sitting in a chair looking at the PC. And actually you'll put two people in a chair, in two chairs, facing each other, and you say, "This is all there is to TR 0. Now you've got to confront him, and you've got to confront him. And you've got to do it for a couple of hours, and that's that."

Now do you know that more god damned balderdash; we'll have to edit out all these swear words, I got to preserve the image of being saintly. A very hard image to preserve. It's so out of character. The simple action of two people facing each other is so intolerable that it backs right up into supervision. So they sit there and break their confront by one flunking the other. It's an additive. The actual action of TR 0 is two people who can sit facing each other for two hours, without doing a damned thing.

Now do you get, the second it starts to, you start to put in that simplicity, from there on it gets into a hell of a confusion? Now I don't know how you've been taught doing it lately. That's no criticism of how you've been taught doing it. I'm just showing you the basic drill was simply to sit, looking at the other fellow for a couple of hours, without a break, without a flicker, without

anything.

Now if there was anybody observing it, it would be not the coach but the supervisor. And any time a guy batted his eyelids and went twitching and scrunching and fell out of the chair, and started to talk, and anything of this sort, it would be up to somebody else to start him on his two hours all over again.

Now if there's a coach and a student involved, you can reduce it to this so as to take the strain off the supervisor, where one is doing the confronting and the other is doing the coaching. Well now you could add it up, now you see how it goes, you could add it up to where the coach doesn't have to do a confront but the student does have to do a confront. And the coach, he flunks the student every time the coach can't confront. I know that isn't quite right. Let's take a look at this. And we start from two people who are going to sit facing each other, because that is the one thing men have an awful hard time doing. Sitting still doing nothing. And yet it is an essential, because out of the failure of that drill comes an auditor trying to be interesting, and trying to enturbulate a session. So an auditor who is enturbulative to his PC, whose TRs are out, cannot in actual fact sit for two hours and do absolutely nothing. Let's get back to basics. How basic can you get? That is the basic on that drill.

Now in trying to engineer it, and in trying to make it work various ways, why a coach is appointed who policed the other guys confront. Do you follow? Now you could complicate it further by, the coach would do various things to try to break the other fellows' confront. But supposing they did those two things without getting that first one? Supposing neither one of them could actually sit there for two hours and not be interesting, and not do anything, and not say anything? That's the acid test. So even TR 0 can fly upstairs to a later complication and forget the early action. Right? So you get down to a simplicity. The most successful ACC that was ever conducted on the subject of TRs had this as its' maxim. Every question a student asked about TRs, he was simply read the TR. The supervisor was completely stopped from saying anything in answer to the question. He simply got the TRs back. And in bafflement, in ARC break, in upset and otherwise, the guy finally had to study the thing out for himself, and by golly we got TRs in. They really went in in that particular ACC. They were doing a pretty good job by the time it ended. Simplicity.

Now of course there can be an additional on confront. Yes, of course. Of course there can be a coach who flunks the other guy for not confronting. Naturally. But let's start it out where it belongs. Can two people sit facing each other without doing a thing, without twitching at all, for two, solid, consecutive hours, without a whisper? Now if they can do that, then you can do something else with TR 0. Do you see how basic the basic is?

Well what happens? You'll ask him to do anything as simple as that, and immediately a bunch of questions and confusions start blowing off. I don't care how you've been taught your TRs here. It is completely irrelevant. I'm just using it as a point. I'm just trying to show you a demonstration here. Now the auditor who's got to be interesting, who can't administer, who can't do this, who can't learn his meter, who can't get his TR 1 or his TR 2 in, actually can't pass that test. Can he sit for two hours, absolutely doing nothing? Now if he can do that, great. And if you had somebody supervising that operation who started his two hours out every time he flunked it... You

put a clock up there for that session. Like one of these photo timers. And the guy, all of a sudden, started going this way, or started doping off, or something like that, somebody simply hit the button to begin the two hours. You would wind up with uneventful sessions.

Now to that ability you can add speaking, replying, handling origins, handling a meter. Now if you can do all those things without any question and with great calmness, then you can add to it the admin necessary, and you've built it up from somewhere. So all I'm trying to show you here is just an example of how you build it up.

If you started in on this basis, this individual, you're trying to teach this individual just one thing. You're trying to teach him that an F/ N must be put down on the report form. Now you obviously have got to show him what is an F/ N, he's got to know what an F/ N is, you've got to know what a report form is, and he has to be built all the way up to there or you can't teach him. Now it's very remarkable that we have just found a case which has had a bit of trouble with auditing and has been a little bit difficult to handle in session. And I'll be a son of a gun if there weren't about three lower grades that had never been run. Here the person had gone all the way up into the OT sections with three lower grades hanging fire. Now it'll make a tremendous difference, tremendous difference, because those three lower grades have now been put in. It will now make a tremendous difference to the case in its' progress, because what happens is, is when some lower step is missing on the staircase, and the fellow doesn't make it, he just more or less keeps marking time on that step.

Now the grade, what they call the gradation chart, is the only ladder anybody is climbing now. And I can actually give you, and will, a simplified gradation chart, which gives you the exact whats and whiches as it goes up. There are several of them struck out on the original issue. One is the CCHs in lieu of problems. It's not in lieu of, it's not in lieu of problems at all. If you had to run the CCHs in order to run problems you would run both the CCHs and the problems process. You can't run the CCHs and then say the guy's a problems release. Do you follow? Doesn't make sense.

But I can give you a simplified gradation chart, and will. But where those blocks are missing on the line the case is not going to do well. And the higher they go the more trouble they will have. And then can even get up to a point of where they're trying to make clear and keep falling on their heads. Try to make clear and fall on their heads. Try to make clear and fall on their heads. Try to make clear and fall on their heads. There isn't enough charge off, that's the whole thing. Not enough charge off the case.

Now, look. You know about that. I've told you all about that. But let's look at training. And let's apply the same gradation idea to training. Where you leave out a basic simplicity the guy will now have a complexity, and his training will go around the bend. So we find this fellow who cannot, in actual fact, turn in a session. It's always some weird thing. PC falls on his head afterwards, and so on.

Now we're going to look for some very complex reason, because that's all we're going to get off this fellow. That's for sure. All we're going to get off of him in explanation is very, very complex reasons. "Well you see, I really don't hold with the idea that man is basically a spirit, or basically good. Actually he might or might not be, and that has always been difficult for me, and therefore my training..." Well, that has something to do with male cows.

He can't audit because he's got basics gone on his gradation scale of training. There's something, brother, he doesn't know nothin' about.

Now you could take your little handy, Jim Dandy made up assessment, and you could actually find out what it was. This is getting very clever. This is the case supervisor fixing a guy up so he can be trained. And we do an assessment. And it has the steps of training, see? "TRs, E—meter, administration, reports..." You get the idea? You just go along the whole thing. And you could even rack it up 'till there's a gradient sort of scale of the things you learn. Assess the thing out, and you'll find the hole. And it'll be a big hole. All you have to do, all you'd have to do then if you are auditing it of course, is prep check it. Something like that. And you will find out exactly what it is, and so on. But you weren't doing it for that reason. You're trying to find out where he's missing on training. And you find out, it'll be something very stupid. It'll be something very stupid. He'll finally tell you that the week he was supposed to go through the Comm Course in the academy, actually that week he had to be out, and there was a good reason for it, because he actually had a suit going at that time, and if he hadn't been present, so he wasn't able to take the Comm Course. It's something stupid like this. And it'll be something big.

Now when you know the standard steps of something, the reasons why somebody can't attain it look like boulders. They're not tiny little pebbles that are very, very hard to find. They're all through their auditing reports. They're all through their training reports. It becomes very, very obvious. But you have to, in order to appreciate that, break down what are the steps. What are the things one has to be able to do in order to audit? What are the things one has to be able to do?

Now, you could do something this simple. This is all under the heading of standard tech. That would be standard auditing. There are certain things you'd have to know how to do. You'd have to know how to run an E—meter, and you'd have to know how to write, and you would have to know, you get it? You'd have to know these little simplicities. You could make a list of what they are. And they're not many.

Now, on a case, what does the fellow have to be able to do? The fellow has to be able to relax enough in order to... Well he has to be able to talk. Let's start lower than that. He has to be able to extrovert to some degree, so that he can find out that there is somebody trying to talk to him about something more than a social conversation. Now you pick up many a PC, and when you first start, when you first start; this is gonna blow your head off in a minute. When you first start auditing them they audit very slow, and very badly. And then you run what you've got. And you run ARC Straightwire. The old style is the one that really makes the gains. That is, "Recall something that was really real to you." See? They're not the little, tiny, shortened commands. I don't know where they came from. It's the long ones. "Recall something really real to you." A time when you were, "Recall a time when you were in good communication with someone." Those are the real ones.

And all of a sudden the guy extroverts enough to find out there's an auditor there. Now he's still introverted, but you run some secondaries to F/ N, you find moments of loss. And I'll show you how this can be skimped. Somebody can get the locks by "Recall a loss" run, and then mark down that the fellow has gone release on secondaries. And you know I've seen it on now on folder after folder? The guy was never run on a secondary in his life. They just said,

“Recall a moment of loss.” And the guy F/ Ned on it, and they said, “That’s it. He’s been run on secondaries.” What a damn lie. You’ve seen the mechanism working right now.

You run a guy, we can recall a moment of loss and then you can go back and run a guy through an engram of loss. Pardon me. You can run him through an engram of loss, you can run him through a secondary of loss. You can run him through both. I have something to tell you about that tonight. I might as well you now.

One of the reasons we know that every secondary, which is a misemotional incident, has below it an engram, is because every once in a while somebody falls through the ice. You’re trying to run a secondary and you find yourself running an engram. It just happened on a case today. It isn’t something to really blame an auditor for, unless he forces somebody from the secondary into the engram. But every mis—emotional moment has a moment of pain immediately and directly underlying it. There’s pain and unconsciousness on the earlier track than every secondary. But a secondary can be run independently. The deaths of loved ones, and that sort of thing. Boy, you can make a PC shed buckets of tears when you really run a secondary. But look how, look how it could be skimped. “Recall a moment of loss. Yes. Thank you. Good. That F/ Ned.” A fellow just recalled losing a paper clip. Then he F/ Ned ‘cause he didn’t think it was important. See?

Now you say he’s a secondary release, ta da, ta da, ta da, ta da. God damn. I’ve seen a woman who looked like she was about sixty five, when she was about thirty five, run on a secondary, a real secondary, and run through it for blood, for real, come out at the other end looking like she was about twenty one. There’s a terrific gain to be gained there.

Alright, this extroverts the person some more, don’t you see? Now you take the available engram and you’re going to find, this is also going to include his psycho somatic illnesses. If you really run the available engram. This is gonna be the chronic ache or pain that he complains about the most. So you run that, you extrovert him some more. Now you’ve extroverted him to a point of where he can really see the auditor. Now he’s ready to consider communication. Up to that time he could do the commands, something might get some place. But you now have, for sure, extroverted him. You’ve extroverted his attention. You would be absolutely amazed, but a certain percentage of PCs who walk into a session, and so on, never see a wall. They see a picture of a wall in front of a wall. And you have to interrogate them very closely to know what’s going on, because it seems too usual to them to be remarked on. So they see a picture of the wall in front of the wall whenever they see a wall. Now don’t think that these characters don’t make mistakes when they start to handle machinery, and plow cars off the road, the guys who can’t drive on roads and have accidents on roads are exclusively just doing this. They’re doing it with wild abandonment. They’re driving on a mocked up road. And they’re driving with mocked up controls. They’re confront is not up to looking at the control panel of an automobile or at the gear shift or through the windshield. They depend on looking at a picture. In other words, it’s safer to look at the picture than it is to look at the actual object. Because the actual object, they think, could kick them in the teeth. There are lots of these guys around.

So you sit down, and you try to short it all up. And you say, we’re going to run a communication process zero, without setting this case up. Well you

could often find, you can often find a case is not running because its' sub zeros are out. The case hasn't been extroverted enough to really be audited on something analytical. Something like communication and so on. You've got to dig them up. Dig 'em up and audit 'em is your process of line.

Now this is what'll knock your head off. Do you know that there's tremendous numbers of cases running in the OT sections that cannot define an ARC break? Do not know what a missed withhold is? Do not know what a present time problem is? So that you ask them for a missed withhold, you get a PTP. You ask them for an ARC break and you get a missed withhold. You ask 'em for an ARC break, you get a PTP. You ask them for a PTP, you'll get an ARC break. And I have seen auditors sufficiently foggy on the subject to ask the person for an ARC break, get a PTP, and then run ARCU on it, and wonder why he can't get a read. That's why you can't get the Ruds in. Talk about the blind leading the blind. If the auditor doesn't know what these Ruds are exactly, why, and then the PC never has had the command cleared for him, how could you ever get the Ruds in? It isn't that the words are addressed to some tune. You actually have to get these Ruds in. There are real ARC breaks there. The PC doesn't know what to call them. And he doesn't know that those are ARC breaks. Do you see how auditing could be screamingly out?

Now have you ever heard of clearing a command? Well why don't you clear rudiment commands? See? That's an omission. Well it's an omission because after it's been done a time or two on a PC, it doesn't have to be done anymore. Nevertheless, if I was auditing a PC and I got some kooky answer, I ask for an ARC break and the guy says, "Yes, I can't make up my mind whether to leave my husband or not." Wow! I would know dog—gone well, I would know dog—gone well that this character had never had his rudiments clean. And I wouldn't take it up so as to ARC break him or drown him or force him or knock him in the head in a session. I wouldn't. I would let him get away with it one session, and then the next session I would clean those rudiments up by command until they ran out of his ears. You understand?

But in order to do that I would have to know what they were, wouldn't I? So let us take such a thing as an ARC break. What the hell is an ARC break? It's a break in affinity, reality or communication, or understanding. And that is everything it is, and that is all it will ever be.

Now that's a break in affinity. Now what is a break in affinity? It is represented by emotion. Now any emotion below affinity is of course in the range of the field of emotion. And do you know I had somebody the other day defining an ARC break, and defining affinity as unhappiness, upset, ow wow! Awful. What the hell? So somebody, when they say, "I'm trying to attain ARC with somebody" would be defining it as something they didn't want to have. So therefore you would get a backwards answer to every ARC break. If they like somebody they would have an ARC break because... So we would get into some wild, screaming mess here of some kind or another.

Now here's an even worse one. Here is a worse one. Believe it or not, just today, I did a session from another zone, where recall was defined as going back on the track and going through it. And the auditor was a little bit upset, and he didn't catch it and straighten it out. He didn't redefine it as remember, he didn't do anything to square this thing out. And I think very often auditors consider trying to clarify the command as evaluation of some kind. What you're trying to do is make the English come straight.

We ran into a guy not too long ago who couldn't run havingness because he didn't own anything. That is to say, he had no bill of sale to it. He couldn't run havingness 'cause he didn't have any bills of sale. Another thing is, we have a child's dictionary on board, and the damn thing says source is starting point. You can't define it to a child and then run Pr Pr 4, because that's a mis—definition of source. So somewhere along the line I'm sure going to have to write down the accurate definitions of these words in English.

Sounds absolutely incredible that you'd have to rewrite the English language for the English speaking people. It's in their big dictionaries. We're not using it incorrectly. Affinity is affinity. But somehow or other people get this thing going.

Now let's look at this recall as a return. Do you realize that you could never then do an LX—1, set the case up? Couldn't. How could you do an LX—1 and set it up with a recall process and then run the engram? You couldn't, because he'd always run the engram.

Now look at the horrible mess this case would be in! He goes through life recalling or remembering things by going back on the track and going into the engram. Look! Now that's what we mean by basics are out. The command is not understood, the command is not delivered, the command is not answered. This guy was actually asked to recall an LX—1 thing, and defined it as going back on the track and going through it. Was asked the recall question after giving this definition. He answered it just once, and after that they had to run the engram. He ran the engrams very badly because they wouldn't, couldn't be set up. And here was a marvelous point of education. This fellow had never heard of recalling. He's never heard of remembering. He doesn't remember. So what the hell good is a reviews? The review would be pointless. You could review this guy endlessly. Forever! If you just hunt and punched, and punched and hunted, and... The commands that he's been given have never been cleared with him. He never answers the auditing command. It doesn't matter what you do with him. He can't discharge the bank, all you do is plunge him into it.

Now the reason the reviews would be no good is because the second he leaves the session, and suddenly remembers that they didn't take up Aunt Hatties' death, he promptly throws himself into the secondary to remember Aunt Hatties' death. This PC doesn't know how to remember.

Now I've run against cases like this before. And I make them run the engram of having come in the room. Mm. Make 'em run entering the room for the session as an engram. Do you realize there're people around who live in the physical universe as a perpetual engram? Each successive moment of the time track is just another moment of pain and unconsciousness. It's the wildest thing you ever saw. And this person inevitably would give you a recall process as returning. They're charged up like a galvanic battery. You say, "Did the letter come?" The fellow moves back down the track to when the postman appeared, and moves through the incident in order to give the answer. And the funny part of it is, is this guy always has this weird comm lag which you never can quite figure out when you try to talk to him. And that's what he's doing.

Now of course this stuff doesn't erase because it's too late on the track. He's moving through life as a perpetual engram. Now when you actually throw him into an engram that has a violent fire fight of some kind or another, he

really falls on his head. And the only way he gets an F/ N is by bouncing. Bounce into PT, or bounce into the future, or something of this sort. And then you get a sort of an F/ N with no GIs.

So you get a case like this, see? And you audit it. Or you get somebody, if you're trying to train, how do you get this guy going? How do you, how do you actually get him to audit? These are very difficult problems unless you know the magic answer. There is something missing along the line of the ordinary. Which they're making very extraordinary indeed. Or there's just something missing. 'Cause you believe that somebody has turned up pretending to be a Class VI, pretending to have been fully trained in academies and on the Saint Hill Course, pretending to have gone through and been audited on every grade up to OT 4? Who knew nothing about an engram, nothing about a meter, nothing about auditing, nothing about nomenclature. This was a mysterious character to have walking around in the environment. A person is allegedly about OT 4, and they're supposed to know about auditing, but they talk to Joe Blitz, and all of a sudden after talking to Joe Blitz, Joe Blitz in some incalculable fashion is ARC broken, and you say, "What did you tell him?" "Well I didn't tell him anything, I just told him his English actually wasn't up to being able to answer the auditing commands, and that he'd better go study his English a little bit more." And the guy was an Englishman, you see? You get a fend off of some kind or another. His ARC break was no auditing. 'Cause he blew him but good. He's never studied, hadn't been to any academy, never been through the Saint Hill Course, never been audited on the lower grades, and had never opened the cover of a single OT section. But had simply received them and turned them back in.

This was revealed when pretending to have a Class VI almost, except for the last item or two on the checksheet, we sent to Saint Hill to get that checksheet. And voluminous correspondence ensued, and the people at Saint Hill looked all over for that checksheet, and they couldn't find that checksheet. And we finally checked it up and really got the facts on it. The reason they couldn't find the checksheet, is she wasn't on the Saint Hill Course long enough to be issued one. But had simply walked onto the course, been told she had to have a checksheet and had blown.

Now a character like this makes a fantastic spoof, because that character's pretending like crazy to have had this, that or the other thing for various reasons, and so you as case supervisor, or you as a training supervisor come along and you'll take this on its' face—value. But it doesn't go anyplace. There is something very missing, and that is what will give you your apparency of tech failures.

You will immediately consider the preponderances that something has been done wrong. No, the majority of these apparencies of tech failures is nothing was done at all. It's the craziest situation you ever really cared to walk into. It's a sort of a situation that haunts you after a while. But look at the ARC break this person must lay into the environment. He has allegedly been trained. Alright, if he's been trained, how come he doesn't know? If he's an OT 4, how come he goes around trying, pardon me, not OT 4, but if he's a grade four, how come he's going around trying to mane everybody wrong? Do you see? The people in his immediate vicinity become mystified. And it operates as an invalidation of tech.

Well, that's serious in its' own area. It has an affect upon morale, and it lays

a mystery into the environment. And this happen all too frequently I assure you. But that isn't actually the basis of what I'm trying to tell you. This is the one that really bugs you as a case supervisor or as a training supervisor. You get this guy and you have him do a session. You get this guy and you have him do a session, as case supervisor, and it doesn't come off. The session doesn't occur. And then you do your nut and you try to force him in, and you put him in a condition and that sort of thing, and you try to straighten this thing out. And you give him another chance and something else falls on its' head, and you can't quite figure out what the hell is going on here. Well I'll just give you a stable datum. It is the missingness of the basics.

Do you know I found out one time some fellow, it's very true that any auditing at all is better than no auditing. That's still true. You can sure wrap a guy around a telegraph pole, but brother, he'd be in a hell of a shape if he wasn't audited at all. That's still true. But you can get, you can get some of the weirdest ones. And boy they really puzzle you. 'Till all of a sudden you see a tremendously long session, or some auditor who is not too bad, is trying like screaming crazy to get something done in that session, and he goes on and on and on and on, trying to get this thing done. And he can't get this thing done, and the person just doesn't seem to be able to follow that line. No, this person's, this person... Don't always blame the auditor.— The auditor to some degree may be to blame. You can keep trying to smooth out the auditor, for sure. But man, there is something out. There is something very, very basically out. And you now better make is your business to find out what it is. And your business as case supervisor then is trying to find out what in the name of god is out with this case. So you can order a check of cases, just had one. Just ordered this. And it came off very successfully. And so forth. The person was actually given, "Check all lower grades", and then the next C/ S was, "Run any of those found not to have been run." And there were several lower grades that were out, and they have now been audited. And you'll find now the person will fly.

But you seldom look as far as the person has never answered the question "Do you have an ARC break?" See? The person has never answered the question, "Do you have a present time problem?" So look, if he can't answer the question, does he have a present time problem, is he a problems release? Well he couldn't be a problems release, because problems had never defined for him, he has no definition of problems so he's never been run on problems. He doesn't know what they are. You ask him for a PTP, you don't get any answer. You get some balderdash. "Yes, I have a problem. I didn't tell you yesterday."... Now your response to that in training is simply make these guys define these things within an inch of their lives. Make them define 'em in clay and so forth. And it straightens it all out. And after that all of a sudden, why things start going along great that weren't going along before. Or, in the subject of auditing, get each command cleared and make the auditor write down the full details of clearing the command. And there's too many auditors think clearing the command is just getting what the PC said and writing it down on a piece of paper, and running it. I could boot such an auditor. And he's supposed to get a dictionary, and he's supposed to go into these words, and he's supposed to get this thing clarified as to what is the thought he's trying to put across.

And today I saw Pr Pr 4 blow up. Power process 4. Blew up because of source. Source. It was defined as the starting point. And the PC was sitting there

trying to figure out a race track, or something. The actual truth of the matter is that Pr Pr 4 did not get run on the case, but 5, 6 and 5A did. That's a hell of an omission, isn't it? But it didn't get run. It sort of went, actually it F/ Ned on the PC saying they felt good before he started this. Rehabbed, in other words. Now Power that is thrown out this way is practically not repairable. There's very little you can do about it. You can't fool around with this. But somewhere up the line that's going to show up on the case. Pr Pr 4 not flat. And the time it does, why we trust that the auditor at that time will clarify the auditing commands and run it.

So how out can an outness be? Well you have to figure out what does an auditor have to do to audit, what does a PC have to know in order to answer the question, and you really got, you really got your fundamentals. An ARC break is a break in affinity, reality, communication or understanding. What is a break? Well it means a drop. An end off of it.

Now, if you have a person who is completely impossible to run, and is not educated at all along this line at all, you've still got the clear the word affinity. Cause it doesn't mean any other word. It means affinity. A feeling of sameness with.

Now the reason an ARC break takes place is only because there's been ARC before it. And what you're doina is mending the flow. And if there... All ARC breaks have to be preceded by ARC. I don't think you could have an ARC break with an enemy who had never been a friend. That's why civil wars are so bitter. Because they're fought over an ARC break. But a foreign war is very often fought with great gallantry and so forth, and back a few centuries aao there were commanding officer of an infantry company was doffing his hat to the other infantry company, and saying, 'Gentlemen you may have the first shot.' But they don't fight civil wars that way. The Russian Revolution is the damndest piece of cruelty I ever heard of. Because it is ARC break. There was ARC, and now it's busted. There are no fights quite as violent as those which follow a great love.

So therefore somebody has to know this in order to run it. He has to know what affinity is. A break in affinity. He has to know what break in reality is concerned. And there is another way of running it, which is perfectly legitimate. You see, we have a portmanteau word because we understand it. ARC break. A break in affinity, a break of reality, and a break in communication, and a break in understanding. An upset, you could say, in affinity, an upset in communication, upset in reality, an upset in understanding. Or, you don't have to say an upset in understanding, you could say a misunderstanding.

Now this is so far out that the other day I gave an auditing item, I said, "Assess something or other, and then get anything that was misunderstood in it." And the auditor, so help me Pete, I don't know why he departed from the C/ S, but he ran ARC breaks in it. I said, "Anything that was misunderstood", and the question was never asked the PC. But instead, "Did the person have any ARC breaks with it?" I was already talking about missing ARC breaks. It would've all come out clean. And it came out all of a sudden, finally after two or three columns of hard sweat, the auditor not having asked the question he had been told to ask, the PC cognited like mad that she hadn't, that there was a big misunderstanding on the subject, and that she didn't understand it. And it F/ Ned.

Now, this is a matter of basics. These are a matter of basics. And anytime

you're trying to put something together, don't go into the airy—fairy wonderland of it all. Do something simple. A guy can't, I don't know, he's somehow or another he just doesn't seem to be able to run ARC Straightwire. Unsatisfactory result. Something kooky. Well, let's get a definition of this word recall. What does he mean by it? There can be an infinity of variations from the correct one. Oh, a fantastic number of variations on the actual definition of recall. I'm sure. I'd hate to be given the task of dreaming up all possible variations on a correctness on anything. Because they are infinite. Absolutely infinite. So you've got to find what is the wrong one, and get the right one. Your wrong one would just be some invariable.

Now the weird part of it is, that if you just clear the command "recall" on some PC, just order that the command "recall" be cleared, and it is cleared, the PC goes F/ N for the first time in his life. Why? He's never recalled anything before. He didn't know how to do this. Brand new idea to him. And that's the truth about this PC that I C/ Sed just today. His whole case lies straight in that weird definition of recall.

So there're quite a few very simple basics. Now you're going to get a hold of somebody sometime and order that an engram be run on him. And your auditor's going to send you back a fire fight. You've ordered the guy to a moment of pain and unconsciousness, but he didn't have any place to go. What is out there is he had never, under gods green earth, ever realized that anybody ever made any pictures, including himself, he doesn't know what the hell these pictures are. He has never associated it, that's completely foreign to him. And you will also find out the guy doesn't have any past either. He has some intellectual concept of the fact that he might have been here yesterday, but he couldn't swear to it.

When you get one of these basics out in the field of auditing, recognize that you do not need a tremendous number of complications to explain why the case won't live. If these fundamentals of auditing, these grade processes done on a case bring him up toward a native state, a much more desirable, more potential level, then recognize that any one of the elements connected with those levels, if out, any one of those elements bars the way.

Now I'm trying to get you to look at very basic basics. How can you run an auditing command. This is this tribe of Indians that as up there, up in New York, up the Hudson River, and so on. They had a tremendous number of sayings before the advent of the white man. Like, "The way to cross the river is cross the river." See? "The way to cook ducks is to cook ducks." You know? They had a lot of these things. Well, this is sort of the game line of country, except it now makes very good sense. The way to get a case to F/ N on a recall process is to get him to recall. The way to get a case to F/ N on an engram process is to get him to go through the engram, or to earlier similar incidents, until you get an erasure, and then you'll get an F/ N. But what do you have to do to do that?

Well it's usually the business of the auditor, and when the auditor doesn't take care of it it backs right up into the lap of the case supervisor. And you will, you're going to be in the position where you'll be saying, "Run Dukes on recall an auditor." The thing winds up in a mess. PC gets all massy, TA goes up, you decide there must be something horrible on the track. You might immediately leap to a complex conclusion that some horrible auditing had been done, which when it was disclosed, and pofwa flea fwa fwa, and waffle

waffle waffle, whereas the matter of fact, the guy does not know how to recall anything. So therefore, clearing auditing commands is part of the basics of standard tech. And this class right here, I had to teach you how to clear the rudiments. And I don't think it had ever occurred to anybody before that the reason the case wasn't in session was because the rudiments were out, and the rudiments were out was because the rudiments had never been cleared. Nobody was really insisting on an answer to his question. "Do you have an ARC break?" The guy gives you a PTP. Nobody was insisting on an answer to his question. He bought that, he bought that. I wouldn't have bought it. Without invalidating and pushing in the pcs' anchor points I wouldn't have bought that. For that session, yes.

Next session, "Now we're going to clear the auditing command for you, 'Do you have a present time problem?' What does present mean?" And this girl says, "Oh, a mink coat, so on." And you say, "Well let's get the dictionary and look it up. See what present means." "It's like I said, a mink coat, so forth. Yeah, I got problems about mink coats." You don't know what goes on in peoples' minds. Don't make up your mind that you do, because you start going into that never—never land, and boy you is going to go into an infinity of variables. You know exactly what you mean.

But you have to know, as a case supervisor or as an auditor exactly what these things mean. A present time problem is one which occurs in the now—ness of things. It is a problem in the now—ness of things. The basis of a problem is a postulate, counter—postulate. Mass, counter—mass. Intention, counter—intention. It is two forces interlocked, or threatening to, and occurring in now. And it has to be in action now to get in the road of auditing. So if the PC doesn't know what present means, and thinks it's mink coats or something, you're always going to get a problem, because there've been an infinity of them on the track. You'll also get eventually an ARC broken PC, because she never can clean up problems.

She answers problems in this wise. "Uh, let's see, problems, problems, problems, problems, have I ever had a problem?" You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" The PC says, "Have I ever had a problem? Let me see. Yes, I think back in 1722, now my recall's opening up a little bit, I had a problem. Now Christ, I wish we would get off of this process because I always seem to have problems, yap yap yap." Don't you see? Well the PC actually, you can clear it false reads, you can do this and that with it. But any time you have to clear a rudiment with a false read, some auditor the person's had in the past, or that PC sitting right in front of you, or that is being audited on your case supervision, does not know the definition of it. So if you see false read on present time problems coming up and is having to be user, then you order the "Clear present time problem cleared. I handled that by making everybody in this class do the rudiments in clay. I cleared it all at one fell swoop. I'm not berating you, I'm just showing you how this is gonna get in your hair. Because if I had to clear some of these things up with you guys, wow! What are you going to do with raw public, and things? Huh'

So you say to this fellow, I've seen idiocies happen on this little three year old kid walks in for a session, and the auditor says, "Do you have an ARC break?" Wow. And the kid tries to give him some answer. Here in the Sea Org. why, they auditor's very often fooled. He asks a six or seven year old kid if he has an ARC break, and the kid answers him very glibly indeed. Tells him where all the spots are, 'cause these kids know their business. Don't

expect somebody walking in from the public would.

Do you see what fundamentals are? How fundamental is a fundamental? When you're walking on the sidewalk it is the sidewalk. It isn't, it isn't a composition which may or may not have come into being and which may or may not be made of infinite mind. I can tell you that OT 8 you're in for some shocks of simplicity. The great mystery of the physical universe is no mystery. But it is too simple. So therefore it gives problems. Do you follow?

So you have problems occurring every time somebody has avoided the basic. You have difficulties and complexities and errors arising when the basic is out. Now the way you put the basic in, is to get it clarified as to that is the basic. In auditing itself, that's all you are doing, is clarifying the basic. So if you start to clarify the basic with a misunderstood auditing question you're never going to get down to the basic in the first place. Do you see how idiotic this... It's simple! It's too simple. It's, it's actually simple, you know, to a point where, ham. Well you can get very baffled trying to put it across sometimes. You tell this fellow, "Turn on your E—meter." And that's a very simple action to you. But he, for some reason or another, has read a whole series of directions about the electronic potential of sweat and the hyper sensitive neurons, and how the capsulized long fronts go wobble wobble Wobble wobble, and the business of turning on an E—meter to him is a production like setting up the electric light plants and light lines of a city, even back to mining the coal. You will see some characters in the lower, lower, lower areas of training, you say, if you put your E—meter in front of them and you say, "Turn on the E—meter." The guy doesn't reach over here for the sensitivity knob. What he does is he... "Just a minute I'll get it, yeah, yeah, heh heh..." If I ever saw anybody do that I'd put him back on E—meter drills for forty eight hours nonstop. "You're supposed to have checked out an E—meter, huh? Good. Turn it on for me." I might even do that if an auditor's giving me a lot of trouble in sessions. I'd say, "Turn on your Emeter." If he goes... "Just a minute, I'll get it. Ah, yea." Boy, he'd sure be back studying E—meters.

How the hell can he operate an E—meter when he can't even turn it on? You see what I mean? Now if this is the thing which you look for in the case, if this is the thing which you look for in the student, if this is the type of basic you are trying to put in, you will win all the way!

Wherever you see an apparency of unworking tech, it's this sort of thing that is out. And it is frankly, too idiotic for you to easily grasp. You'll laugh like hell over these things sometimes when you finally find out what is out. Wow! It's unbelievable! It is always some piece of damn foolishness. It is never anything complex. So therefore, you get asked for answers to conditions that don't even exist. You say "This PC has had a great deal of fwa fwa, and he's done a great deal of study. And back in llama time, and so on, he seems to have a tremendous amount of ability, and therefore he should actually be audited on some easier process, or such higher level process, because he says these processes are too easy for him." I've seen one like that. "Ding a ling." Good. Find out if he's ever been run on ARC Straightwire." "I did. He hasn't." "Then how do you know the processes are too easy for him" "Oh, I get what you mean." "Run ARC Straightwire on him." If they do this guy comes up shining.

But you're presented with problems which don't exist. The apparency of unworking tech includes with it the apparency of difficulties which don't exist

in the first place. And the way you surmount all this, and the ease with which you surmount all this, is one hundred percent. Just look for the out—basics, to hell with what they're chattering about. Actually assume the attitude that monkeys chatter endlessly but they don't necessarily make any sense. They say that fifty million monkeys writing for fifty billion years would write all the works of Shakespeare. But I don't think any publisher would wait around that long.

Now you're going to get, "Well, fwa fwa fwa." Now there's an old policy. It's the person who takes conclusion from juniors is going to fall on his head. You can trace back your more serious administrative errors to taking a conclusion of a junior without getting the facts. You have had... The junior has told you some conclusion, and you'll find out they normally will tell you conclusions, because they haven't got any facts. "And I think we ought to discontinue processing this PC for the excellent reason that he has not yet made any gains." That's a conclusion. You say, "What is the data on this PC?" "Well I think we ought to discontinue the..." He didn't give you any data, did he? He gave a conclusion. "What is the data on this PC?" "Well, he's very hard to audit." That's a conclusion. It's no data. What you're going to have to do is train up and regiment people on the straight forward basis of, "Look, son, when I asked you for data I wanted data. What you think about it is completely unimportant to me." "Has the PC been run on...?" You say, "Check the grades of the PC up to two. Where the person's supposed to be." "Check the grades." You get it back from the auditor without even asking the PC anything, and say, "He hasn't been audited very much." You've had it. But you gave it to a guy who didn't know how to check the grades up to two. So he chickened, and gave you a conclusion instead of fact. So your main action to overcome all of this, get in basics, is you just tell them to be gotten in, and the next thing you know they go in. When you want somebody to check the grades of this PC up to two, you want somebody to sit there, put him on the meter, and ask him if these grades have been run. And then give you the behavior of the meter as you ask him, and you can even describe what the grade is as long as you don't run it. When you've got that, you know where you are. You know where you are exactly. The processes were described and the TA went up. Now it can either be rehabbed, or it was never run. See? It was either overrun or it was never run.

So you've got now, you've narrowed it down, to grade zero, communication, was either overrun or never run. The rest of them apparently OK. But grade zero was either overrun or never run, so you have the auditor ask them, was it run? Did you go release at that point?" And it doesn't F/ N, and you now know it was never run. So you can describe to him step by step exactly what you want. Those are the basic things. You do your nut. Because it's unbelievable to you that anybody could believe some of the things they believe, or the outnesses on why a case doesn't run.

The one I told you about with the recall? You know what his advertised OT section is? 3. This person has had trouble the whole way, has given people around him trouble, he's in difficulty perpetually, he runs horribly, he runs very badly indeed. Supposing he were to leave session with an F/ N? Then he'd try to remember something and he'd put himself back through an engram that wasn't ready to run. So you see what you've got to be alert for?

Somebody comes along and asks you for something wonderful. Yes! What magic thing is it going to be that makes this auditor an auditor? You could tell him at once. You could simply write down a list of the things an auditor has to know, you could assess those things. The one that he doesn't understand and that sort of thing, will read. People gonna look at you and say, "Well we could have done that." Here's the joke. They couldn't have.

You have to be very brilliant to be able to think simply and act and use the simple solution. And the basis of all of this is, that all power is total simplicity. The basic lesson a thetan eventually learns. But when you can get it to no effort of any kind whatsoever, it is total power. You could tear this planet in half if you could think of doing it without any, any force.

So that actual power depends upon total simplicity. And after you do it, it looks so simple to some people. They wonder why they didn't think about it. Or why they didn't do it. Or why they didn't conceive of it. Well you can point out, alright, perfectly good. I mean, more cheers to you if you conceived it. We got the thing on the road now, alright. We assessed how this auditor never got trained. We figured it out. They don't have any E—meters in the academy. My god that's right. See? But these things are usually of that, of that category. And then what arises on all of this is this fantastic over burden of complexity Oh, many Complex, complex, here, there, everywhere! Towers and towers and towers of pure balderdash. You get the apparency of tech unworking? The basis of it is that it isn't applied.

Now the worst cases you're going to have this is that it hasn't been applied. Now somebody's going to say, "Oh yes. I understand that. He was audited by somebody who really didn't have his TRs in." No, no that isn't what I'm saying. You know, he just wasn't audited at all. Then it starts to dawn on somebody. What's that? I mean, you know? "Well how could he have gotten there?" Yeah, well look. I've got news for you. He didn't get there.

Now when you can master that level of think you have mastered a near total power in standard tech. Both in training it, in case supervising it and in auditing it. And you've seen yourself doing that, and you've seen yourself doing that on this course, I'm sure. And you've seen it stripping down, stripping down, become easier and more simple, more direct. It's more action. And the less difficult it seemed the simpler you did it, the more F/ Ns were arriving at the examiner. Now F/ Ns weren't just arriving at the examiner, F/ Ns have started coming into session. So at the beginning of session you no longer are getting in Ruds, because you're sitting there looking at an F/ N. Which you have to wreck to do any process. See? And what you're doing now is you're just in the business of widening F/ Ns. Do you see? Well that's in direct proportion. If I can teach you this, I have taught you all. It's in direct proportion to the effortlessness with which you regard the action.

Total power is total effortlessness.

And when you've got that you know how to mock up a planet.

Now, any action is based on certain simplicities. Those simplicities are stable, they are standard, they'll become obscured and complicated more and more. That is, the individual gets "weaker and weaker". He gets more and more complex. The basic is more and more lost.

Let's take this bird. He doesn't know what an ARC break is. He doesn't know what a PTP is. And he doesn't know what a missed withhold. A missed withhold is defined as something he keeps from himself. Alright, it's

something he keeps from himself. A PTP is something somebody worries about, but he knows that it's wrong to worry, so he never worries. An ARC break, an ARC break is, in actual fact, a problem of some kind. Now you start auditing this guy. And it's very hard to push it through. Very hard. Now as case supervisor you start handling his case on a via. But it's very hard to push through. Just can't seem to get any place, and it's very difficult, and the folders get thicker and they're already very thick indeed. And the guy spent eight hundred hours on 3, and he can't seem to get anywhere. You can run into these problems, you see? They're big. And the farther they have departed from simplicity, the bigger the problem seems, until it is practically a gigantic problem that nobody could possibly ever solve, and nobody could ever see around. This problem is so huge, and it's presented to you normally in this light.

You start going through the thing, and you'll find the answers to his PTPs are worries of sole kind that caused him to be upset. Some weird definition, and they don't seem to be anything in the present, and a missed withhold, he doesn't ever have one of those because he never finds out what he is doing, he says. And you'll find something out. Well you know immediately the guy's audited with his Ruds out, because he can't define 'em. So now with your sword you cut the gordian knot. And you say, "Clear each rudiment."

Now you're liable to run into this trouble. The auditor goes into the session, clears each rudiment, and he didn't know what they were either. So therefore, you had better keep up a liaison with some training entity. And we'll say before you start handing this out, you had better have your auditors clarifying what each rudiment means, before they start hanging up a false one with that. And all of a sudden auditing moves that has never moved before. God, that's awful simple, isn't it?

Now another one is, is an E—meter trim check should be tested before the session, and the meter should be turned on and given a test check. But if it acts kooky sometime during the session, the meter could have been discharged. Also, you can have trouble with the line that's connected with the cans. So you want to bounce the line around, bounce your meter connection around a little bit, and these things screw in, these plugs. And you know, you can have a pin unscrewed? On some of your meter connections it gives you a permanent rock slam.

Now a guy should know enough about what goes wrong with his E—meter not to run into a hell of a lot of trouble. We had one here the other day, unfortunately. Somebody was busy having a hell of a time with the pcs' tone arm, and come to find out the trim check at the end of session was 2 equals 1.75. So all through the session the auditor thought that he was auditing somebody with a very low TA when he wasn't. Didn't start, didn't put his meter into some kind of condition.

Now in solo auditing, every now and then a solo auditor wraps himself around a telegraph pole by not paying any attention to his meter. I know one guy ran a lot of sessions, he ran a hell of a lot of sessions. But he got all messed up on the thing. The meter was discharged. I don't know how he made it read at all. But he was in deep grief finally. 'Cause he knew he hadn't made the section, and he couldn't get any TA action. And then somebody checked the meter and suddenly found out that it was discharged. It's too kooky, see?

Well, how do you get these in? How do you get all these points in? How do

you get them in in training? How do you get them in in auditing? Well you make each one defined. You get the guy to define each one. You'll find your outness fast enough. That's all. That's all the secret there is to it. Let's find out how complicated he is or how simple he is. Let's clear the auditing commands for ARC breaks, PTPs and missed withholds. Big folder. Big folder. Guy is so very upset and nervous that he can't seem to get anyplace. Well there is a way you can go about this. You can actually assess things in connection with auditing, do it on a list 1, the result on a list 1, and then fly each rud. Now you've taken away the obvious ARC break stuff on the list 1, so he won't blow up in your face, and now you're going to fly each rud. Well with any PC with a very thick folder you had better clear the command of every rudiment before you think you can fly it. Pc's liable to have a hell of a cognition. Because where his definition of the rudiment is out, the rudiment's always been out. In other words, the rudiment is so out he can't even define it. And you pull off these miraculous wins, see? Hooray! God almighty! People think you're looking over their shoulder and adjusting their brains for them. And you say, "Clear the rudiments." Folder's this thick, case supervisor, you start going through it, and you find the kookiest damn rudiments you ever saw in your life. And you say, "Nuts." Clear the rud. You look at the answer to recall processes and look how long it takes to run a recall process. Something like this. It'll tell you at once what the state of the PCs basics are. You know what's got to be done with the case. You've got to get the rudiments in on the case. And you've got to get these various things straightened out about the case, certainly in the field of auditing. And it's all in the direction of getting the charge off, but a case is never going to make any progress with their rudiments out.

If his missed withholds are out, why he's going to get mad at the auditor. And it doesn't matter if he's defining missed withholds to himself as something he doesn't know about. What's a missed withhold? It's something I don't know about. Well if he's got missed withhold defined it doesn't keep him from being mad at the auditor when he has real missed withholds. So you straighten it up. All of a sudden he starts getting these actual withholds off that are missed.

Alright, PTP. He doesn't know what the hell a PTP is. His mother walked all over the place. I had somebody one time that had a problem defined as something you did in arithmetic. And knew then that you couldn't solve any problems, because the teacher always said they were wrong. Now that is an outness in a rudiment. Do you see?

Now we take an ARC break, define an ARC break. Actually it's quite a discovery in itself. It isn't remarkable that people don't know this. So if people don't know this they're not to blame. Just by clearing the rudiments you're liable to straighten up all kinds of damn things.

This is how you bring about miracles. By bringing in simplicity where only complexity has existed before. That's actually the whole secret of how you get the show on the road. The cycle of action is, is you say, "Now listen. Over in the academy if you fellows would just start teaching the TRs, we'd be a lot better off." And they say, "Good. Oh yeah, well we do all that." You're defeated there. Actually your auditors, you know damn well because they chatter and yak and so forth, you know damn well they've never done their TRs. You know this. So, take a walk over and say, "Let's see a couple of students do confront." Yeah, this one student who is the coach bouncing

around in his chair, and the other's doing this, that and the other guy up, and the other guy's shaking his head, and yes, well there you are, and back and forth they go. And they look like a couple of god damned bobbing sticks! And you say, "When do you do confront?" "That's confront." Just say, "My contempt. Let's see you sit for two hours, both of you, without moving an eyelash. And let's set up a couple of photographic timers. And somebody else looking in on this, every time they see anything happen at all, have them hit the timer to get the two hours started all over again. And all of a sudden you'll suddenly start getting your TRs in, getting some auditing done.

Also it works on this basis. They're trying to give you problems, be sure you give them some. Never let giving of problems be a one way flow.

I hope that clarifies to some degree, clarifies to some degree how standard it is, or what you are trying to standardize. Because that is what you're trying to standardize. It's what you've trying to make there, the basic you're trying to get in. They are not very esoteric basics. And as I say again, the test of true brilliance is the ability to conceive total simplicity.

Thank you very much.

THE NEW AUDITOR'S CODE

A lecture given on 14 October 1968

Well here we are coming down to the end of the course. Down toward the bitter end of the course. I haven't done your folders today. So I don't know whether you will leave clean or not. You will be happy to know that the two folders which were offered in lieu of the examination, on one of them the whole courses auditing was delivered by John Purcell in a matter of one hour, to a very well done.

Very amusing on that one, the pre OT said when he went to the examiner, "And when I started it I didn't even know if I was a Straightwire release."

And on the other one, and on the other one I knew a bug existed on the case, one way or the other. And I handed it out with a completely straight face, and what needed to be done was the full four rundown, and I knew very well the case needed a repair action before it could be done. The auditor did start the session, and then suddenly realized he had better do a repair, so he ended off, did another C/ S, and carried on with it, also to get a well done.

So, very good. Now let's see. What number lecture is this? (Eighteen) Lecture number eighteen. The Class VIII Course, Sea Org. And the date? The last time I looked it was the what? (Fourteenth) Fourteenth of Oct. AD 18. Very good.

This lecture starts out with a rewrite of the auditors' code. I apologise to those who have gone to a great deal of trouble memorizing the auditors' code. But you must realize that the auditors' code was many, many, many years out of date. Because it talks about flattening three comm lags of equal length, and so forth. Whereas we have moved us into a different strata of approach, so the auditors' code has to be realigned into the field and area of standard tech. It now has, the auditors' Code now has twenty five clauses, and is in a different form. It's in the form of an oath. And it's actually HCOB, or HCO Policy Letter of 14 October AD 18, which will be in auditor 43. It's for you, and will be issued to you tomorrow. And it's to all auditors in the world, since it doesn't just apply to Class VIIIs. And you having a copy of this can drive it home a bit.

So, I'll read it to you, and take up its' various points. It's the auditors' code, auditors' code AD 18. In celebration of one hundred percent gains attainable by standard tech, it begins. And then it says, "I hereby promise as an auditor to follow the auditors' code. Number one. I promise not to evaluate for the preclear or tell him what he should think about his case in session." Now that clarifies that. The other one, you could tell a fellow he needed auditing. But the word evaluate is, very often gets in the road of an academy trainee. He doesn't quite know what it's all about, so he just passes it by.

Give you an example of evaluation. "No, that's not the cognition you should have there, it's..." Well god, these things do happen you know? I mean, these things do happen. Somebody doesn't understand this, and wild things happen. "I don't think that you have completed the list because you should put drug fiend on it." In listing and nulling. I have actually seen auditors sit and suggest items for a pcs' list. Now it's quite one thing to make a prepared list, and if it's it and if it isn't it isn't it. But it's quite something else under listing and nutting to suggest that the preclear put down three or four more items. He's listing who or what has suppressed you, and the auditor says, "You should put your mother on the list, and you should put so on, and you

should put so on." I know it sounds absolutely impossible, but it has happened in the past." The usual reaction to this process is so and so, so now you should..." "The manifestation which you're exhibiting at this moment is normally considered insane." It can get pretty damn wild. Now this is best understood as being an opposite to what was laughingly called psycho analysis, developed in the late 20's, along with other oddities. And the psycho analyst, he operated this way. He would say, after he'd had the fellow talking for one hour, or four hours a week for a year, to find out whether or not he could help him, why the fellow would finally remember somebody who had suggested some sexual action to him, which was the whole target of the years' conversation, when he was three. And just about the moment he would think of this, the analyst was supposed to jump up and say, "That! That's what's wrong with you, and now this means this so and so, and it means this and this, and it means that and that and that! Now do you understand that? Now if you're very careful after this you will be perfectly sane. That's all." See? "Now we can enter on the long one, which is five years at four hours a week." I'm not joking. That was standard procedure.

That went so far, and entered into this, and when I taught, I think it was something like twenty one psychiatrists something about Dianetics in Washington D. C., they were leading psychiatrists of that area by the way in the nation, these birds listened very avidly, only they could never get past the introductory lecture. They didn't, they didn't know that they didn't know, and they were in a very astonished sort of state. And they listened to this over and over. And about the third lecture, which was I was just giving the same introductory lecture every night. And they were supposed to then have some Dianeticists who were going to show them how auditing was done. And how you ran engrams. And how you really did this stuff. But they never got to that. They just got to this introductory lecture. They were sort of frozen state of astonishment. And finally, after three or four lectures, one of these birds, a psycho analyst, he went back out of the lecture, and he went back and he used it. God knows. He used it. He'd never seen an auditing session in his life, see? But he used it on this paranoid that he had been dealing with for years, and he came back, and he was madly enthusiastic. Boy, this Dianetics really worked. "I used that return mechanism you talked about, and I actually got him returned to an area where he was lying in his crib. And, he had dirty diapers, and his father wouldn't change his diapers. And I could point out to him right at that moment that that's why he hated his father!" What I'm telling you is actually word for word, verbatim, an actual incident.

Now that sort of thing can go on. And people are so used to giving advice and telling people what to think that the reverse is quite different from what was normal procedure. So therefore it leads the line. Not to evaluate for the preclear. Or tell him what he should think about his case in session. And it is a very necessary bit. If you ever want to see some preclear spin, it's, it's on that one. He can spin. And that is why, by the way, in psycho analysis, one third of the patients in the first month of processing committed suicide. And it's probably just this evaluation plug. And then the analyst said, "He came to me too late." That was his standard response to this. They always came too late. I think if they'd come at the year of one year old it would have been too late.

What is not generally known about older practices is they did not have the

target of making somebody sane. They didn't have any of these targets. They didn't have the target of making somebody brighter, or more sane. They concluded that a person, once he had an I. Q., he had an I. Q., and it was never going to change, and it never would change, nothing could change it. And you would ask these birds what they were doing all this for, and they really didn't know. So you therefore find it's rather difficult to understand them, and the point of difficulty in understanding is a very simple one. It's because you are assuming that they have a goal or target of making somebody sane or making somebody better. And they don't have that goal.

What goals they have god knows, I have interrogated them many times. The only trouble is, when I talk to them they generally go into an hypnotic report of some kind or another. They go, gong! And so forth. Weird.

They, another practice that was in that field is most of their practitioners came from institutions. And they would take somebody who was an institutional case and he would become interested in the subject, and then he would be trained. And that is, was, it. Now you think I'm joking, but that happens to be the truth. I counted noses on them one time or another in a certain area and found they'd all been institutional cases. And many of them go back into the institution after they've been practicing a short time. That was what psycho analysis and what they call psychiatry and so forth was all about. It wasn't a question of making anybody better. I don't know. It seems to have been some kind of a dramatization. Perhaps a dramatization of R—6, Cause there is a psychiatrist in R—6. But I will point this out to you about this particular area—I will point this out. That the word psychiatrist is misused and mis—named. And has been borrowed falsely, and is falsely used. So is the word psychologist. That is false, a false name, which is improperly used. Because the word psyche means soul in any dictionary, and a psychologist is a student of the soul, and a psychiatrist is one who treats the soul. Both of those groups using those two terms at this particular time, alike say in psychology they don't know what it means. That's a fact. That's in the textbooks. They don't know what this word means. And they do not treat the soul, but in the next three minutes of play, invalidate it. It came in with a Professor Wundt of many a year ago. 1879, Leipzig Germany. That man was, the whole modern psychology actually came in with this fellow Wundt. And he said man was an animal. And he had no soul. And they called it psychology. Do you see? So the word is a complete misnomer and they have no right to it.

Similarly, the word psychiatrist is a complete misnomer. They have no right to it. Nowhere in the world is the title psychiatry legalized. That is not legally held by anybody. They hold the title by reason of a medical doctor internship. And in most laws, anyone who is permitted to administer medicine is permitted legally to treat the insane. So the medical doctor who administers medicine is the only one who is actually permitted to treat the insane. These other fellows have to have a medical certificate. The medical doctor, by the way, would very happily get rid of all of these boys. He doesn't want them. That is actually the state of mental healing as it is.

Now it shows you that we have to put this in an auditors' code, right up to the front of the line, that there have been fantastic abuses in this particular field. So therefore, therefore an auditor in training should understand that thing pretty well. And I have found auditors being trained at level zero and

so forth, who had been over it, who had read it, who didn't know how you could invalidate anybody, or how you could evaluate anybody. And these fellows, these fellows were doing it. One way or the other.

Now one of the ways of evaluation is by an expression. You can evaluate by expression. You can hold your nose or something, you know? Or frown in some peculiar way. And the preclear now knows he isn't doing correctly.

Now, the second one, is "I promise not to invalidate the preclears' case or gains in or out of session. Now invalidation is the think level of hitting. If anybody has any idea of what invalidation means, it's a think level of hitting. And instead of hitting the fellow you invalidate him. Instead of taking a maul to his skull you say "You are a bum." So it's not very difficult to understand. But if you go around telling people their cases are bad, they aren't doing well because their cases are bad, and that they haven't had any gains and so on, you can fold them up pretty badly. I've seen them very, very badly folded up, and I've seen where invalidation of case, coming up on later sessions, was a very heavy hold up on the case.

Now you can find other things wrong with a person, rather than to invalidate his case. "Yeah!" you say, "Well the reason you aren't doing well is because your case is in terrible condition, and why don't you get it fixed up?" Very often husbands and wives will get involved in what they call Scientology fights, and start using terminology and invalidation of this particular line and so on. And if you're very wise don't do it. But particularly that's something an auditor mustn't do.

Now, three is "I promise to administer only standard tech to a preclear in the standard way." That puts you in the running. Now I decided I'd give you some big choppers, you know? Some big teeth that you could come down with.

Now four, "I promise to keep all auditing appointments once made." Now the reason that that is in there, is I have seen some cases have a very bad time of it, and I know of one case currently that is having a very, very bad time of it, simply because the auditor said he would be there to audit him at such and such an hour, and he drifted in late, and this guy started to self audit, and all kinds of wild actions have occurred from that particular point forward. It is a bad code break. After a PC has sat around for a half an hour, waiting for the auditor, his case is so damned stirred up that there isn't very much you can do about it very often. He's, he's impatient, he's angry, he's ARC broken, he's this and that. Well the reason he gets this way is he puts his, sort of his case on a time schedule. Alright, it's supposed to be, it's supposed to be nine o'clock and the auditor's supposed to be there at nine o'clock. And he's supposed to be there at nine o'clock, and so his case is all ready to fire at nine o'clock, see? And then the auditor doesn't arrive Still nine twenty, and the case actually will be found at this moment on a protest or on a blow. And they're actually very hard to audit when appointments are not well kept. But you notice it says appointments once made. So the reverse of it, of course, is damn it. Don't make appointments you don't think you can keep.

Alright, number five. "I promise not to process a preclear who has not had sufficient rest and who is physically tired." Now the background of this, is one time I drew a coordination back in the Wichita Dianetic Foundation. A tremendous influx of institutional cases were being thrown at Dianetic orgs way back when. A Dianetic auditor of those days got so that he could

process a psychotic standing on his head. It was easy as pie as far as he was concerned. They all cut their teeth, because for some reason or other a great many institutional cases came in, and there was no proviso that they shouldn't be audited by Dianetics at that time, and so the Foundation did audit them. And it was a very bad show. And it messed things up most gorgeously. It wasn't that the cases weren't handled, oddly enough. Those cases were handled left and right and center. But very often they were sent in as bird dogs. And they were sent in to spin. They had already received some post hypnotic suggestion under drugs that they were to go to a foundation and then, when audited, were supposed to spin. This isn't me talking through my hat. That's what was supposed to happen to them. And we had one case where the parents of the girl showed up about forty eight hours later expecting if the money had been accepted and that she was being processed, and the girl had spun, and that they could then you know, lay it in with an egg, an axe. Well, they were so stupid as to send in the lawyers' check as her payment. And this girl came in and nobody could figure out where she came from. And she was obviously spinning madly. And so, no sign up was done of any kind whatsoever. They put the money aside to be refunded and sent the girl off to a motel or something like that to wait for somebody turning up, because they figured somebody would turn up. And in forty eight hours, sure enough, her parents turned up. Wrath, you see? "What have you done to our daughter to drive her crazy?" Well you see, nobody had done anything to her daughter. Nobody'd touched the daughter, but she had spun. Not because she was refused auditing, but because she'd been set up to spin. Don't think that post hypnotic suggestion and that sort of thing was not known to these guys. They knew all about this. And I've seen at least two or three cases directly attributable to this.

Now therefore, every once in a while a case like that will show up. Now the funny part of it is, not that they're bird dog type case, just the psychotic. And you don't detect it. After all you're not supposed to be able to detect it. And these next two are the only times I've ever seen them spin. So I've done a coordination. I've done a coordination. And that one, physically tired, and six, "I promise not to process a preclear who is improperly fed or hungry." And those characters only spun when they either hadn't had anything to eat or when they hadn't had any sleep. And that is the trouble with a psychotic. They can't eat, and they can't sleep. Those are the two things they have a great deal of trouble doing.

And if you process one of them when he hasn't eaten and he hasn't slept, you'll have very bad luck indeed. I'm not saying you should ever process one. But I'm just saying, whereas, if you can get them to sleep and you can get them to rest, and you can get them to eat something, oddly enough they can be processed. They very often present no more problem than other preclears.

People are worried about electric shock. The only reason we say anything about electric shock, electric shock cases coming in. It's not that we can't process electric shock cases. They've been given the old yo heave back into R—6, where electric shock is gorgeously advertised. The psychiatrist is supposed to electric shock people. He does in R—6. See? And the society's just dramatizing this, don't you see? Well it's tended to put the bird into R—6 to a marked degree, and the rest of it is, is he is already under some tremendous mental duress of some kind or another. And very often, still

while you are processing him, unbeknownst to you, still under treatment. And you get the wildest bing—bing of mixed therapies, which is also in this, and so on, and there just isn't any therapy involved with it. It's just a method of punishing somebody.

It's like the fellow who was asked, a psychotic who was given a prefrontal lobotomy, and he was exhibited to a medical convention, and somebody asked him on the side, "Well, what have you learned all about?" They were just talking about what a marvelous recovery it was. The guy was a screaming mad man, you know, all this. And the psychotic, who apparently hadn't been talking to anybody or other, said out of the corner of his mouth in reply, "I've learned to keep my mouth shut."

So anyway, it is the no sleep, no rest, is the time he'll spin. Now if you want to really put length of time in a session, process a perfectly sane person who hasn't had any sleep for about twenty four hours. You're going to have a long session, because the body is a sort of an electrical machine anyhow, and it starts to drain down anything he can put out. And it's a, it's a hard fight. It's a hard fight. It lengthens the time in session if he's had no sleep. And also, if he's ever going to get into any trouble or make an error in the session, now he's likely to make an error in the session, and so is the auditor, why it goes in sort of deep. And it's very hard to repair. So the wise thing to do is to size up your PC. Has he eaten? Has he slept? You haven't. Well very good. Come back some other day when you have." And that way, you keen it up, and keen out of trouble. Probably all the trouble you'll get into with PCs is right in those two. Insufficient rest and they haven't eaten.

If you were to process somebody in the morning before he'd had his breakfast, or before he'd had anything to eat at all, you'd find out his processing reactions were quite different. Processing has something to do with the electrical currents of the body, or something like this. And a fellow who hasn't eaten apparently isn't doing enough with his oxygen or something. It's ties up with basal metabolism. And you could get very technical about the whole thing. Actually there's a way you can test one of these on one of these meters. If you ask the guy to take a long breath while he's holding onto the cans, and if you then get a long fall, he's eaten. But if he takes a long breath and lets it out, and the needle doesn't drop, don't audit him. He hasn't had anything to eat. Or he's very physically exhausted. Interesting, huh? It's just an interesting phenomena.

It's not that the machine accurately measures basal metabolism or something like that, it's that it does react in that fashion. Did you ever see a preclear yawn and then see a long fall? That's why you should put yawn in your administration. Also cough. Naturally cough would fall because there's a physical convulsion with regard to it. But you don't often notice that the yawn produces a fabulous amount of surge. Well if it produces a large surge you know your PC has eaten and he's slept very well, in spite of the fact that he's yawning. There's somebody yawning now.

OK. Those two, those two, when I see those two violated and so forth, my hair stands on end. Because it means that the auditor who violates those two is one of these fine days going to wrap a preclear around a telegraph pole. And one day I noted in an auditing session that the auditor said at the end of the session, which he'd apparently known all along, that the gains weren't very good because the preclear had only had one hours' sleep in the last twenty four. He'd apparently known this the whole session, and it hadn't

affected his judgement as to what gains to expect. He shouldn't have expected any gains at all. But what stood my hair on end is the person he was processing had just come to my attention as once upon a time an electric shock case in an institution. Brother, he didn't know it, but that auditor was riding right along the edge of that cliff in a motorcycle at ninety miles an hour, the rocks falling down into the chasm with every spin of the wheel. Nuts! So, best way to stay out of trouble in that direction is, has he eaten? Slept? Good. Fine. Now, here's the next one. "I promise not to permit a frequent change of auditors." The funny part of it is that you will find, that after you've been through about three auditors on a preclear, he may very well get sort of nervous and queasy. And the lower the state of case the more nervous he's going to get. And he, well a wag just starting out, he would feel, if you gave him on his first sub—zero levels, if you gave this guy three auditors in a row he'd feel he'd have to get anything he was going to say off to them all over again. He'd have to tell each one about himself all over again. And it'd make a rather hideously anxious sort of session. "Does this fellow know me or doesn't he know me?" And then he would also go so far as to think maybe he had to do all the processes over again too. There's all kinds of kooky things happen. So insofar as possible, particularly the worse off the case, insofar as possible keep the same auditor. Now this mostly gets violated in review .

Now let me show you this oddity. Review gets the worst cases. It's only the case that's messed up and in trouble that really gets into review, right? So he has a review on Monday with auditor A, Tuesday with auditor B. and Thursday with auditor C. Well now if it was all on the same cycle of action more or less, he would find he was very confused indeed. You've actually impeded his case gain. And once more, if you did this to a psychotic without knowing he was one and so on, he would probably spin. So it is actually better, in review, if you've got three auditors in review or something like this, or more, it is better to wait 'till that auditor. It is better for the review receptionist to see who was auditing him last time, and put him on that auditors' schedule, and know when that auditor's going to be free, and tell him to be there then. Not to backlog him, 'cause it can be done in the same afternoon.

This is, this is just good sense. But it's something you should caution a receptionist or somebody who isn't used to scheduling people, and so on, that doesn't mean anything to them. They just throw the folders around this way and that, see? It's something to caution them about.

Now it's not good enough to maintain on duty one auditor who does one session a week, just because somebody started a session last year and you can't change the auditor. It's not a good enough reason not to give a session because that auditor's no longer in the organization. That's not, it's not good enough for that. Well what I'm talking about is, is a frequent. A frequent change of auditors. Every time the guy gets a list, why he gets some different auditor. He's always being audited by a different auditor. And next time a different auditor. You can unstabilize him. And actually, your processing is so swift these days that it's very simple to schedule the same auditors. Simple, simple, simple. And the only reason you've been shifting auditors around in a class and so on, is to give one another practice. And so on. And to that degree it's tolerated. It's actually been too much, done too much, right on this class.

So that was number seven. Number eight, "I promise not to sympathize with the preclear, but to be effective." Notice this is changed. Now masked under that is a custom and habit which Saint Hill gets into periodically. Saint Hill does alright lots of the time. But every once in a while I've noticed that amongst the students, all missed withholds become ARC breaks. They won't pull a missed withhold on each other, all they'll do is run ARC breaks on each other. In other words, as students, sort of their mutual rudiments go out, don't you see? So you can... I've seen this go and happen, and then be busted up, and then happen again, and then go again so many times that it's a natural sort of phenomenon. A certain group starts to get sympathetic. It's what they do. See? So, they smash up each others' cases actually.

Mazie Ann day after day has had this howling missed withhold from her instructor. Her supervisor, see? Day after day she exhibits the manifestation of an ARC break. Day after day the guy who is auditing her pulls an ARC break because he sympathizes with her, because he realizes that anybody should be mad at that supervisor. It's on a "you poor thing" basis. And will actually go on and continue to pull ARC breaks. But there isn't an ARC break in the lot. It's a missed withhold. And the person doesn't recover. Now if you start, there's a lot of this on record. If you start sympathizing with the PC about how badly his mother has treated him, or something like this, or sympathize with his hard lot, you're actually admitting that you can't do anything about it.

Because the three cycles of doing something for somebody who is having trouble are first and foremost, be effective. Cure it up. Handle it. Well if you can't cure it up and handle it, you can make him comfortable. That's the second stage. If you can't cure it up or handle it you can make him comfortable. And if you can't make him comfortable you can sympathize with him. It's that low grade an action. So instead of sympathizing with Mazie Ann about how bad off it all is, and how she's being treated, and so forth and so on, be effective. Maybe she is being badly treated. Well don't stand around and sympathize with her. Make sure that the ethics is in better in that area. And if, if it's her, well make sure she gets audited and somebody pulls the missed withhold. You know, be effective. Don't stand around on the beautiful sadness of sympathy.

When auditors' start that, boy, you can just kiss your gains goodbye. And your students no longer start making wins in the academy, or at the Class VI course. PC's start going up in smoke. Actually it's a marvelous method of putting somebody at effect. "Oh you poor thing." Same thing as saying, "You've been overwhelmed." Same thing as saying, "You are the effect." Do you see? "You are the effect."

Alright, number nine. "I promise not to let a preclear end session on his own determinism, but to finish off those cycles I have begun." That means that if a PC blows the session the auditor is remiss for not finding, noting when it happened, the ARC break, and not handling it before it resulted in a blow, not noting and finding the missed withhold that is going to make him blow. Do you understand? Those are the only reasons a PC ends session on his own determinism.

But the same time, that precludes that the auditors' TRs are going to be sufficiently smooth so that he can even be understood, and so that he is auditing. Remember it is an auditors' code.

It's a very bad thing to let a PC end a session on his own determinism.

Actually you can see an ARC break coming that is going to wind up in a blow, for as long as an hour and forty five minutes before it happens. Doesn't speak of a very alert auditor. Certainly it's detectable ten or fifteen minutes before it happens. It never happens suddenly. And it's a flagrant session ARC break which is handled with the list 1. So what the hell? I mean, the auditor wouldn't be very effective if some preclear blew session. And then when the preclear blows session, he's just left parked, right there. And it's either got to be picked up by somebody else, or something effective has got to be done in some other quarter, and so on.

Once in a while a preclear'll walk out of session just because he can't stand it anymore. There are silly auditor errors pulled by some complete, untrained bird. Like, four auditing commands, which are all different, all spewed out in a row, with the PC trying to answer one or the other of them, and then refusing to tell the PC which one he's supposed to answer. I mean, the outness of this kind of thing on a very, very unprofessional co-audit level and so on, can be pretty kooky. And sometimes a preclear would end session just on a matter of self preservation. But, this understands that the auditor has within his power the ability to continue to handle and continue the session. And it is an auditors' code. Not an amateurs'.

Ten, "I promise never to walk off from a preclear in session." Now this is one of the serious things that has happened from time to time. The auditor simply gets up and walks off. Leaves the preclear sitting in the middle of an engram or an unfinished cycle or something like that. The auditor gets up and walks off. Yes, it has happened.

Eleven, "I promise never to get angry with a preclear in session." Now that I have seen spin PCs. And it's about the only time I've ever seen a PC spin. The auditor became furiously angry with the preclear in a session. He must have been some auditor. He was up in Spokane or some place. And this PC, this PC traveled a couple of thousand miles in a total spin to get to the organization and get the thing handled, and so on. But all that had happened, he'd just gone into a rage at her in session. She wouldn't answer the auditing command, and for no reason at all he went into a rage. ARC broke the auditor or something. But it can have very serious consequences.

Twelve, and here's a new one. It is, "I promise to run every major case action to a floating needle." Gone is your old three equal comm lags, and so forth. Number twelve, "I promise to run every major case action to a floating needle."

And thirteen, "I promise never to run any one action beyond its' floating needle." That catches it both ways and the middle, doesn't it?

Number fourteen, "I Promise to grant beingness to the preclear in session." It doesn't say I don't promise to go on tip toe around, whenever I'm around the preclear when I'm out of session. Let me read that one again. Fourteen, "I promise to grant beingness to the preclear in session." Its' modified. It's in session. But I have seen auditors treating preclears as though they were still in session when they're out of session, and I've seen preclears sort of hanging the auditor with the fact that they're his PC out of session. It's unfair and goofy in both ways. And so on. I've even gone so far as to occasionally tell a preclear who tried to continue the session after the end of session, "You are not now in session." And they sometimes blink, and say, "Yeah, that's right." I didn't say, "Bug off." But I might have. That's in session. It's in session. Sometimes you get a PC hangs himself around your neck. God help

us.

Fifteen. And this is a different and a new one. "I promise not to mix processes, the processes of Scientology with other practices, except when the preclear is physically ill, and only medical means will serve." Boy that is open to a lot of interpretation I imagine. But the net result of all of this is, that before you could have misunderstood it to the degree that the guy couldn't possibly have had his leg set if he was being processed. You see, an extremity of that character could happen. You'd better have arteries tied up and legs set, because bodies are rather inhuman things.

It doesn't mean that when a preclear is sufficiently ill, and he won't recover, that you shouldn't process him at all. Doesn't mean because he's being given medical treatment you should abandon him. I'll tell you something funny in this particular field. The original experiments, way back. 1945. The original experiments on this line determined that function monitored structure. In other words, function ran structure. That was a big lesson. Actually, endocrine compounds like hormones and so on, could be given to somebody. Well that's physiological. I mean, you know? You can give him hormones and so on. Well he should have responded in some fashion to this. And then, after they were mentally unburdened of their problems or troubles, it would work. But it wouldn't work. In other words, the wild variable was that hormones and certain preparations, and by the way it was undertaken with people who were just released from Jap prison camps who had been starved during the better part of World War II in Japanese prison camps. And they were coming in to Oak Knoll Naval Hospital. And it was very difficult to handle these boys, because they were very badly deranged. They had been subjected to brutality, the like of which nobody ever heard of. And they weren't really treated as prisoners of war at all. They were rust absolutely inhumanly butchered. And these fellows were carrying a terrific amount of mental stress, so that on some of them you would give them preparations, like amino acids, which is the acids of protein, so maybe they could begin to digest their food again. Or something like that. Wouldn't work, you know? Wouldn't work. Damn little to do with it. Because there's enough coordination there they could imagine that they were associated. So this, this is interesting, this is interesting from this standpoint, because it brings you up to this one. The guy's on penicillin, but his lumbosis won't cure up. He's got pneumonia. He actually can be on penicillin and it isn't handling the thing. He isn't getting any better. Or he's getting better very, very slowly indeed .

Now he was so ill before he went on any antibiotic that he couldn't stir. But now that he's on the antibiotic he can stir around a little bit. Do you follow? Now, this magic can occur. Now that he can pay attention he's not running a high fever, or something like that. But he isn't getting any better. He's come up just that little bit, and he's stuck right there. You can audit the engram and the penicillin works. I've seen this. I've seen this and done some work with this. It's the most miraculous thing you ever cared to see. I mean, the fellow's been hanging five for three weeks and they're starting to step up the penicillin to million units an hour or something like this you know? He isn't getting any better. He doesn't improve. They continue. This is all, anything, you know, and then just run the engram of the illness, or put in his Ruds, or something like this, and all of a sudden, wham! All cures us in about four hours. So what it is is sort of a penicillin assist. It's a reverse flip. You

say, "Well you shouldn't audit a person under drugs." You shouldn't audit a person under soporifics, which are sleep. Sleep drugs, you shouldn't audit a person under those that produce wild euphoria, or vnee vnee ney cay. You shouldn't process him when he's on that kind of drugs. For the excellent reason that the processing probably becomes part of the trip. So you try to process him later, why then it restimulates this, and he sets into a sore of a fog. It's wild. It's kind of a mess. He has sort of a processing engram. You know? And he's somewhat hypnotic when he's on this stuff. So that you say to him something or other something or other, he's liable to come out the other end of the session without remembering a single thing that happened in the session. That's expressly the type of drug.

I have people come around and say, "Mazie Ann has been on tranquilizers for fifteen years, and does she have to come off her tranquilizers, because she has Petit mal seizures, so that you can audit her?" I often think the tranquilizers didn't do her any good, they haven't even got her tranquilized. Look at her, man. What the hell's the difference? You're talking about some tiny thing. As far as penicillin is concerned, or stomach pills, or something like that, forget it. Processing won't do anything with it or to it or apart from it or anything. It doesn't have anything to do with processing at all, because it doesn't produce an hypnotic state. Doesn't produce a lowered thing that leaves you at the end of the session with a sort of Scientology engram. You got it?

Alright. Number sixteen is, "I promise to maintain communication with the preclear, and not to cut his comm or permit him to overrun in session." There's one for you. That puts it right where it lives, boy. It doesn't say maintain two way communication with the preclear in session. Nobody really understood that anyhow, 'cause that wouldn't make much of a session. But it says, "I promise to maintain communication with the preclear, and not to cut his comm or permit him to overrun in session." So an auditor reading that has to find the point where you stop his talking without cutting his comm. And that's an interesting one to learn. And it is a thing. There is an exact point where you do this. And it's very easily seen and very easily understood. Not very hard to. But if it's not pointed out in any way to the auditor, he's not likely to have much of a grip on it. He's liable to cut his comm, cut the preclears comm without knowing he's cut comm. You see?

Alright, and permitting a preclear to run on for another page and a half after he has passed the F/ N is just the best way in the world to knock it in the head.

Number seventeen, "I promise not to enter comments, expression or enturbulance into a session that distracts a preclear from his case." Now, that covers about it all. You can't, not supposed to enter comments, like, "Yeah boy, that's sure great. Yeah, you're really doing groovy." Anything, you know? Expressions includes facial expressions. Or enturbulance. That means dropping cans, E—meters, auditing report pages, opening and closing drawers, looking for Kleenexes, and so forth, and it also includes having odd objects on the auditing desk. It's a distraction. It also includes making the environment safe enough to audit in it. So that you know that the environment is not going to be interruptive, 'cause that's going to enter an enturbulance into the session. And this is one of the main reasons for a false auditing report. You get an auditing report, looks OK, the preclear falls on his head two days later, this has been what has happened. That's been what

happened. That's very heavily the facts.

Now number eighteen. That is to say the auditor's entered, without putting it down, he's entered comments, expression or enturbulance into a session that distracts the preclear from his case. Alright. Number eighteen, "I promise to continue to give the preclear the process or auditing command when needed." I have seen, in actual fact, the maddest thing. I'll add to that in the session. "I promise to continue to give the preclear the process or auditing command when needed in the session. ' Now I've seen what that exactly means, is I have actually seen an auditor give the orders to run back into an engram, and then shut up. I've actually seen this. Not just once. I don't know why, and I don't know what they do, and they haven't got any explanation for it at all. The guy never comes through with the second command. Never says, "Go through the incident." Something, just some freeze. You know? They freeze somehow or another. I've seen it a couple of times. And either the person just went blank, or was himself sufficiently distracted, or didn't know what he was doing, but boy, does it leave a preclear to scramble for himself. Two minds put him down there and he's got to get back on one. And it's definitely a very hard scene on a PC.

Nineteen, "I promise not to let a preclear run a wrongly understood command." Now if he answered it as a wrong command, and then you caught it and then you corrected it, you'd be in violation of number one of the code. You'd now be evaluating. He thought he answered it right, you told him it was answered some other way. So therefore, it means that the things have to be cleared, and they have to be correctly cleared. You say, "What is the definition of that?" And the individual then gives you some definition which is the wrong definition, and then you turn around and give him the right definition, you are going at it all backwards and upside down. So I guess you jolly well better have a little old slit of paper to hand him, and have him read the definition. "Now this auditing command I'm going to give you is ARC breaks. And A is for affinity, and that means..." You're going to have to go into the business of training some preclears. It'd be nice to have a little book that explains all of these words, wouldn't it? This is what it means.

Now when you catch up on your homework, preclear, I will audit you. Now the only difficulty with that, is after the guy read the book he has some F/ Ns while he was reading it. So you'd have to check for it if that happened. But that is one of the major sources of no auditing gain. PC didn't know what the hell he was being asked, see? He had the words, and totally evaluated some other way. They were weighted. You know, he had the weight of the words all different. It's like the childs' dictionary comes up and says, "Source is the starting place." He couldn't run the process on that. Source is not the starting place. It would be the point of origin, or it would be the originator. Or where something was begun or dreamed up or mocked up. And then a guy could run it.

So no source becomes a thing that doesn't have a starting place. "Well that's a race horse wandering around in the pasture." He isn't at the starting gate, don't you see? It's easy.

OK. Twenty. So the way to get around that nineteen, on the wrongly understood command, and you notice it's wrongly understood command, is bring your preclear up right. I wouldn't even bother to bring him up right in session. I'd say, "Study all these definitions so I can audit you."

Now for years we've had to educate preclears, only nobody ever admitted it. Have to educate him into what's going to happen, what he's supposed to say, what he's supposed to do, and so on. When you don't do this I see some of these preclears running around being psycho analytic subjects. I have actually had, I have actually had somebody sit down in the session and start to run a psycho analytic session on me. Not a psycho analytic session, a psycho analytic I don't know what the hell they call it. Orgy. Wing ding. Actually. And they start to tell you about their, not just even the words they're using. "Well when I was a little child I did have an awful lot of trouble. We had a lot of hired men around and about the place, and each one of them violated me in turn. There was Joe, Bill, Pete, Tom, Oscar. Now, you see, now these..." And I'd say, "What's going on?" "Well, don't you want to know all about this, and so forth?" And I'd say, "No, I don't want to know anything about it. Have you ever told anybody else about these thing?" "Oh yes, we always talk about these things." "Who's we?" "Me and my psycho analyst." very good. Do you remember a time when you first heard that you should have some psycho analysis? That's very good. What was the date of that? Very good. Alright. Now what is the duration of the period? Very good." I never, I never monkey with it, boy. I never monkey with it. That is a former therapy getting in your road. And it would read on your seven resistive cases. Well you don't let anybody act like that in a session. Either educate them or scan it out, boy.

It does take the cooperation of the preclear. I don't know if you've ever noticed that about auditing. Then there was the auditor who was the only one in session who ever got any gains. (Laughter.)

Alright, and here's another one. "I promise to estimate the current case state of a preclear only by standard case supervision data, and not to diverge because of some imagined difference in the case." Now I'm putting weep—pons (weapons) into your hands. The weapons.

Alright, twenty two. "I promise never to use the secrets of a preclear divulged in session for punishment or personal gain. ' Now you know the old one of that there is never use Scientology for personal gain, but I'd see auditors all over the place getting rich and everything, and organization getting rich, so it can't be well interpreted. But this is what people worry about.

Now, you will probably see somewhere over in an ethics code appear another one. "A person who knowingly waits until he's in session to divulge evidence of a crime is culpable." Because then you'll find nobody's ever confessing unless he's in session. But anyway, regardless of that, this is what people worry about. They worry about, the world worries about this. They think that if we have such power that we can get information out of people like this, they actually have had reporters and things mention it to me very recently. "What about all those hundred and thousands of cases you have at Saint Hill, and all those tremendous secrets you have on people, and all of this kind of thing?" So they worry about it.

They think people are entitled to their secrets. In actual fact I wouldn't give you two bits for the whole collected lot. You know, man has a lot of crime mixed up with vanity. Some PC, see, that comes in, and boy he gives you this long criminal record, and so on. I feel like asking him sometimes, "Are you bragging or confessing?" You know it's the truth. Because it's not worth all that. It's not worth all that. Only in their zone and area it is. We have become

more blase. Imagine, though, imagine though, in the nineteenth century how a fellow was made guilty his entire life because he had once seen a photograph of a lady who was naked to the waist. This corrupted his entire life. I don't know.

The main thing about it is, see, the value of the withhold is this, and we could be jumped on for this. So I've included it in the auditors' code. That's the only reason it's there. We actually don't do anything about it. Actually there was one hell of a crime committed not too very long ago. And it wasn't owned up to, and it was admitted in session. Actually nothing happened to the fellow. He was not punished for it in any way. No. Now goes the continued story. He wasn't punished for it in any way, nobody did anything to him, and so on. Do you know that he went ahead and tried to knock himself off? He then tried to mete out his own punishment in the thing. And right this minute is in hospital, having undergone an operation he didn't need. He was getting well. And it all traces back to waiting until he was in session to admit to a crime, no punishment was given him of any kind whatsoever. It was a very heinous crime. No punishment was meted out. So he started meting it out himself. And that's what he's doing right this minute. And there is no other explanation to it. It's not a guilt complex. It's bust he's making sure he gets his throat cut for it, Cause he knows dog cone well it should have been. But it was handed out in session.

Well the world worries about this, what happens to this. And I have actually seen a PC actually made very, very ill where his auditor suddenly trying to make him guilty in session for what he's doing, and I have seen a PC folded up for being charged for something which was divulged in a session. And it, after all, the auditors' code is an attempt to maximize case gain. We now know this, we now know that it is only where tech is out that ethics has to go in. You got it? You get tech in on the guy, why it's silly to try to get in ethics. Why? It's reverse end to. Alright, number twenty three, "I promise to see that any fee received for processing is refunded if the preclear is dissatisfied and demands it within three months after the processing, the only condition being that he may not again be processed or trained." Now we've had this a custom for some time, but it might as well appear in the auditors' code, because a lot of auditors are not bound by this. It's a wild one, actually, because the truth of the matter is, is every time that I have been around and somebody was talking about money being refunded, not on any auditing I was doing, but money should be refunded for the training or processing, or something like that. And you gave it back to them, without even this last qualification, that he may not be trained or processed again, and so on, it's very, very rare that the person will take it back. I've stood around and gone to a hell of a fuss to make sure that somebodys' money was refunded. And it was almost impossible to do, and when it was done and so forth, why they went around sort of hang dog and sheepish about it, and it made a mess. But this is something no other profession could do. This is something nobody else on the planet would dare do.

The manufacturer is forced to do it with his products, but nobody in the field of healing has had enough answers. So it's a total dare.

Now, if we have that in the auditors' code we can start to insist that it be practiced in the field of medicine. And we can hold it up as something wh ah is applicable to professional ethics in general. And it could go so far as, "Well if the patient dies there is no reason why the family should receive a medical

bill, of course." It is a fantastic propaganda weapon. And the truth of the matter is, you're far better off to do this. You're far better off. If you were individually practicing and some sc comes in and says, "That didn't do me any good whatsoever. ' You're probably practicing on somebody who is PTS, who is connected up, messed up, she or he is a seven resistive case to begin with, they're not going to do you any good at all anywhere. The best thing to do is just promptly say, "Alright. Sign this waiver that you're not supposed to be trained or processed again anyplace. Good. Here is your dodo." Right now. Bong. You find the person's, "Wait a minute."

In the first place they do it sometimes just trying to get even with you. They got a missed withhold or something of this sort, so they're trying to get even with you somehow. And they don't mean it. The number of people who would accept their money back on the condition they were never trained or processed again are so few, but it is not something another profession could do. They wouldn't dare. All the money'd have to be returned. You actually can throw that down the throats of people legislatively. "When other professions are willing to adopt a clause of this particular character, then they can talk about being ethical." Until then they had better not talk about us. Defense line.

And if all auditors stood back of that as a defense line it would be a very good one indeed.

Now, twenty four, "I promise not to advocate Scientology only to cure illness or only to treat the insane, knowing well it was intended for spiritual gain." That's actually not to get anybody off the hook and not to agree with any laws or anything else. It's, boy do you go in the soup when you try to go any other distance than for gain for the individual himself.

OK, and number twenty five is, "I promise to cooperate fully with the legal organizations of Dianetics and Scientology as developed by L. Ron Hubbard in safeguarding the ethical use and practice of the subject, according to the basics of standard tech." That should straighten out a lot of it.

So that is the new auditors' code, good, bad or indifferent. Right now there is a code of reform which is being put together, but that would be the code of a Scientologist. And I don't know what results are coming in on this on a code of reform, but it is a very interesting project which will probably be adventured upon again somewhere up the line. And the project is writing every prominent man, or every professional man in the entire community, giving him a description of Dianetics and Scientology, of the various things it has done and oppositions it has met, and what it can do, and asking him for his advice in the usages to which it could be placed, and asking him for any recommendations he'd have as a reform of its' practice. And there's some fantastic number of these things being mailed out. There's about, oh I don't know, there's about three million, or something like that in the United States, and some vast number in other areas. And the net result of all of this will eventually be codified into a code of reform. But it will be the code of a Scientologist, or in practices or organizations. And very doubtful if anything would be added to the auditors code. It just sort of blows the criticism that's been going around.

And at any time you find the subject's under criticism it is a very good approach. Say, "OK. What do you want changed?" Nobody can complain about that.

The auditors' code which you have been going by, of course is

fundamentally correct. And as you see it has not actually been invalidated, it's been put in a different form. And it has been brought up to date. So that the floating needle, and so on, is included in that.

Alright, so much for that. I hope you agree with that. I... Very good.

Now there is, it's one thing to freeze a subject. A guy by the name of Augustus, whose real name was I think Octavius, whose real name was probably Bastardus, or..., who was kicking around about the time of Cleopatra or something. Anyhow, he was all mixed up with some jerk, some epileptic by the name of Caesar... It's all sort of confused in mind at the particular time, because I wasn't in Rome at the time. But this bird Augustus, he called himself, which meant top dog or something, he froze the boundaries, he froze the boundaries of the Roman Empire. And he said, "Rome hereafter must not expand." And he's the man who killed Rome. All you have to do is say in this universe something may not expand, and from that particular moment on, it stagnates and will eventually fail and fall. Which was a woeful fact. Actually he said, "Every eldest son had to serve in the footsteps of his father." So that nobody could get out of any profession his father was in. The boundaries of the empire must not expand any further than they are, but we will hold it at that point. Of course, immediately it started to crumble. He had a lot to say.

It is a very, very bad thing to totally freeze something in this particular universe. Now I'll point out to you that what we know, however, we still know—And that is that we know the basics as we come up the line. It is absolutely amazing how little this auditors' code has changed in fifteen years. But here is this minor change. It is adapted to the increase of technology.

The net result of an unchanging absolutely never to be varied situation is, of course, stagnation. But something can continue all the way from standard basics. In other words, you can have certain standard basics and develop on top of those basics. More can be found out about what you already know.

We have an already workable path. That path is very workable. It is very swift. I reserve, and I wish to impress this upon a Class VIII student, I reserve the right to release further advances of technology. I can assure you that they are not going to invalidate the things you already know now, because everything which has been developed has been developed forward along the exact lines which you see them in now.

But let me give you an example. This morning I was doing the research on 8, and I was very fascinated with a horrible circumstance which took place. And I immediately checked it up with two other auditors that I respect on the ship. And I checked it up with these auditors as to whether or not they'd ever really seen this phenomena. And all of a sudden an explanation fell out of the hat about something, and I found out they had both been wondering about this also. And I collided with it, because somebody sent me a new E—meter and it is not a new E—meter in design, it is simply that somebody changed the manufacturer. And the new manufacturer, before he can release or before they could accent this meter, I of course have to give a pass on it. Well I had actually already given a pass on it. I hadn't been able to detect any vast difference in this meter. But I had noticed that the needle of the meter was a tiny bit thinner, and probably the movement of the meter itself might have been a little bit smaller than in other meters. But I had not noticed anything more than the fact that the meter was very lively. It was lively. It's more lively than the original Mark IV.

So, I hadn't paid any attention to this, and yesterday my meter ran down, or had to get charged up or something like this, and somebody put this other meter, which is the prototype. It's not the meter which I would normally use anyway. It was the prototype. And they put up the prototype on my desk for my use, for checking something out. And what do you know? I turned the thing on, and I checked over something, and I thought you know, that should be a release point of that action. And I got an R/ S! I got a wild rock slam. Now I looked at this meter again, and it wasn't tuned up in any peculiar way. But I suddenly recognized why I hadn't been aware of it before I'd turned it on and used it, that it had a terribly faint, light, very, very thin needle, which is off pattern, don't you see? And, so I looked at this, and I thought, "What am I looking at here? Why should I R/ S? This is sort of mad." And so I said, "I better check out if there's been an invalidation, because R/ S, invalidation, they go together." So I checked out, and sure enough there was a tremendous read on an invalidation. And I thought, "That's really remarkable. But if it's a tremendous read on the invalidation, why doesn't it R/ S?" So I went and synthesized again the exact point and situation on the track which had made it R/ S. And it held for a moment and then it R/ Sed again. And I suddenly realized that invalidation would read, of course. It was a float. It was a floating needle. It was a floating needle and the invalidation was I'd invalidated a floating needle. But on this very, very light meter, with this very light needle, with my case section where it is, I've stopped floating. I R/ S. I get a hair a dial wide R/ S. And what it is is a reverse rocket read. The R/ S begins with a rocket read which is backwards from right to left. And I get a backwards rocket read as it pops. It pops like that, and then pops the other way. And that's all it is. It's just a, it's quite remarkable, but it took a different meter to demonstrate the thing. And so I asked one of the other auditors and he said, "Oh yes." And I said, "What cases have you seen something like this on?" And one was a 3, and one was an OT 6. An OT 3, an OT 6.

Alright. Now the datum that suddenly emerges here, this meter was tuned up rather more sensitive than meter normally is, and was in itself a much livelier meter. So if you were to turn up a standard meter to maybe one hundred and twenty eight on its' sensitivity switch knob, and then to tune it up to four or five, or something in that particular range, in the OT sections I think you will find out that you get your floats become reverse rocket reads. And if you'll watch this carefully there won't be any doubt in your mind about a float, in the upper sections.

Now to give you a little more data on this, found out recently that auditors didn't seem to know that after an individual was clear that his thoughts read on a meter. And you notice it's only recently that we have had to do anything about this. The thoughts read on the meter. You ask the fellow some question on the meter. All he says, you know, on a green form. And all he says is, to himself is, "No I don't think that I..." Says this to himself. And you get a long surge, pow! Now an auditor who didn't know this, but in auditing a pre—OT, he would think the thing read. So actually what you have to do on anybody above clear, is you have to be wary of the fact, is their thinks read no matter what they think, it'll read. Particularly if they're thinking against something. If they're thinking a negative of some kind or another, up against the bank, or against the auditor, or against the meter, or something like this, you will get a read.

So that makes a case above clear, actually some cases down at grade four,

this lively. But very few. But a lot of auditors would just keep on buying this, you see, from clear on up, that every time they had a read that was a positive. You could wreck cases that way, so we're having to teach people how to get in suppress and false. And because auditors have done this in the past, a good thing to get in, false reads. And it cleans up a lot of cases, right?

Alright, now we have had a case or two in the upper OT sections recently, who have appeared before the examiner with a wide, wild R/ S. And to show you how odd this is, we have somebody who was comm eved because he R/ Sed on something. And in no case was it an R/ S. There is such a thing as an R/ S. But it is not what we think it is. A float at a certain high case level, with a certain tune up of sensitivity, actually behaves at an accelerated line it looks like an R/ S. Now the least you could tell about it, even with an ordinary meter, is the person should start rocket reading, and reverse. This is a sort of a pop. The needle pops backwards from right to left. And you can usually really tell if you tune up your meter right, why your floats become absolutely unmistakable, because they begin with a pop.

Now as the guy goes on up the lines this phenomenon begins to increase. And if your meter is already set up to read this pop, why if you were auditing somebody at OT 7 or OT 8, I can assure you that his float would be a rock slam.

Well, in supervising your folders, and so on, I have learned some new things, and so on. I'll continue to learn them, I'll continue to publish them, and I'll continue to make sure that you receive them. I don't expect a tumultuously changing future. I do expect a very successful one. And as we move it on up in the line up, we will undoubtedly have things which we notice, which can be incorporated. And when they work out uniformly to the better good of all cases, they will themselves become standard tech.

Very good? Thank you very much.

AN EVALUATION OF EXAMINATION ANSWERS AND DATA ON STANDARD TECH

A lecture given on 15 October 1968

Thank you. Thank you. We have come to the end of the trip. That sounds very bad in some connotations. Now, you probably want to know what you got wrong on the examination. The examination is what processes do you use on the green form. Well for some reason or another you characters have forgotten that you can have, and have issued, and have done green forms. It is the ordinary Qual action. Now the reason why this was not hit hard in this course, is that so many green forms had already been handed out amongst the students that we did not heavily use green forms.

The best thing you can do with a green form is to itsa, earlier itsa. That's the best thing you can do with it. And out of that you could even omit ARCU, CDEI, if the guy didn't even know what he was doing on that. Just itsa, earlier itsa. Do you follow?

You can run ARC breaks with this. So, an auditor, you could train an auditor to use a green form rather easily if he could recognize an F/ N, and knew enough to get an earlier incident.

But a green form. Apparently your answers on a green form were very poor. Now it takes a rather skilled auditor to run listing and nulling, so you tend to minimize that. And you tend to minimize that, but when environment reads on a green form, the proper thing, the actual proper thing to call for if your auditor is skilled, is a remedy B. When you get a continuous present time overts reading, the best thing on that is the listing and nulling question, which is actually of the family of S and D questions. It's one of those very good questions. Is, "What are you trying to prevent?" And that is what you use to handle continuous present time overts.

Now an S and D reads if the person is connected to a suppressive person or group. And you would do an S and D. And the S and D, of course, is done on WSU, an assessment of which S and D is required, and if you start doing too many S and Ds on a case all it does is invalidate the last S and D. But you can run one of each kind. There's an F/ N available on W. which is withdraw, there's an F/ N available on stop, there's an F/ N available on unmock. So there're actually three types of S and Ds that can be run. You wouldn't even bother much to clarify that, but beyond saving that if a person has been run on a withdraw S and D, then it should not be run.

I don't know if you could get, if you realize this, but your recall or remember being blank, is a sort of an S and D all by itself on your LX—1. That type of list.

Now there's several of these types of lists, by the way, just as a notation here. There's several of these types of lists. They're all handled the same way. Don't all of a sudden believe that they are something brand new and wonderful and strange. For instances the Money Course people are giving all over the place, is just one of these L—list. It would be handled exactly the same way. Run the motivator engram, run the overt engram, and the thing would be in actual fact, just those things associated with money. And it'd simply be a list of these things associated with money, gives the person a prepared list, it's already prepared, it's issued, it's not changed, not added to. And it's simply assessed, and you do a recall or remember, and so forth on that. Just filling you in on a little bit of data here. The lists have not at this moment been prepared. And as a result, I didn't give them to you.

But your LX—1, your LX—1 is simply the pattern. That is, the pattern. The other pattern, the LX—1 is the pattern by which you run a recall, get an F/ N, run a activator chain of engrams or secondaries, get an F/ N. You can get an F/ N from secondaries, and you'd get an F/ N from engrams. overts, secondaries, you can get an F/ N for overts, secondaries. You can get an overt for F/ N engrams. And that is one pattern. Another pattern of action is you assess this little prepared list. A very simple little list. And you can do, for something like auditing or something like that, you can do the L—1 on the result of this little prepared list, or you can prep check it.

These are all of a family of actions. They actually can be addressed to anything. I just saw about a, I don't know. Must be a twenty page auditing report on a prep check of what you have been going over, called, you know, they make a list like, "Auditing, auditors", you know, so and so, so and so. That little list. And then prep check it. And that little list, all by its' little lonesome, produced twenty pages worth of session, on a case that has been a kind of a no—case gain case, and all that sort of thing. But that's all by itself, you see?

Now actually you can prepcheck floating needles. You can do all that sort of thing. But this is all outside the zone of green form. You don't discover these things on a green form. These are the things which a case supervisor adds up as necessary on the case, and he puts the thing together. Now when you send somebody over for a green form, over to Qual, your ordinary action would be something on the order of omit lists. You haven't got any security in your auditing, your lists. And they've done too damn many lists already. So just omit lists, do the green form, itsa, earlier itsa. And you'll just be surprised what these characters can run into on this.

So, you apparently forgot the green form. And that is Qual's chief weapon. Now one of the things about the green form is people mustn't send people to Qual to get a disagreements check, to get a sec check, to get a bop bop bop bow bow. People cannot dictate what happens in Qual except the case supervisor. Do you see? So that executives throughout an organization can send their staff in for anything they please, as long as it isn't done.

This also follows on into the field of the ARC break registrar. It's very unfortunate that it is known as the ARC break registrar, because what they ought to be doing on those people is a green form. And what they ought to be using is itsa, earlier itsa. That's all they ought to be doing on the whole ARC break program, the ARC break registrar, the ARC break auditor. That's all they ought to be specializing in. Because it's very safe. Very safe. And if you omit lists off of it you've got an unlimited run. It really doesn't matter how often or how long you go on this sort of thing.

But I didn't issue these green forms to you for the reason that anybody can do a green form. It's very simple. I've taught you some very standard actions. Now remember, when you've been putting in the Ruds, exactly the same action you use in putting in the Ruds is what you use in handling a green form. Except it ceases to be what is just in the rudiments, and it becomes the whole green form goes that way.

Now, this has, you had another one here. What does setting up a case mean? And apparently you missed this left, right and center. And some of you undoubtedly got it, but it was a common miss. It was question 246. You fly the Ruds or green form to F/ N before starting a major action. And brother, you better remember that. 'Cause if you missed that on the

examination, man, wow, you're going to have trouble. We had somebody just a day or two ago in auditing do the unforgivable thing. The guy had a somatic so they thought they'd put the full four rundown through. They're gonna handle a lousy little PT somatic with a full four rundown. Why that somatic ought to have been handled and everything ought to have been handled on the case. They guy was set up to go. Don't you see? And so, setting up a case is, you fly the Ruds or green form to F/ N before starting a major action, and that, you wouldn't attempt any major action on a case. Don't attempt a major action on a case that apparently has something wrong with it. Handle whatever is wrong with it before you attempt a major action. And if I can give you that the case'll fly.

You're handling a guy who is dead in his head or stuck here on earth, or something like this. The major actions of a case are to fly this thetan. I don't know. I might even go so far as to have somebody who is having consistent tonsillitis and lumbosis and bog—woggus, and that sort of thing, make him get himself straightened out medically before I'd touch him. Yeah, the case is obviously going to get audited with all the grades to cure his god damn tonsillitis.

Now the difference of viewpoint is, is you really shouldn't give a damn what shape the body is in as long as it does not deter the PC from flying. So your Ruds, and your little green forms, and your actions of this character, and how you set these cases up, you set the case up before you attempt a major action. And you're going to have terrific wins. Because the major action is for something else. It's to fly the guy. Not to handle his ingrown toenails. Do you see that? So I'm clarifying it here, because it possibly wasn't clear.

Question number 247, how do you set up a case? There is no consistency on this. There, some said just Ruds, some didn't mention F/ N. Hardly any mentioned a green form. Others went into more complex action of setting up a case, such as running engram chains and that sort of thing. But, you set up a case with Ruds or green form to F/ N, or list 1, or list 4. But you set up the case somehow. See? You can, you can go into more complex actions. Yes, that's very true. You can run engram chains. You can do this, you can do that and the other thing, see? But where you haven't set up the case you throw away the major action. And when you've thrown away the major action you've got no place to go. So you set up the case. You don't run somebody with a constant, persistent present time problem on a major action like grades. Don't say, "Well it'll all be handled when we do problems." Bunk! Problems are addressed more or less to the whole track.

I had somebody the other day, had somebody the other day run on the grades, and all that handled was her present time problems as a messenger. See, that was a flunk. That's a throw away of the whole line of grades, because in actual fact, the present time problem wasn't really straightened out on the case. You want this person to look at life. See? We want him to look all around and we want him examine his track and we want him to fly on this stuff. So this, this you've got to get. Because it's the very guts of modern auditing.

Alright, and question 250. Is "Explain the mechanism of release, and at which point you get an F/ N." The F/ N occurs when the PC disconnects from the mass. That's a release. When he disconnects from the mass, that's a release. Oddly enough, it translates through to the person that when he, for instance was in prison, and they let him out, that'll read as a release too.

Which is perfectly OK. Cause it was a release from the mass. Do you understand? But it's a release from the mass. And the comment here on the case, these, not my comments but the people who corrected the examinations, quite a few amazingly had this wrong. And for some reason had it confused with other thetan pictures. And some even said it's when you create the mass. I wouldn't know how you got that wrong.

If it's too, the trouble with it is, it's too damn simple. It's too simple. That's what's wrong. It's actually almost impossible to complicate the answer. So I'll give you the answer very bluntly. Here is a mass. When you take the thetan out of it, it's a release. When you erase the mass and leave the thetan there, it's an erasure. And there is no other complexity to it. Pleased That's all there is. That's all there is. There isn't any other complexity to it whatsoever. I'll go over it again. There's a mass. Any old damn mass. Mental mass, prison, cat fights. Alright. The mass. Alright. Here's a thetan. He's stuck in this thing, see? And he's saying, "I'm not happy. I get yowl all the time. You know? I yowl. I keep seeing these bars in front of my face. Yap yap yap yap. Complain, complain, complain, complain, complain. Why is he complaining? 'Cause he's stuck in a mass. He's out of time, he's in a mass, and so forth. You come along, you audit him, you go poof! Do you see? This, oddly enough, will drop out of sight. And he'll say, "Whee!" That's a release. Alright. Now, we've got another action. And here he is, stuck in prison. He's really stuck. 199 years to go. And we come along and we erase this. The engram he's stuck in. The mass he's stuck in. We get it as—ised. It doesn't disappear. It's gone. Gone. It ain't never gonna come back no more. And that's an erasure. Only two actions. He gets out of the car, or you scrub the car. That's all there is to it. You try to make anything else out of it, and boy, you gonna go around in circles. Sure we know he makes up the mass. Sure, we know all kinds of complications. Sure, we know that the mechanics of electricity show that ohms, volts often resist. Yes, we could probably fix up slide rules that would tell us the exact density of the release he's stuck on, and I imagine somewhere up the track if I don't keep my eye on it some damn fool will do this! But that's all there is to it. He gets out of the car or you erase the car.

In either way he's rid of the car. But if he just gets out of the car he's still got a car somewhere. If you erase the car he isn't ever gonna have any more trouble with that car, because it's gone. We don't care that he mocked up the car in the first place, he usually hasn't found this out. And very often he's so disowned something he has mocked up that it appears to be something somebody else mocked up. And sometimes it is something somebody else mocked up. Who is right there that moment looking down his throat. But we don't care what the hell! I don't know why you worry about where the hell the mass came from at the stage of defining release. Who cares where the mass came from? It is. And you can take him out of it, or you can erase it. You got it?

Brother, that's all there is to it. Wow, wow, wow.

Now you could exteriorize and get him out of the body, and then you can get complexities like that. You can exteriorize him, and get him out of the body only he took the mass with him. So he complains that it really wasn't a release, 'cause he didn't think he was stuck in the body, he thought he was stuck in some mass. It's what he thinks he's stuck in. It isn't his idea. He's really stuck in it—Like, like fly paper. But you can do those two actions and

they're entirely different.

Now, here's another one—"What is the matter, and how do you handle someone who found 'none' on three?" And I got one on you guys. You never checked out on your study materials at an AO on 3. You never did—You never did, and by god, from the lesson I've had here, you know what I'm gonna do? Dey gonna give star rate checkouts before dey ever get 3—And that's going on right now. Going on right now. That was telexed to them yesterday. They study it and study it and study it, and they can call it name, rank, serial number, everything else. Whether they can confront it or not we don't give a damn. And then we fly the Ruds, and let them go at 3. And of course when they fly the Ruds they go F/ N, they say, "It's all gone." We say, "Very good. It's all gone. That's great. You didn't find any?" "Oh, no, no. I never had any. I'm peculiar. I'm one of those people whose feet never stick. I was actually born in the universe as a free being, and I am still a free being. This stuff crawling on me is simply a rumor." And at that moment we will fly a rud, run incident II, capture to pilot, find some engram incident I's, and run them. And the funny part of it is, is you know sometimes this happened? It sometimes has happened that after we've done this once or twice the guy all of a sudden wakes up. And he says, "Hey, you know? There's a lot of these, hahahaheehoo. We say, "Here's your study materials and your pack again. Guess you go back to the old salt mines, boy." You understand'

Now we're not trying to invalidate his 3, we're not trying to get him to audit 3 forever, or anything like that. But he ought to be reasonable clear of fleas. So we don't have to use through the following OT sections flea powder on him every few minutes. And the reason for OT section failure is a failure, not to audit 3, but a failure to check out the materials of 3. The most abysmal ignorance you ever heard of seems to exist on this subject. I don't know why—Maybe a body thetan reads it. (Laughter.)

So you're going to find a lot of these cats, and the thing to do is to pat them on the back, and say, "Cheers." And not evaluate for him and tell him it's an unflat 3. Throw him into session, run an incident II capture to pilot, run him back, run some incident I's, and then they either don't have any more or they do. See? It's an open and shut proposition. If you can't clear it up in a review session they've got more. If you can clear it up in a review session, that's it. Do you follow? And they're going to have to do it all over again at 7 anyhow. It isn't that they departed. It's that there's other phenomenon of a case at 7, almost as startling as that of 3. And if you make them go back and audit 3 too often and too many times, and so on, you'll start running into phenomena of 7. And then the guy sort of gets plowed in and doesn't know where the hell he's going or coming, boy. And he can really get chewed in. But the way you'd straighten it out, is just take the repair actions which you've been taught on this course.

You could do an assessment of them, and ba ba ba body thetans and sessions, and invalidations and solo auditing, and bow—wow, and examiners, and review, and auditors and so forth. And I don't care, run it on L—1, prep check it, whatever you want to do with it. You could straighten him out. Do you understand?

If he overruns 3, there's another trick, I think I've told you that already. You can overrun a body thetan on 3, so it'll then read as an overrun 3. Well the answer to that is always "who". Who overran 3? Who's overrun on 3? And you'll get all of a sudden, we had one case who had apparently run 3, and in

great thoroughness had overrun and ARC broken every body thetan he had. Actually it didn't take more than about a half an hour review session, or something like this, to clean him up both ways from the middle, and he was getting more blowing off than you could count. Because that's ail we were picking up, you know? Overrun, ARC broke, overrun, ARC broke, overrun, ARC broke, overrun, ARC broke. And it was running, Overrun, F/ N. ARC break, overrun, F/ N. FtN. Overrun, F/ N." He looked like somebody'd left open the gate of a menagerie. But the guy really started to fly. So you can set 'em up. You can set 'em up. It doesn't matter.

They can also do a gorgeous job of plowing themselves in on this. But we can pick them out of it. So, so what?

Also, the larger majority of it, when they do study the study materials, and they do audit, go clear as a bell. You hit them on the left ear and they ring for half an hour. And of course, the trick of it all is, is after you've done the Clearing Course the guy usually goes free of the body thetans, so he parks them all over in left field. He is clear. Do you see? But his environment isn't. So therefore he often goes clear, has a ball, thinks that life is wonderful. And suddenly falls on his head again and can't understand it. Actually what he's done is run in some body thetans.

The reason why you discharge it on 2 is so the body thetans won't be so charged up they can spin him when they hit 3. And if the guy's fixed up 2, and discharged the thing a bit on 2, when he hits 3 he won't spin.

If you were to take somebody who was a wag, right straight off the street, run Incident 2, not as the capture, but just run Incident 2, just the volcano, and let him walk off, you'd probably have a dead man on your hands within five or six days. And the way we're getting away with it is fantastic. But let me point out, that it's we're getting away with it. Because once they start to freewheel through this stuff, they can't sleep, they can't eat, and they're finished. The body dies for lack of rest and so on. Because the incident itself is set up to do just that. So it's nothing to play with.

Isn't it interesting that we haven't had it happen? Well it's an attestation of modern auditing and the preparation of cases. And the way it doesn't happen, is to get the bank discharged a bit. Show the guy what to do. And it doesn't happen. It's really remarkable.

Also, we've already pointed out the by—passed charge. If he didn't know about Incident 1, and nobody pointed out the fact that there was an earlier Incident 1, and he ran the volcano he would spin for sure. But the mere fact that he knows there's an earlier Incident 1, and I don't know how it got removed from the materials because there was no doubt of it in the original material release, Incident 1 is way earlier. And you point out the fact that Incident 1 exists, and that all by itself tends to discharge 2, so it can't wrap somebody around a telegraph pole. And that's why it isn't happening. I'm just telling you the other phenomena could happen, however. You don't... He doesn't study the materials, never reads the materials, he's never been audited, he's never come up through the grades, and some how or another we force him back and run a volcano. Just that. Only we erase the volcano, and let him freewheel. Well the whole bank freewheels. All thetans in coordination do a beautiful freewheel, straight through R—6.

And he'll freewheel for days and days. By freewheel I mean it's automatic run. It Must starts and it keeps going. Do you see? Basically that's why the materials are confidential, so just that won't happen to somebody. That's

why we say the case should be prepared; Well, prepared. He should be run up through the grades. That's why we say he takes OT 3 when he's supposed to take OT 3. That's why the guy, when he runs OT 3, should run the study materials of OT 3. He should know them, and no casualties will occur... It's something on the order of, you take and put a knife through the right hand tire of a car while it's doing sixty miles an hour. It'll go off the road. Well, that's a stupid thing to do, isn't it? That'd be a very stupid thing to do. Well so you don't do that to somebody.

Now I don't know if you knew or not, that there was any liability to 3. But there is. That liability to 3. That it is prematurely run and so on.

Now the material is somewhat self protecting. Because very often somebody gets a hold of the OT section materials, and we have had that happen. And they looked at it and said, "What's this got to do with? It doesn't have anything to do with me. And so forth. There isn't any picture on it. There's no reality on that." And they walk off and leave it. And they don't even know they got their hands on anything. In other words, it's so far beyond their reality that they don't even contact it. Which is quite remarkable.

Additionally, supposing somebody came along to get the materials, didn't run any of the materials, and then all of a sudden accidentally ran a piece of 3. There he would go. But he would have done himself in with his own lies. Well the materials, to that degree, is self protecting. I imagine some psychiatrist who got a hold of it would decide to test it out on some patient. He'd probably go mad far quicker than the patient.

Alright. But the answer to the question, "What is the matter", and "How do you handle someone who found none on 3?" He had a severe physical injury and got them all packed together, and run it like an engram. It's the melazzo, actually.

The majority of you got this wrong. Some said you check it and run the grades, and others that you unburden the case with LX—1 assessments and prep checks, and so forth. No. The guy who found none on 3 has been packaged by a severe injury, and what you do is run the engram of the severe injury, and then blow some of them off the cluster, and then you can run some Incident 1's, or you can run an Incident 2, and then some Incident 1's, do you see?

But the mechanism of the cluster is what you haven't understood. Supposing you had twenty gum balls, and they all rolled around independently of each other just great. Now these twenty gum balls are somewhat loosely heaped up. And somebody hits them with a sledge hammer. Now can you tell one gumball from another gumball? No. But if you run the engram of being hit with a sledge hammer, then they get separate again. You get the mechanism? And that's the basic mechanism by which you handle one of these none on 3's. It's just one of these simple things like release. See?

Here's a whole bunch of body thetans all piled up around this bird, and somebody comes along with a baseball bat and hits the lot. And they go squash. And now they can't tell the difference between one or another. And each one has a different viewpoint of being squashed. And so the thing doesn't as—is, and they're all tangled up, and that usually puts each one of them in a different position of the back track in addition to the squash. It's a mess, man! So, you just run the engram of the squash. They all come apart and run individually. And that's the melazzo. And that is what you do with a none on 3. He's had a severe injury. Now it may be a whole chain of injuries

before you suddenly get a release, but the top one was the cluster. Even though it didn't erase, you at least got the thing that disconnected it. Do you follow?

Funny part of it is you can do that two or three times. If you ever ran into a cluster of a person who had been electric shocked. Violently electric shocked, it's liable to come off piece meal as a cluster. You know, it isn't a PC, but some electric shock case, having kicked the bucket under the gentle ministrations of what they laughingly call the butchers. Alright, that character goes out as one piece, don't you see? And he sort of flies around and then he hits somebody. That's a cluster. There be a pressure on the body. Now the preclear won't be a part of this cluster. It'll simply be hitting him. So the thing you do is you've still got to find a mutual engram of the cluster. And then the PC may be very confused, because he's never had that experience. Well that's right. But it's still just the mutual engram of the cluster and then you run the Incident 1s out of it, and it all goes sssss! It's a very easy operation if you know the mechanics of the thing.

So if you're ever puzzled about this, remember hitting a pile of gumballs with a sledge hammer, and then figure out how you would fix that up. And that's all there is to it.

Once more you're making too much out of it! Simple. Elementary. Alright?

Now, the next one is, "What do you know when you ret a read on overrun on 3?" Well there's been one incident, number, an Incident 1 overrun on somebody or something. But it doesn't mean 3's overrun. It means somebody has been overrun on an engram in 3. Got it? Alright.

And most of you said to handle it like an overrun. Boy, you'd go mad trying to handle it as an overrun. Somebody's got to find what, who, which, has been overrun? Therefore, it's a very peculiar overrun. Don't you see? If somebody,... People who've run the thing verbally, "Go back to the beginning of the incident," see? They've said this a half a dozen times. The thing is already erased. The thetan parks back at the beginning of the incident. But there ain't anything there! And so he stays there in confusion. "What am I supposed to do here? What am I supposed to do here? What am I supposed to do here? What am I supposed to do here?" You catch him a month or two later, and all you do is indicate the fact that he's overrun it, and he goes thump! "What do you know? Sssst!" Gone. See, it's one of these damn fool foolishnesses, see?

"Everybody knows the mind is so complicated that nobody could possibly figure any of these things out." Truth of the matter is, they're so buried under complexity that they've been very hard to dig up. But once they're dug up, boy, they look as plain as a dog's bone on the lawn. And then you come along and you say, "See that over there? That's a dog's bone. It's just been dug up. ' And people say, "Now let's see. Is it the bone of a cow?" It's irrelevant. It doesn't matter what it's a bone of.

Alright. Here was question 270, "Should you find out what the TA is up on before you get it down?" No. Mostly said yes. Should you find out what the TA is up on before you get it down? Not necessarily. Not necessarily at all. You can simply ask the guy, "What has been overrun?" It very ordinarily comes down. Do you follow? I'm afraid that was one of these trick questions. One of these sneaky questions. But, if you first try to find out what it was up on before you did something to get it down, you would very often miss. This is one of these wild questions.

The TA that starts going up, don't you ever as an auditor sit there and watch a TA go up. You indicate, ask if something's been overrun, PC can't find anything, come down. You start messing around with it at that particular point and you're liable to be in severe trouble. Right in the middle of a session. He can't answer the question. He doesn't know what's been overrun. That's not been overrun. You shoot at it a couple of times and it doesn't come down. You had better instruct any auditor auditing for you to pack it up and ask for a C/ S. Don't go on with the thing going up and don't get in a fire fight over the PC trying to get it down. Similarly, a low TA. Don't do that. In the middle of a session all of a sudden the guy's TA goes low. Don't start bugging him. Don't start chopping him up about it, because he'll get frantic. That's why PCs should never be able to see the TA. Never. He starts getting frantic. You've entered a present time problem into this thing. And you know very well, by the mechanics of it, the person who has a present time problem, he doesn't make any case gain.

Well let's look at it now. The guy knows he's got his TA high, or he knows he's got his TA low. He now has a present time problem, right? The weird part of it is, you're not going to solve it. Your chances of setting the TA down at that moment are zero. That's how you get into these fire fights, 'cause the guy's now got a present time problem. If you're going to ask him anything, "Do you have a present time problem?" "Yes I have a present time problem. I have a TA that's high." "Well good. Thank you very much." You'll watch the TA come down. You see it's idiocy, but if the guy's TA is starting to rise and you can't immediately go back and say, "Hey, wait a minute. It goes back to here", and rehab it right now, pack it up. Don't just sit there and fool with it.

A TA which inexplicably goes up when it shouldn't be going up usually forecasts itself a long time before. You'll see this person's TA acts up. Suddenly. Why? Actually, the thing I would do on it, is I wouldn't fool around with a TA that suddenly, inexplicably goes up. The auditor tried to rehab, say, "Did I bypass an F/ N?" So forth, and yip yip, and so on. "Was something been overrun?" And the TA keeps going up. Oh brother. Unload, unload. Knock it right off right there. Pack it up, and say, "Thank you very much." And send it, send the thing for a C/ S. Or make somebody send it to you for a C/ S.

What you normally order, what you normally order that is the most successful, is seven special cases. Something has appeared on this case that wasn't here before. And you're liable to get the most astonishing result out of this. And once you do that, wham wham wham wham. Now don't, in a session, try to C/ S it at the same time. I've tried to keep you from doing that. But if you can't immediately spot, "Hey wait a minute. I by—passed an F/ N on you." You should see it right in front of you. You say, What the hell was the matter with me? I mean, there it was. He got an F/ N on clearing the command and I thought he was still F/ Ning on the last process. And obviously he F/ Ned on clearing the command and I missed it." The TA'll go flow, boom. F/ N. See? Nothing to it. But if that doesn't happen, and it doesn't clear it and so on, then you had better do an assessment and every other damn thing.

Those are the proper actions for handling high TA or low TA. But if the guy's TA is going low, and he's getting ARC break needles with the TA down at 1.5, and all of this sort of thing, and oh wow, wow wow. You can get into an awful fire fight with a PC under that one, too. And the best thing to do if you don't

immediately rehabilitate it, wham wham wham, and it's quite obvious what this thing was all about, in the first place it isn't gonna do him a bit of harm running with a low TA, 'cause it'll come right back up again. Usually a low TA'll come right back up again. There's case after case around, that every time you ask them a question the TA goes down to 1.7. And then as they answer it, it goes back up to 2. So why get, why get all sweated us about it? But he goes down to 1.5 and has an F/ N, well that's for sure an ARC break. So that you can check that out easily enough. You can check it out now. But if it's getting difficult to check out, pack it up. Get another C/ S. Get back off of this thing and take a look at it. And see what's wrong with this case. All of a sudden, all will meet the eye.

You're busy processing somebody who is so PTS it is pathetic. The whole behavior of the case is this. You start tracing back through other ARC breaks the person's had. It's always an ARC break with mother, or it's an ARC break with something, or it's an ARC break with wuf wuf vuf, and each time they have this ARC break the TA is sunk. A person's PTS as hell, this is the time to run an S and D, something of that sort. He's PTS.

You know that a low TA equals invalidation, high TA equals overrun. There's nothing more simple than that. Do you follow? Alright. Now whether you know it, the thetan starts to spin on Incident 1. Well he doesn't spin on Incident 1 really in the first place, but he has run an incident that should be, what do you know if the thetan starts to spin on Section 3? And so forth. Or something. He normally has run a 1 on one thetan, and a 2 on another thetan, so that's he's got a 2 which has been run without its' 1. And it's when you run a 2 without its' 1 that the guy spins. Yet people will do this. Every now and then they run... They will run on this one and 1 on Joe, and 2 on Pete. Now Pete starts to freewheel. So all you have to ask is, "When did you run the Incident 2?" Something like that. And, alright, then get the same thetan down, and run an Incident 1—And he unspins, just like that. Magical. Right now. That's all that's wrong. Do you follow?

Some said not enough food and rest, and other said the case was overcharged. Both of which are probably true. But the actual action is, he's run, usually run an Incident 1 on one thetan, an Incident 2 on another thetan, and you've got an Incident 2 run now, with the thetan going through the thirty six days, all on a big freewheel. And maybe a whole cluster started through it. And the thing to do is to whip it back, and get the 1 run on the guys who are going through 2. And you get the Incident 1 run, it'll unspin, just like that. There's nothing to it.

Alright, "Explain the mechanics of LX—1." It's the basic postulate he made to move off the track. The mechanics of LX—1 is simply he couldn't stand it anymore, so he decided he had been wiped out, driven off, over powered, overwhelmed, whatever the words are of LX—1, and he's moved off the track. And he's not now in his own valence. And by running recall you discharge the top of the engram and you can run the engram out to then, and he will get back in his own valence. And he can stay in his own valence. As long as the case is very badly over charged he's not likely to stay in his own valence.

Some two or three people, by the way, believe implicitly, for some reason or other, I don't know why, but some two or three people believe that if you'd run LX—1 you omitted the valence shifter on the full four rundown. And I don't know how anybody would figure that out, because the full four

rundown doesn't have anything to do with LX—1. And one case that had, had the valence shifter left out of the full four rundown had a lot of trouble at once. So it's not something that you would leave out.

There's probably fifty ways you could handle the guy out of valence. Well the first way that was ever written about is in Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health. It says, "Get into your own valence." There's was after way you can handle it. But the case is so over charged he can't stay in his own valence. So you have to discharge the case. So anyway a case can be discharged will eventually get him back into his own valence. But the full four rundown flips him out of the valence as a body thetan and gets him into his own valence, so that you can run confront on him. If you run the full four...

You recall the being, you run the motivator chain, you run the engram—overt chain. Those are the actions you take, and that is the only actions which you take. You actually could prep check it or something. But it seems silly to prep check it, because it's too hot a button. And that isn't what's wrong with him. OK?

Actually I think you did most remarkably well. And I have noticed, I have noticed that anybody who can pass a long examination with high grade normally knows what he's doing.

Now there are a few more points I'd like to make here, before, while I still have a chance to explain them to you. Now one, at this juncture, it will be available to you. I have been working too hard with you, and so on, to actually put together your book of case supervision. And what you lack is why certain things are done here and there. And I haven't explained that in all things. It seems sort of mysterious. And it's funny to me to have to explain it, because it sort of feels to me like I'm explaining why a lead pencil makes a mark. You know?

Here is this biro and he has... It's so damn simple some of these things, you see? He's got a folder six inches thick! Well now look, if that many auditors had worxed on him for that long, and he is still getting audited, the case is overcharged. That's a very clever analysis, isn't it? Thick 'older.

So we're going to undertake a lot of actions to take charge off the case, because it's all on the basis that reality is proportional to the amount of charge off it. Alright? But it's that kind of think. That kind of think. And you wonder... Actually C/ S 7 was saying to me the other day on one case here, "God that was clever. To prepcheck a floating needle. Look what it did for that case. How on earth did you ever guess that?" 'Cause it just says, "Prepcheck floating needle." See? Bong. You know? No assessment, nothing. Bang! You know? And, prepcheck it, and wow! It goes on and on and on and on and on. And it's all straightened out. And the case does beautifully.

I'm afraid I can't take too much credit for it, because the guy has complained to his auditor about floating needles, and he has even said that every time he gets a floating needle he feels horrible. He's complained to the examiner about a floating needle. Not, not very mysterious. So I just looked at this, and read it over and so forth, and I was reading through it to find where I could straighten this case out a little bit more, and I ordered three prepchecks on it. And the first one to prep check floating needles. Naturally. You see? So you're not very mysterious. It's sort of like asking me to explain why is that white sign white. What color paint do we use to paint a white sign? And I look sort of blank, and I say, "Well alright. White paint." "Great! I

never would have guessed it!" You know?

Alright, so this guy, this guy... It's reading the folder, it's reading the folder. It's reading what's going on. That's why auditors have to be able to write. And if you want to keep yourself from getting headaches as a case supervisor, you should insist like hell that auditors either clarify what they've written, or write plainly. Because otherwise you can pick up a case, you know? Trying to make the damn thing out, and you want to help the guy, and somebody's standing in your road with a horrible scribble, and, and you get strained up on it. Boom.

But you look through this thing and you say, "Well I don't find my wife, and so on, but in the next session, wa wa wa wa gab gab and my wife, and so on." Aw, for Christ's sakes! There's no mystery about it. The guy keeps getting off the same withhold, and he keeps getting off the same PTPs, and so forth. And in setting up the case let's just make sure that these things get cleaned up, that's all. They obviously aren't getting cleaned up.

One of the ways, and the ways, the idiot way they don't get cleaned up is, the guy has a withhold, and he gives it as an ARC break. The guy has a PTP and he gives it as a missed withhold. So I'm likely to be as evaluative as this. "Pres check the missed withholds." He keeps giving them as ARC breaks and PTPs, and they're very obvious. It's no guesswork on my part. I mean, they are. See, an ARC break, "I don't know how I'm going to pay for..." Oh, god, Christ! That's not an ARC break. Never has, never will be. And yet, somebody's running ARCU, CDEI. And then they run this column after column, and page after page, and ARCU, CDEI, and "Do you have an ARC break?" And here's a big fall, and then they clean up false. And the guy never does give them anything under gods' green earth but PTPs. And then I'm liable to say, "Fly the Ruds, but clear each command." And the case straightens out.

You see, you can't straighten out a case on missed withholds if nobody asks him for anything but ARC breaks. You see, it's all this idiot stuff. Like the way to cross the river, you cross the river. You know? The way to get in the boat is you get in the boat. If you want to get the PC someplace in a boat, you have to have a boat to put him in. You know, it's this kind of stuff. And the violation of logic is so fantastic as you wouldn't believe it. And until you're case supervising you won't believe how easy it is to do. It's terribly easy. Very, very simple.

Well you can't clean up one rudiment if the guy never, doesn't know what the rudiment is, and is always cleaning up some other rudiment. Right? You see, the case, the case is always having trouble with X, A, or something. He's always having trouble with this guy, he's always having trouble with this guy, he's always having trouble with this guy. Hmm. Well yes, he's at least got a problem with him. See? So you could actually specify. "Ask him about the problem with Joe, and by earlier similar itsa get rid of it." Because he's obviously got Joe identified with Admiral Henobarbus back in someplace, you know? Wow. It's not complicated. Cases are not complicated when you know this. They're very simple. But you have to do the thing you're supposed to do. And that's what standard tech becomes. For instance the guy's got to have his ARC break cleaned up. He's in a sad effect. Alright? He's in a sad effect. What you gonna do? Sit there and pull missed withholds? Well you know very well that's idiotic. But it's just as idiotic to clear up his missed withholds by running ARC breaks. Or, try to clear up his PTPs by, he keeps

saying they're ARC breaks. Do you see? There's some illogic about all this. There's something that doesn't add up about all this. And all you'd have to do is look for what doesn't add up and that's that.

But I want to make this point with you very sharply. And that is the available F/ Ns. How many F/ Ns can you get? Now you're liable to get yourself a problem that runs something like this. Some weird problem. See? And it runs something like this. Former therapy. And you run the motivator engram. And the guy's still got a somatic, but it's F/ Ned. Well, it F/ Ned. Well you can't do anything more with that, can you? Still got a somatic. And you know he's still got a somatic of having his guts cut out or whatever they do. And he ran the engram of it. Oh, what can we do? All is lost. There's an available F/ N on the overt. You find and run an overt chain, you find out he was making a specialty of cutting people's guts out. And that's the somatic. And that's why it's still there.

Now let's say, here's an actual case, of somebody who had an Incident 2, shot in the brisket. Run out, discharge to F/ N. Alright, great. Still sore! Still got the somatic. You say, "Oh wow. We failed." No, no, there's another F/ N available on shooting people in the brisket. So you run the overt side of it, and the somatic goes pft! Magically. So you don't do any more work than you have to do, if you got rid of it running the activator side, great. But if you ran the motivator side, and the guy's left with a somatic, you still got an F/ N on the overt side. Do you follow?

Now sometimes you run "Recall being...", and then you run "Doing it...", and you'll get rid of both sides very nicely. But it sometimes doesn't work. And remember you've still got an F/ N left. Look at the number of F/ Ns available. On the recall process, any recall process, there's an F/ N available. Any activator chain of secondaries, there's an F/ N available. Any activator chain of engrams, there's an F/ N available. Any overt chain of motivators, there's an F/ N available. There's an F/ N available on secondaries, overt secondaries. There's an F/ N available on overt engrams. And there's an F/ N available on recall the overt. So you got one item assessed off a list, and what do you know? You got six F/ Ns available. The possibility of running them all on most cases is slight, because you try to run the secondary, and they're liable to plunge into the engram. But at the very least you've got two. You have been given a sketchy line up of it, because it's usually sufficient. But look how many are available.

Now we've got "Assess the item kicked" on some list. So we could run "Recall being kicked." Bang. Recall being kicked. We could also run "Recall kicking." That's two F/ Ns. Now we could run the engrams of being kicked, and we could also run the engrams of kicking. And that's four F/ Ns. That's four F/ Ns on the same subject. It's just which way did the flow go?

So don't feel all is lost if you've run an engram chain to an F/ N. All is not lost. You've got the other chain you can run. This Mellow says, "Well I got this horrible head, this horrible head, and it doesn't go away, and my back hurts and my head hurts, and it just doesn't go away." And you've run all of his head injuries and his back injuries, and well... Well get clever. You get clever. You have an engram chain on the other side you can run also to F/ N, which is him, hurting peoples' heads, hurting peoples' backs. And you've probably got one on heads, and you've probably got one on backs. Do you follow? There's a lot of F/ Ns available. But your minimum number of F/ Ns on any button is four. Recall motivator, recall overt, engram motivator, engram

overt And if you, if it's all very sad and misemotional also, why you've got two secondaries available. "Recall this death." Whatever it is, see? Being sad about some relatives' death, see, and you run that thing out, and that's all squared around. Alright, did you ever think or running somebody being sad about your death? Do you see? See, there's two different things available, see? And very often when your death engrams or your death secondaries, rather, won't run, it's because, you know, the fellow just lost his uncle, and he felt very sad about it, and he's griefy, and he runs it through and he still feels griery about death. And it went to F/ N but he didn't, didn't feel so good. And so forth. Run the secondary, run the secondary of somebody feeling bad about his death. And all of a sudden the whole thing will go zzzt! And this is the phenomena.

Now hear me now, 'cause every once in a while you're going to have gotten an F/ N on some injury, and then have the person complain that it F/ Ned before he got rid of it. Have you ever had that happen? It shows up every now and then.

Well it F/ Ned on the motivator, or it F/ Ned on the overt. And it hasn't F/ Ned on the other side, and there's still mass there. They're not, they actually if they checked it over, they're not now sad about their uncles' death. They just know they got this funny griefy feeling stuck on their skull. So they say, "Well it F/ Ned. I think it F/ Ned too quick. Well sure. It didn't all disappear." Well if that side of it F/ Ned he's released from that side of it. There's two sides to that, you know. Now you can turn around and run the other side, whichever way it is, and the rest of the mass goes pffft! And then that really does F/ N. It'll be a relatively small F/ N. But if you've ever had somebody complain, "Oh well yes. Well I F/ Ned on it, but it really ended off too quick." Yeah well they had it coming one way and went the other way. You pay a lot of attention to that. 'Cause you know you're running this guy with motivators when he's guilty as sin of a bunch of overts. So he F/ Ns on the motivators, but the overts are still there bugging him. But of course they're all ready to blow. They'll blow now, go binge You could just run them very briefly, and they'd blow. But he deserves the motivator, don't you see? And you ran out the motivator. Now he hasn't got a motivator, but he's got the overt. So he gets sort of unhappy. You got it?

That's how many F/ Ns there are available. Theoretically there're six F/ Ns available on any button. You should be able to plot this course off the top of your head. There's nothing to it.

Alright. Now there's another point here which I haven't covered with you too well. Missed withholds. Missed withholds. Missed withholds. You are always asking for missed withholds, and so forih, and I very often say missed withholds when I say rudiments. But the rudiment is withhold. The rudiment is not missed withhold. The standard rudiment is withhold. Not missed withhold, but withhold. And here and there in your sessions you've missed a time or two, because you haven't used withhold. Because there's a whole line of the whole subject of withhold is absolutely fascinating. The whole subject of withhold is miraculous and marvelous.

Guys who go around withholding, and guys who have withholds, and all of this sort of thing. You get so accustomed to thinking that a guy is bad off because he has withholds, that you don't wonder whv he's bad off because he has withholds. Well, he's bad oft because he has withholds, not because he's dishonest, but because he's not flowing in a certain direction. And he

can't flow in that direction, and he keeps it piled up on himself. And you can get the same action.

Now, as, well you can practically push his face in. You can get something that feels very much like body thetans, and so forth, just because the guy is withholding. Just that. Just withholding. Nobody's missing a withhold. He's just withholding.

I'll give you an example. Way back when I was fooling around and doing some research thing, I all of a sudden found out sitting at breakfast that it was a very unpleasant proceeding sitting at breakfast, for the excellent reason that the wax type of milk carton which is cold, clammy and slimy, sitting only three or four feet from me, if I would become incautious enough to let my perceptivity slide out if that far, I would collide with this damned, cold, slimy milk carton. See? Waxed paper milk carton. So I'd have to eat breakfast held back from this milk carton. After a while I'd find myself getting sort of cross. And I'd get up, and I'd be fine. And then I suddenly realized, maybe other people get up against things and they don't go back out in that direction. So I have checked this out, and that turned out to be the case. Thetans withhold. They withhold energy, they withhold beams, they withhold emotion, they withhold mass, they withhold from going someplace, when they shoot somebody they withhold from being him. Nobody missed it. And a case can get just gorgeously stacked up, because of withholds. Withhold, withhold.

Thus American girls are very often quite withholdy, and the reason why is, is over in America the girls don't, aren't taught to shake hands. And they're taught that they must be reached for, and never to reach. And that it's unladylike to reach, and that sort of thing. No criticism of it one way or the other. But you will eventually find them sort of, and anybody else in the world that's been trained that way, you eventually find them sort of caved in. And you, as an auditor, might think they've committed some fabulous crime. Whereas it's no more important than the fact that they must not ever reach in the direction of a man. Or mustn't ever reach in the direction of another person. It's which directions they mustn't reach. And they're withheld permanently from that area. See? There they are, withholding. Withholding, withholding, withholding, withholding, withholding. Eventually they squash their noses.

And now you come along, and you're asked to perform some miracle. "Freed me from squashing my nose" sort of miracle, you know? Now this is very unimportant in the lower grades, but when you get up into the OT sections, what I'm telling you now, is very, very important. Because you are going to find some guys have nothing more wrong with them than the damn fools keep on holding onto their bodies from in front. And that those horrible somatics they've got that is tearing their knees apart, or something like that, is simply them pushing on their knees. It's very mysterious.

"Oh, what can be wrong with George? He seems to have these sore throats all the time." Well now the guy is up around an honest 5, or something like this, and he starts developing sore throat and so on. You of course don't audit in this fashion, but you could say, you know, "Why don't you let go of your throat, boy?" So he'll say, "Oh. Have I got ahold of my throat? Ha ha ha ha, yes. ' Very difficult. Very difficult.

The guys get into OT sections, they one, will withhold from things, and they can damn near pull their skulls off or crush their chests or something, see?

Or, they've got hold of the body, or somebody has offered them something and they've suddenly tensed back from it. And it's practically busted their ribs or something. And you run into one of them right after he's flinched from something of this sort. He walked out of the building and he comes back in and he's all caved in. And you say, "Oh my god, what masses have we got? He must have more body thetans. Let's see, what can we do? What wonderful process do we have to run on this bird?" And the funny part of it is, if you use the rudiment withhold, particularly as you get up into the upper sections, as well as the rudiment missed withhold... And the way you do that is you ask for a withhold, and then determine whether or not it's the kind of withhold which is discreditable so somebody would miss it, or whether it's just plain withhold. And you'll ask for the missed afterwards. Or not ask for it. But the actual proper rudiment question on OT levels is withhold, not missed. "Do you have any missed withholds?" Now I've been watching it go on here for some time, and been expecting in vain for some of you to suddenly ask the ordinary, garden variety, way back when rudiment, "Do you have withholds? Or, are you withholding anything?" Now you start asking OTs if they're withholding anything, and fifty percent of their somatics will just go up in smoke. See? So you're missing one.

This is the great ease with which some of this stuff works. So the guy has just went up and pulled himself back on the curb suddenly so that he couldn't be hit by the taxi cab. And he comes in and he's all, so on. You set in, you're getting in the Ruds. You don't have to know all that. See? You're getting, "Are you withholding anything?", and "Have you withheld anything?" Or something like that. And you get a little read. And he feels wonderful. "Oh yeah! Taxi cab. I got myself back off the curb. I withheld... Yeah, that's it." Whml Because you're dealing with somebody who is already pulling, and squashing, and grabbing. Now theoretically you could also ask somebody, "Where you got hold of the body?" And that would cause it. On the OT sections you can't figure out what in the hell is going on, add that to your repertoire. Just, "Do you have hold of the body, or are you pushing on the bony in some way?" If they're not, you won't get any read, and if they are, the damn meter will blow up. You got the point? Because you're dealing with somebody who holds onto bodies, who pulls back bodies, who withholds bodies, who withholds energy, who pulls in energy beams. Do you follow? So that you certainly check this on the upper levels. Not very important on the lower grades.

We found out that newspaper reporters were never, never, never able, never, never, never, never, never able to make a little beep meter we had work. Whereas any, anybody who had been audited at all could make the thing connect and spark, and short circuit. We had a little machine. We'd set it up. And we found that newspaper reporters, wogs, guys off the street, they'd look at this thing, and they'd try to do it, see? Rather pathetic. You know? They'd try to do it, and nothing happened. They couldn't make the thing close. Actually all you had to do is put a spark between it, and a buzzer went off. You can set up two, two contacts, or hold one contact next to a body while the body is also connected to another contact, a very low voltage. And you hold that out from the cheek, and then somebody stands off thirty feet and makes a beam. He puts a beam between the cheek and the finger, and the buzzer goes. And he can turn the buzzer on and off at will. It's one of the most remarkable experiences you ever saw in your life.

The lower level guy, he couldn't do it. And anybody who had been audited at all, boy he could make that thing go beeps And off and on, and first he'd say, "Christ, I couldn't be doing that. That is not possible." And then, ding, "Yes, that was me. Hey! I'm an electric eel." See, he could do it. He could do it thirty, forty, fifty feet away as far as he could see it. Which is very interesting indeed.

Now if a guy can do that he also can of course apply close up on his own body the most fantastic amounts of energy. Actually you can apply him almost at any distance. You got that one?

Now also, let me give you another one that goes along with. Some OTs go around, get a high TA because they lean on things. And if all else fails, remember that they also can lean on things. They habitually push against a wall because rooms are too small. And they don't catch themselves doing it, and it pushes up their TA. they lean on the wall. Very simple. They will do anything that a guy would do with current. Current or force. You can expect anybody to do. One guy had terrible trouble because he had ringing in his ears. And he was ringing them.

Now to show you how far out some things can as, there is a dictionary which I did not do, which is called the Scientology dictionary. I've never read it. It was called to my attention the other day that the definition of recall in it is to reexperience, which is completely wrong. I merely bring this up as what happens when I start clarifying materials. A few bulletins, a few things come out that I haven't written, I haven't said anything about, there's some errors creed un in those things, and it throws technology out. This is what you've got to keep an eye out for. If you run into this sort of thing, why, send it through to me and let me find out whether or not it is factual or not, on a clarification. Because you're liable to get in some arguments with somebody on it.

Another datum I wanted to give you, is you can do two or three assessments on LX—1 and run each one of them with engram chains and recalls, and everything else. I mean, it's quite remarkable. They move upscale on LX—1. They'll get different buttons. And you can do the same things with them all over again.

Now, we have, we have pretty well reached the end of the line here. We have pretty well reached the end of the line, and we have the general situation pretty well in hand. Not to pile you up with a tremendous amount of data here in the last few minutes of play, but I will tell you this. That putting through this Org VIII Course as we have called it aboard, has been quite a tour de force. It has been, called for a lot of coordination in a lot of ways. And I noticed even down in the last few minutes of play that we were still riding close to the edge in some instances. And all that got straightened out.

Now I want to talk to you for just a few minutes here on the subject of what you will be doing, what your difficulties might be. First and foremost people are going to ask you, "What is so different about standard tech that is different from Scientology?" And a wise guy sort of answer, which is perfectly legitimate is, "Well you see, standard tech is the way Ron does it." That was sort of, just, you know, floor the opposition.

But, the truth of the matter is, is standard tech is a standardization of processes, so that they apply to a hundred percent of the cases to which they are addressed. And that was the main thina. And it was codifying a style of auditing which produced maximum results in minimum time. And that was

what standard tech was. And they're going to say, "Well that therefore invalidates my Class IV, my Class VI." And you say, 'duo no. No, no, no, not, not at all, not at all. But in due course, when you have learned all there is to know about everything you can also learn to be totally simple. And when you achieve that you have achieved then maximum velocity and maximum gain."

Standard tech is simply how to achieve maximum velocity, maximum gain in processing, and what are the real importances in processing, and how do you set cases us, and what do you do with them. The truth of the matter is, the subject itself was pretty well wrapped up in 1966, but required settling down. And it hasn't been until now that I have settled the whole subject down, and have begun to take out of the lineup additives which have been put in there that were unnecessary, and made it come back and do what is was supposed to do. For instance, as you've seen even on the OT sections I have taught you how to get something like maximum gain out of the OT sections. I've taught you how to get more gain, more velocity, out of the actions which other people would say, "Well I don't see how that's any different than anything I've been doing. I sit down at a table, I let people talk to me while I fiddle with my E—meter. I don't see how anything's different about that, and so forth." Well, I'll tell you to whom it will make a great deal of difference. It'll make a deal of difference to somebody who has been trying to put across to somebody that his case hasn't been handled, and people have gone on not handling it for some time. It will make a great deal of difference to that person. It will also start to make difference to anybody else in the vicinity who is audited by comparison. He's been audited one way, and he suddenly starts getting audited in a highly simple way, and he starts making much faster case gains in the same line of direction.

So in actual fact, standard tech, for all of the technology, or for all of the work which has gone into the simplification of it, for all the work of codification of how I got it across to you, and so on, is more of an experience than an action. It is something which is experienced. And after you've been at it for a while you've either got it or you ain't. You see? It's something you experienced.

Now just as the lowest mark on the course was the one who had been audited the least, this coordinated. He started to catch up undoubtedly in the last couple of days. But it took a catch up. Because it's something one experiences.

Now I don't want auditors at large across the world to believe that all of their training is invalidated. Quite the contrary. What I believe is that somebody has invalidated their training. What we're doing is de—invalidating training. What they have learned, they have learned. And then somebody has pushed it aside so they felt that is was not learned. And what it required was a stabilization. And giving one back a security of the data. And if one had a security of data, he could then carry on very nicely and very smoothly, because with that security of data and with somebody holding him on the square, hair line road of it, he all of a sudden realized that by doing it just this way, and using Must this data, he all of a sudden got things to fly, which have never been flown before. And so therefore, the biggest hump in standard tech is the auditor making it work and the auditor having it work on him. Can he make it work as an auditor? Does it work on him? And so on. And out of that of course, you get your superlative auditor. For instance, it'd

be very difficult to kid me about how this worked or that worked, or something else worked. I know how these things work. And anybody who has worked very long in this field with standard tech, and he's seen this work, and he's seen the put together, and he's managed to cut it down to where he's, to look at it is totally simple, and so forth, to jar him out of that rut would be very, very difficult indeed. In fact people are liable to accuse him of being unbudge—able, or conservative, or a fuddy—duddy. "What's the matter? You mean he won't run PCs wiggling their ears anymore?" and so forth?

But people are going to ask you. People are going to ask you, "Why is standard tech so different than just general tech?" Well actually there is no general tech. There has really never been anything but standard tech. But, it required codification, it required delivery, it required simplification, and once the research line was completed on it, it had to be delivered and it had to be delivered in the simplest possible fashion. It is necessary, actually, for an auditor to go all over the research lines and datas and side panels, and everything else of this whole subject, as he does on the Class VI course, before he can appreciate all there is to know, and how little of it is a main line action. And if he gets that all settled and straightened out, he knows a tremendous body of data about the mind. There are fabulous amounts of it.

You actually, if you settle down on just standard tech only and didn't know the other lines, then people would think they were making fabulous discoveries every time they found out that you could match terminal a couple of mock ups. See, they didn't know that that was ever part of the subject matter. But do you know, oddly enough if hypnotism, and a lot of other subjects of one kind or another went this route, the material which was evolved in the days of Mesmer and Charcreax was considerable. There was an enormous amount of it. And it's been boiled down now to some little, tiny balderdash that doesn't even work. But there was a lot known in this particular field. There was a lot known. And it has all more or less disappeared. It isn't know to anybody anymore.

It's very funny. Now any day now I expect somebody to break out and find out that there is such a thing as an hypnotic rapport. A guy pinches himself in the shoulder and somebody else feels the pinch. And they're going to be very fascinated. 'Row did that happen?" Actually it's all part, and is called actually, Mesmerism. Back in the eighteenth century. If one doesn't know the scope of discovery of a subject he cannot then take hold of its' various importances. If one doesn't know how wide the study is, then he cannot also find out how narrow is the walk that goes through it. If you can grasp that you've got it made.

And you're going to see that when you talk to an academy student. And you're going to tell him just exactly what you're doing is great. And he's doing just exactly this, and you actually think you have a cracker jack auditor, and he can do exactly what you say, and go ahead and this is great. And you think that's fine. There is no reason to make a Class VI out of him, he's doing so well. This guy is in danger of stepping off the edge of the sidewalk, and finding out some horrendous thing, like "invent a problem", get himself some big win, feel that the field has not been covered or researched, and then he's completely off into some brand new field. Scientology being only this tiny, little, simple thing, you see? He's in this brand new field, which has a vast ocean of data in connected to it, because

he's never been exposed to the data. He actually won't be an auditor who can hold the line until he's also found how much there is to hold. And then he will understand it.

Now when you try to relay to somebody, "This is standard tech. I am a Class VIII." Yes, people are going to be making a bunch of, a lot of fuss over you. That's for sure. And you have deserved it. You've earned it. They will try to feel un—invalidated, not invalidated, and this sort of thing, and be happy about this. Well you can help them be happy about the whole thing by saying, oh well you see, the funny part of it is, is all the simple things you know are true. And the only difference is, is you don't know how true they are. And Ron said for me to tell you that standard tech does not invalidate anybody's tech, but is just the high velocity, fast, streamlined way through, and it takes the total expert to do it. It is the road to total gains. Well, you have to know a great deal. Now all of you have been trained a great deal down through the years. You've had lots of training of this way and that way, and you've done this and you've done that and you've done the other thing. The net result of it is that you can look back over it, and you can see, you can see where it's shined up, and you can see where it was rather dim. And you undoubtedly, those of you who have been through Saint Hill recently and so on, and those of you who are very old timers indeed, have a very good grasp on the whole width of the subject, have a very, very good grasp on the subject itself, and know very well it is only where your own insights have been themselves, then invalidated, by bad training or by counter—data or something of this sort, that you've had any losses at all.

Now I'm not trying to tell you you might have known all this before. That would be a little bit too much. That would be me bowing out of the picture too much. I have done a re—evaluation of materials, a re—evaluation of add—ups, and that is a very definite part of the speed which you attain in them. These materials have been groomed within an inch of their lives, really. And this of course is not something that one normally sees. When one is trained in some subject he does not see the amount of research or testing, or other things that go on with it. Well that's all been there too. But if you notice you have not been trained anything that was very contrary to anything in your training. It's more main line than otherwise. But you certainly have shed a lot of complexities that somebody or another has given you.

The main, the thing that you will run into is the fact that auditing is a team action. It's a team action. It requires the Ethics Officer and the HCO Exec Sec and the Org Exec Sec and the Qual Sec. and the this one and the that one, and the promotions people and the this, and so on, and the handling it up. What I expect you to do, what I expect you to do is set and hold the standard, and continue to go forward with the standard. And by doing that, and by doing that consistently, set up examples of what can be done, and continue to set up those examples of what can be done, so that people eventually realize that that's what can be done. And then they start doing it too. That I do expect you to do.

And I know you'll do that. It has been an all night, all day proposition of training the first Org Vllls. You have had some fairly damp times of it. I have had some rather snarly times. I have never read, my C/ S 7, the LRH Comm staff has never made the tape of me snarling over some of these folders, and so forth, but she often threatened to do so. Because some of them were pretty gruesome. I mean the snarls, not much the folders. And somehow or

another we would bring it all off, and somehow or another, why, amongst us we seem to have gotten through with it. And you all made it for which I thank you very much.

Now you've contributed a great deal to this class. You have made the grade in more ways than one. And I appreciate very much what you've done. And I respect you a great deal for coming here and going through the lineup, and coming out the other end victorious. And for that I wish to thank you. Thank you very much.