TECHNOLOGY AND HIDDEN STANDARDS

A lecture given on
2 March 1965

Thank you very much. I take that, that early applause you gotten there, who was that for, Mary Sue? Who was that for?

Audience: Mary Sue.

Mary Sue! Well, you want to be awfully careful—you want to be awfully careful how you encourage her!

Ah, dear, she's having a ball. We've got a reorganization going and she's taking over the point of Staff Training Officer. That's where she is from a very high echelon. And we is about to go, organizationally, man—go, go, go. And frankly, I've had to clean everything off of my plate just so that I could turn out the materials necessary to carry it. And I found a bunch of natural laws in the field of economics which makes the subject of economics—all they had before was „supply and demand," you know. Kindergarten. They found out people—people exchange things, so that's economics, you see?

The second I start doing VII materials—economies and organizations are a matter of the MEST universe. And let me give you a tip: If somebody around you or your organization is having trouble with organizational matters, you just processed them subjectively too long. It just doesn't matter how much you process them subjectively now, they're not going to go anyplace, the trouble with them is objective. See? And you want to give them objective—type processes, not subjective. And you'll find their eyesight will pick up and all kinds of wild perceptive things will occur, don't you see. And when I get back to this point of economic zing, why all we've got to do, all we got to—this isn't our main line of action, our main line of action remains Scientology.

All we've got to do is write this up. I've got these natural laws along this line, well write some textbooks up. And we formed up a course up at Telesurance to teach all these salesmen in the television industry. It's going over beautifully now after being in the run for a couple of years.

All that's very successful, all we have to do is use this, swell it up as a wave, get it a wider and wider carrier wave and next thing you know we'll be teaching every business executive who amounts to anything in the Anglo-American world. And as soon as we've got that channel being plowed open—of course we haven't got too much to do with that channel, you don't have to worry about that channel—the fellow will be asking all the time, „This stuff works, this stuff works, this stuff works. Let's see, where's it come from? There's some obscure mentions of the subject called Scientology back of this damn thing." And they'll say, „Well, that's for me," don't you see?

And we'll put them on a demand basis of Scientology in the business world. That's where you come in. It doesn't mean that we'll be going into the business world, don't you see, you'll be going into—into the wider zones of society all this time on quite another, much larger channel. But this is just one of these little subsidiary channels, that's a leader. We've taken a couple, three years, now, to plow this little line, hasn't it? And then all of a

sudden, why, we've got materials or product to put on this line of magnitude, it should go out with a crash.

But what's very interesting to us organizationally and much more important actually than its application in business, is the fact of having isolated these basic laws of promotion, organization and delivery—what are these things and how do you straighten up the lines and exactly what actions do you take along in this particular line.

Some years ago somebody came along and said well, we ought to be able to work out dissemination techniques out of the technology of Scientology. You've heard that often, I'm sure. Well, that's now being—that's—that's been done and my plate is so doggone stacked up that trying to get it down into even its rudimentary form so that it can be issued is just a flat—out proposition. Ever since I come—came home my finger here from holding pens and that sort of thing is absolutely scarred and messed up to a fantastic degree. It's actually, you can feel it developing calluses all the way along the line. And—just trying to get the materials out.

Now, some of you have—well, this is the subject of the lecture. So let me finish off the footnote—the foreword on this. Your materials and so forth are coming to you with great rapidity, but this administrative material is right out—right out there in front because this will make Central Organizations. And I found all the points where they don't expand and all the things which make them not expand and things that automatically contract them and how organizations after they go through emergencies always shrink in size rather than increase in size—found all these various points.

So that in actual fact this technology is not the type of technology which you have in processing. It is the type of technology one should tell the janitor what the formula is—only this formula's applicable to a civilization—but you tell the janitor what the formula is and ask him to look that over with relationship to his job and follow it for a few days and he doesn't just sneer at you; it's very comprehensible to him. He says, „Hey! You know, that's true." And the next thing you know, why his lines are cleaning up like crazy and everything is going in all directions like crazy in the janitorial department.

His willingness to work was jammed by ignorance of the law which governed that work under its various conditions. That's interesting, isn't it? He was never really unwilling to work, but he was trying to handle his post or position in a rather ineffective and stupid way which would kill it off sooner or later, don't you see? Well, there was a right way for him to handle his post that he could follow, bang—bang—bang. Right now you could probably have a conversation, I don't think with what's—his—name, and I for—keep forgetting his name—the rest of the world has forgotten it almost, too. He's got some post up here in England, some kind or another, some kind of secretarial post.

And you could probably take one of his smarter ministers, and you could certainly take the opposition at the moment, and you could say, „Look, you're running formula one, or formula—yeah, you're running formula one backwards. Now, it goes in this sequence and not in *this* sequence, see? And you're running it in *this* sequence, and if you continue to run it in this sequence in England as you have for the last century, you will continue to get smaller as a nation. Now, all you've got to do is reverse these two in sequence. And instantly England will start expanding."

And he'd look that over and it's the same formula you gave the janitor, see? But the janitor understood, so for sure this guy will understand it. And even though he might louse up and do some weird things, as long as he followed this particular sequence and didn't reverse it or get it out or follow the wrong condition ... The guy's in a Condition of poverty—this is not one of the conditions, but let's just give you an idea—he's in a Condition of poverty and he applies the Condition of Affluence—the formula of Affluence, you see. Well, he's going to—he's going to go appetite over tin cup. Of course that's a gross thing that anybody can see, but this other one is not quite as gross. But it's just as visible.

All you've got to do is run one of these formulas backwards and you'll shrink, collapse, go bankrupt. It's villainous.

Now, you think I'm talking to you from a hidden standard basis, but I'm not. I'm merely announcing to you that the formulas do exist and that I am writing them down and you will have copies of the policy letters which have to do with that before the textbook is issued on this particular subject and that's about the value of what the material is. It means Scientology organizational expansion right on out, out, out, out, up, up, up, up. And our little subsidiary lines like an administrative line that plows into the business world and so forth, just readies you up a new market.

See, we can already reach it with just what we've got, don't you see? All right, let's get out into the business world and then all of a sudden create a future demand, so that after we've gone pretty distant in the present scope that we are operating in, we've developed a new scope. And after that, by that time, we will probably have some channel into government and we can then put in some little lines into government and then make those lines bigger and so forth, and there we go.

And you say „a world without war" and so forth; we'll have it, very soon. As long as they don't commit one before we make it. And that's the rush. And that's why I consider my plate so highly loaded, is we're operating against a schedule. We have, however, made all of our deadlines and there wont be anything happen in the immediately foreseeable future before we arrive now, which is very, very good news. I mean, it's no longer any question of our arriving before everything blows up because it's going to take about three years for China to complete its development to blow up things and by that time we'll be there.

So it was a nip and tuck proposition. The questionable periods are all behind us and that we can do something about it is rather fantastic. Now, you sit there and say, „Well, what could I do about this sort of thing. „It's rather hard to see from a personal viewpoint. It's an operational organizational action that is required in order to utilize and channel your activities, and it requires a knowledge of the basic economic laws which apply to you and which make it possible for—do your post fitting inside a wider organizational structure which is running right, don't you see? And those combinations are the combinations required. Organization is important to you, and—because only in that way can you build it on up to civilization level, don't you see?

So it goes from the individual to the single organization, from the single organization it goes to what you call all Scientology and it goes from all Scientology to civilization, see? And it's a gradient scale.

And just like—you are going to start out tomorrow and form personally without any assistance from anybody a new civilization. Well, of course, that just is like telling the pc, „All right, go ahead and run the GPMs," you see, and he's just in off the street—that looks impossible. But when you recognize that this would permit you to straighten out where you sit—right where you sit—as a person, straighten up your economic and organizational lines as a person and then move up a little bit higher than that. Permit you to straighten up the organizational and—activities and so forth from where you sit as a person—whether you're a field auditor or an organizational staff member, this doesn't matter. Your zone of influence in other words, small or large, you can straighten that up and all of a sudden it starts going zing, you see? You start going zing and then it starts going zing, then you realize that the component zings added together inside one Scientology organization and so forth would make it go zing and then the composite of those Scientology organizations all going zing, of course, makes Scientology go that way. You follow? And then no civilization could resist the impact.

And then your next—next action, of course, is a widening zone of influence, and your widening zone of influence goes out. In view of the fact that our intentions are good and are not based on anything reprehensible, why, we'll make it. If our intentions were

entheta to some degree and so forth, don't you see, we wouldn't make it. We would have some success and then collapse.

But it's a foregone conclusion now—I can speak to you from the fact that it's now a foregone conclusion—that we will make it. This was still in doubt, let us say, January of last year, see. Would we make it in time? Well, we didn't have all of our technology and we didn't have this and we didn't have that and things were in question. Exactly what we would do was in question and so forth. Well, that picture has entirely changed now and there is no slightest doubt of our making it now. It's not even a question of how fast we will make it. It's a—it isn't a question of how fast we will make it, because as soon as the materials are in your hands you can't actually help but make it. It's unfortunate, you see? I mean, you've had it.

I know that here and there I will be smelling rubber as the brakes burn, don't you see? It won't do anybody a bit of good.

As I just say, it isn't the unwillingness to work on the part of the janitor, it's just he doesn't know which way to put the brooms, don't you see? What should he do as his first action in any given condition? Well, if he selects the long—wrong one—and the wrong selections he can make are almost infinite in an uninformed state—then what happens at a professional level of a professional in the intricacies of his decisions and so forth? Well, if there's a sorting—out formula which he applies to any given situation that carries him through right and he knows what he re—if he reverses a couple of these things he's going to go wrong, why, there isn't much doubt about his arrival, don't you see?

So this—we're back to the Chinese poet who was a very famous Chinese poet and is one of the greatest of Chinese poets even to this day, and every time he wrote a poem he would go down and talk to the old flower woman and read the poem to her. And if she didn't understand it, he'd tear it up. And if she did understand it, why, he'd publish it. And he to this day, thousands of years later, is the greatest Chinese poet.

Okay. This is what date?

Audience: March 2nd.

Second? Second of March? Hmm! AD what?

Audience: Fifteen.

I'll bet some of you thought „14." March 2nd AD 15, and we've got ourselves a little lecture here about technology and hidden standards of technology and so forth.

You've got in the human race and in the mind, a barrier called a hidden standard. When anyone is critical, they are apparently criticizing against a hidden standard of behavior. They seldom tell you what the exact standard of behavior should be; they never spend much time on this. They just tell you what it shouldn't be. Your mama and your papa telling you that you were a bad girl or a bad boy very seldom defined for you what a „good girl" or a „good boy" was in—when they did, it was some—in some antipathetic definition that would have upset anyone to have tried to have been good that way, you see? Definition of a „good boy" is somebody who eats spinach.

So, man doesn't even have a definition—well, he today doesn't have a definition of what a normal person is. Well, that's easy to see how he wouldn't have this because this character, „normal person," doesn't exist. Read a science fiction story recently in which some fellow was the normal average of the whole civilization, so they elected him president because they all wanted to relax or something and the civilization eventually collapsed. They—nobody knows what a normal person is, but—and that's easy to see why not. But nobody really knows what a good person is. A good person is something that isn't defined very actively.

Very few people write this up. The commies approached it recently in trying to write up what was a good communist. And they—it was very interesting; it was a Chinese effort. And he was apparently somebody who wanted no rewards, who wanted to be anonymous,

who wanted no credit for anything he did and was totally anonymous and was missing as far as the society was concerned. I thought this was terribly interesting, knowing that if somebody isn't known to some slight degree, he gets no reward or anything else.

I can think of this, some poor guy in a Central Organization who has been working down there on the address machine or something like that and he's just been doing a bang—up job, don't you see, and somebody else comes along and is appointed Address In—Charge over his head and does a perfectly horrible job, you see, and gets an increase in pay and is moved on up through the line and so forth, and this guy keeps on running this little address machine and so forth. „Well," you say, „what's wrong with this bloke?" Well, there's something missing; he didn't make himself known. I mean, that's always part of work, you know? This anonymity, it gets somebody into awful lot of trouble, don't you see? Who's running the address machine? Well he is, that's all. And it's as crude as this—it's as crude as this: When he sees an executive around the organization, much less the Org Sec and so forth, he should say, „I'm the fellow who does all of the address machine work," you know. Just as crude as that. Introduces himself.

In the business world this has become, in successful areas, a rather interesting action in that it's now courtesy for a fellow to announce his name whenever he is—meets somebody else for a conference, don't you see? Shakes somebody's hands, he always says his name. He doesn't wait to be introduced or something like this, he says, „John Jones. Glad to meet you, Mr. Smithers," which has just about gotten to be a standard courtesy among the more successful firms. So much so that *Esquire* has started to lampoon it and so forth, and it quotes one instance of saying, „Damn it, Bill, you don't have to keep saying 'Bill Smithers' to me. I'm your father, man!"

But nevertheless, we must know it's a step in the right direction if *Esquire's* joking about it. Anyway, that's rather obscure, that joke, too. We have an index in Scientology of certain people fight things—they're almost test people—and if they fight certain things, then we know they're good so we do them. We know these people are instinctively trying to knock us in the head, so if they criticize certain actions which we undertake then we look these actions over very carefully for potentially successful actions. It isn't the sole reason we use, but oddly enough over the years it could have been. Do what your enemies protest. Always do what your enemies protest, and it's a crude test and it's not a perfect formula of success and it's not any natural law, but it nevertheless would get you through somehow when you had no other line of judgment.

For instance, the examination system—these little tests and systems are quite interesting as they weave through the society—the way they choose doctors to get top doctors, knowing well that the examination System just doesn't work in the field of medicine—the theoretical examination only with no practical application, don't you see, of course, doesn't work. In actual fact, appointments to major hospitals are usually measured on the fellow's position on the football team. Look it over for a minute. You talk about a wildly gone test, see? They have no other standard which is reliable, and if you think the standard over for a moment, as a medical doctor was telling me just last night, it's not too bad a standard. It's preferable to a weighted standard which doesn't turn out a result.

So, the standard that you could use in that particular instance: „Well, let's see, we don't know whether he was examined fairly or unfairly. We don't know whether he was good, bad or indifferent. We don't know whether we've got a fellow with initiative or no initiative. We don't know what kind of a fellow we've got. Well, what was his—what was his position in the realm of sports in the medical college and so forth? Oh, he was captain of the football team. Well, very good. That's the—out of these candidates, that's the man we want." Yet the fellow was supposed to be an orthopedic surgeon. This would be his qualification for an orthopedic surgeon, don't you see? Given the fact that he got through the medical college, they have then no other security on how to rate the man, so they merely

take—he must have been popular, he must have been fairly well physically coordinated, he must have been able to get along somehow and he must be somewhat extroverted in order to be in this position.

But maybe he was—when we apply this to basketball, this would of course, in the United States, give us only surgeon generals in hospitals who were six feet seven. So it's not a very good way to define it. And you'll find examination and selection of personnel gets into trouble continuously for lack of a standard; lack of a standard. There is no proper standard.

The hospital is blaming the university, but just as I found that some of our nonexpansion and so forth was traceable to the fact that my plate was too full—in other words, the nonexpansion was traceable right there under my chin. And yours, too, don't you see—but nevertheless it was traceable to my chin. There it was, you know, and if I couldn't handle certain of these items—if I didn't have time to handle certain of these items—it would cripple expansion, don't you see? I had to make, then, way to do this. So, they blame—whereas I might have blamed the organizations or the field auditor, which I didn't—you know, say, „Well, the reason we're not expanding is he's not working," see—all the time, all the time holding on to the materials in front of me here that he needed vitally—There's troops on the front line—they've got neither guns nor ammunition, don't you see, or directions of how to load them if they did have, don't you see? Nobody's even pointed out the enemy and so on, and all of that directional action and coordinative action is stacked up on one plate not done, see? Not digested, there it is. So, of course, how could you expect him to do anything

Well, the medical university is blamed, of course, then, by the big general hospitals for not making it plain which is the best student. Well, when we get down to this, this is another operation of the hidden standard. In other words, the medical hospital is running a hidden standard on the university because the medical hospital is not telling them what an optimum surgeon is.

Now, they'd have to have—before they could demand of the medical university what was a good doctor or a good surgeon, then they would have to have a complete map of this individual. And they'd say, „Now, you give me somebody who fits these characteristics, and he will be appointed at once to our staff." They would have to do this. But they don't do this. It's almost a human foible that they don't do this. It's general. They set up a hidden standard. They don't say, and then they say to somebody else, „deliver it." „I'm not going to tell you what boojum is,"—remember the old joke from way back? „I'm not going to tell you what boojum is, but you've got to give me some." That's the hidden standard at work. And you'll find it all through.

Now, you've got, then—you've got this situation where the individual is not able to know what's—what he's supposed to deliver. If everybody stands around and says, „Give me some boojum," and then he doesn't know what boojum is and so on, why, he gets into a sort of a spinny, confused state. And the wife says, „Well, you're not a successful husband," and he goes around holding his head in his hands saying, „I'm not a successful husband." Well, it's very interesting because he hasn't got a clue what a successful husband would be. What was a husband?

You could probably handle all marital relations just with that datum of the fact that people run a hidden standard on others, and that you, to straighten up that situation, only need to demand to know the standard. You do this sometimes out of rancor and so forth in debate and so forth, „All right, well what *is* a good boy?" don't you see? But if you were to make a wife who objected to her husband—now, we know technically it's because she hasn't understood him and got overts, but that's the mental aspect. We'll talk about the VIIth—the VIIth—you see, the physical universe aspect of here, the level VII. What exactly—the relationship of the spirit to the physical universe. What exactly is she

demanding be out there in front of her? That—what is she demanding be out there in front of her? And you're liable to find all kinds of things.

Now, you run into this as a—oh, you could make her define it. And you'd straighten up all sorts of things. You'd find out it was supposed to be Cary Grant, don't you see? Or Rudolph Valentino, and he's been dead for years. Very hard to furnish. So it's—it gives an apparent atmosphere of dissatisfaction. And people who are going around in a state of dissatisfaction—perfectly all right for people to be dissatisfied, there'd be no challenge in the environment unless they were. But if you wanted to do something about this and so forth, the thing to do was—would be to discover what they would be satisfied with. And there you're going to pull the longest comm lag in history on some people. They're going to sit there for hours, man. For hours! They can't tell you.

Now, we used to have processes that handled this sort of thing with auditors. Now you, as an auditor, come up against this very, very often. Very, very often. And you as an auditor have to face up to pcs who are running a hidden standard on you all the time. And you have somebody that say, „Only L. Ron Hubbard could audit me,"—and you've run into this character, a large majority of you have—are actually looking at somebody who is running some kind of a hidden standard. But you never probably realized he was also running a hidden standard on me. See? Not only you, but me, too. And Lord knows—Lord knows what his standard for me is! And even more intimate to the situation is Lord knows what his standard for you is.

Now, you say, „Well, it's hardly worth dreaming up because it has something to do with Saint Peter or the Archangel Michael or something like this. You'd have to be the Virgin Mary to audit him, you know?" You must realize that when you look at that situation you are not looking really at a standard, but a perversion. So you could be more specific and call it a „hidden perverted standard." But nevertheless, he does have a standard, so we could call it a standard, but it's hardly real enough to merit very serious acknowledgment on our parts. And we make a mistake when we don't rather seriously acknowledge this fact, because it's the unacknowledgment of the standard which he holds which has held it parked on the time track. Nobody's ever acknowledged this standard, you see?

She's always demanded that her husband ba—ba—ba—ba—ba, and it's probably something silly. And—so that if she, in any lifetime—it's probably—you know, and the other thing is, is they carry these on for lifetimes. Even when they address you, the auditor. It's for years, they—oh, ages and ages and ages they've had this same standard that anybody who was going to do anything for them had to , don't you see, and then it's blank—blank—blank. And in this case the wife, you see, in order to have a husband that she could have any faith in, the husband would have to blank—blank—blank—well, whatever it is, don't you see. And if she announced this originally way back in Lord knows what lost eons to some fellow, he probably laughed at her. It's probably something silly, don't you see? You know?

It's like, „If you were really a husband, why, on Saturday morning at 9:30 you would bring me red roses." Of course he can't do it because he doesn't know this is what she requires. She has forgotten this, because the first time she ever announced it: „I would really realize you cared for me if every Saturday morning at 9:00 or 9:30 you brought in a vase full of red roses—and it must be in a green vase and so forth—and then I would know exactly where I stood with you. And when you stop doing this, I will realize that you've gotten tired of me, don't you see. And we will set this up as a code system."

Maybe it worked once or twice, you see, very successfully. And then all of a sudden she met some fellow and she said, „This is the code symbol," and of course it was rather silly—if it had much to do with love it would be silly. I'd hate to replay some of my own very youthful conversations in this particular line. (When I say youthful, I mean way back on the track when I first got mixed up with humans.) I probably sounded very silly. It's—sufficiently that today I always have a little bit of a hard time writing dialogue of that

character in stories when I do write stories and so on. I have trouble with it, so it obviously is something that gets you in trouble.

Anyway, it was some silly standard of this particular character, and this bird laughed in her face. Didn't acknowledge it. Nonacknowledgment. So when you add up these various inventions and characteristics, you must realize that not one of them has ever been acknowledged if they are now still in existence. They've not been acknowledged. They have been refuted or protested. And so the standard is the collection of nonacknowledgments that the person holds in some zone, sphere or activity. It's this collection of nonacknowledgments.

Now, if you want—now this goes further than that. See, acknowledgment is quite a mechanism. If you want to end a cycle of action, you acknowledge. But let me show you something: that if you don't want to end a cycle of action, don't acknowledge. This has terrific application to auditing. There's such a thing as a half—acknowledgment which is actually a „continue," an encouragement. This has had part of our interest in our own technology. We use this, the half—acknowledgment, you see—the encouragement. The „Mmhm, mm—hm, mm—hm..." And people who acknowledge that way very often wonder why on earth people talk to them forever. They shouldn't blame the person talking to them forever, they just never have acknowledged what the person said. And they go on, „Mm—hm, mm—hm, well, hmm. Well, well. Mmm, mm—mm, mmm, hmm..." And next thing you know, the poor bloke talking to him and so forth finds he's got a dry throat and his head is starting to ache and just realizes suddenly he's not being received or acknowledged, don't you see? If he's not received he'll ARC break and if he's not acknowledged he'll go on talking. You see, to that degree, then, he is trapped in this cycle.

All right. Acknowledgment, a very full acknowledgment of any given cycle, ends it and a nonacknowledgment continues it. Hidden standards are merely a collection of nonacknowledged things. They've never been acknowledged. So therefore, they're kind of goofy. You see, if nobody ever agreed with them, never acknowledged them and so forth, why, naturally they'd be pretty nutty. So all these hidden standards are nutty. And they form some of the most interesting bric-a-brac that you ever saw disassociated on one sheet of paper, when you start writing them down. They just don't seem to bear any resemblance to anything, don't you see? Well, that's because they come from civilizations we know not what of anymore. That's because they come from customs and peoples that we have no contact with. And the person himself has forgotten where it came from anyhow, don't you see, or who he was when he first collected it.

But the common denominator of all hidden standards is that it's nonacknowledged material. It's not that it's protested or suppressed, no, nothing violent about this, it's just that it's never acknowledged. Do you follow? That's why people tend to get uglier after a certain period than prettier. Nobody ever says, „My, how ugly you look today!" Nobody ever does! „Goodness, I certainly see you've been putting on weight lately!" „Thank you!" Don't you see? And one of the fixations into the form of a human body and so forth is because nobody ever says to him, „Well, I see you've become a man this lifetime, Gertie! Good for you!" If it was discovered early on the track it would have been on the basis of, „What? You're a man this lifetime?"

This—these nonacknowledgments as we come up the line. Now, this is very applicable to Registrars, very applicable to your handling of pcs, very applicable to handling of students and that sort of thing. It's really—it's really hot material. And this is a borderline on organizational material. This is just borderline, however. It's not one of the laws. If you acknowledge the person before he arrives in any way, shape or form, he won't arrive. And I discovered this in 1952, quite accidentally. On looking back over 1951, I found out—I was working on whole track research, and in 1951, on a study of a situation which I was making at that time, I found out that my own work had never prospered better and that things for a

certain period of that time had never run better (this was true within limits, see; it was compounded by the fact that I wasn't on deck, too, and that messed it up) but—never answering procurement letters—if I never answer personal letters they ARC break with me, but procurement letters—nonanswering of procurement letters had resulted in more people coming in for auditing than when procurement letters were answered.

You say, „Well, there must have been a lot of silly answers." No, before that there just—nobody answered them very much, but there was an attempted mail line along this line in the early Foundations. But in that particular zone and period there was no attempt of any kind to answer any such letter as „I want some processing and I will be in next August." There was no slightest attempt. And more people came in. You explain it.

All right, well all these years later, there's the explanation, see? Thirteen years later, there's the explanation. Nobody ever acknowledged their intention and so as—ised it and so ended its cycle. Person intended to come in, they wrote to the organization and said so. Then if somebody there answered up and said, „Good. Thank you. Fine. All right. Oh, you're going to come in, well that's very good, thank you so much," it probably left him in a bit of a daze, and they never arrived.

But the person who said, „I'm going to come in for processing one of these days," who had received a letter, „Well, we've got a lot of auditors available at the beginning of the month; I hope to see you," they probably would arrive very expeditiously. And you'd never dare put an acknowledgment in a procurement letter. Just—or nobody will ever appear for training or processing. If you acknowledge too heavily you can just cut it down to nothing.

And that's something you'd better find out as an auditor. This guy says, „You know, I'd like some processing."

„Good for you! Fine!" That's the end of his auditing! The right procedure is just severe—is very, very good courtesy. Tell him how much and where and that you hope to see him there. If anything, a little doubtfully. „Well, so many hours, that'll be—cost you about five hundred dollars and the usual auditing periods are in the afternoon and I will be available next week. Do you have any time next week?" Well, the person says, „Well, yes, yes, I do have." Don't say, „Good," see? Say, „All right, well, see you, probably—probably see you Monday morning, then, huh? I hope so." And the person will come on in and be audited. Do you follow that?

This applies also to such things as appointments. Let's take a military appointment. The laziest people in the world are military people. I know, I've been one. You in actual fact get the most action out of one when he's working toward being something and get the least action when he *is* it. So you commission them—and the military is peculiar, then, as being one of the laziest areas known to man, would then be investigatable from the standpoint of what makes it that way—that's because they issue commissions. The man is a lieutenant. He *is* a captain. He *is* a major. He's commissioned as a major. That finishes it. That's an acknowledgment. That finishes it right there. He doesn't have to work to be a major now. He doesn't have to keep going to run the company; he doesn't have to do anything else. He *is* a major. And of course these are the most cocky, overbearing, insufferable people with regard to rank you ever had anything to do with. That's all they've got—they've arrived. So you're dealing all the time ...

Now, it sounds very funny and I won't try to phrase this expertly or usably or anything else, but their commission should read, „You have been a captain and thereby are qualified to work toward the rank of major." Isn't that fascinating.? „You're qualified to work toward the rank of major." Now, this would thank him and wipe out all the monkey business and upsets and so forth of his captaincy and would be a very kind thing to do. And you've given him something to work toward on his next rank. Unfortunately, you're going to see this function of—a type of this sort of thing in organizations in their appointments and so forth. You'll see some shadow of this. But it operates like magic.

The old Businessman who doesn't—he is, he is the general manager. Leaves him only thing—one thing to work for, man, and that's the next post up, which makes him, of course, a sort of a revolutionary bloke and overthrows the board and does various things, but he ceases to do that and one day he realizes that he's working toward retirement.

He's got to have something to work toward. So he can work toward a vacation or he can work toward retirement. Of course, when he's reached retirement he's had it because there is no rank higher than retirement. There's nothing to go forward to so there's nothing to attain so there is no future. And you could actually look over actual statistics on this, of the number of blokes who kick the bucket immediately after being retired and you can assign it to many things and you just better assign it to acknowledgment. That's where it belongs. Retirement is an acknowledgment of his total active life. A reward and acknowledgment for your total active life. „You're an active human being, thank you," is what it's saying, see? Nobody's ever wished him any further longevity, see? That acknowledges that.

And that alone—of course there are many other contributing factors—but that's the central factor. An acknowledgment of his total active existence would finish him. An acknowledgment in the form of a military commission of a major, of course, makes a major. It doesn't have—the guy has no future and he has no place to go. Makes the military very conservative.

Now, you could say eventually he will become a lieutenant colonel, a light colonel, by the selection system. Or he will become something by the selection system, he hopes. And a lot of those boys are working on it on a career basis, but how many of them around are there who don't work on it on a career basis? It's a funny thing because it's an invitation to overthrow their superiors. You want to know why they have mutinies at sea and in armies and that sort of thing? Well, that's the basic reason.

Nobody ever said to anybody when he was advanced to lance corporal, „Thank you for having been a private. You are now entitled to work toward lance corporal, while wearing the chevrons and so forth of a lance corporal. You can become a lance corporal."

Now, we—in organizations and so forth—we have to differentiate between the being and the hat. Probably not occurred to many people in organizations and so forth that there is a hat called D of T. And the only way that person can get in trouble is to be George Smith while he's pretending to be the D of T. No, the D of T is a set of beingnesses and lines and actions and policies all by itself, and that is the D of T. And then there's a being who runs the D of T hat. Now, the only way he can get in trouble is to be George Smith miscalling himself D of T. See, he's operating like George Smith one hundred percent of the time and never operates as anything but George Smith, don't you see? Someday we'll have a D of T called George Smith—I can see it now.

But don't you see, he's only George Smith. He has no familiarity or knowingness with regard to what this hat is, so of course he can't wear it.

He's not studied it or something like this, you see? So he goes around operating as George Smith. He isn't even operating as, let us say, an HCA or an HPA either. He isn't wearing that hat either. Well, this would make a pretty random training department and I think you'd object to it and would be one of the first ones to object to this training department because the hat of D of T is the functioning hat there and it is not being worn.

Well, the funny part of it is it must be in the process of being attained, always. In order to get a hat on you must put it into the process of being attained. Very peculiar. Because the attainment is an acknowledgment, the second that you mention that it's been attained, why, that is the end of that. Do you follow? Now you've given the guy no future, you've cut off the finished cycle of action, he doesn't study it anymore, he sits back and relaxes and the hideous part of it is he may be sitting back and relaxing as the D of T.

Now, you have a hat, D of T, which is apparently being worn because you don't have George Smith. You can't really detect Smith-isms and yet the D of T hat isn't running. So you wonder what on earth has happened here and you get a condition of noncompliance. Not to go off into organizational matters, this all applies to a hidden standard.

Do you see that these mechanisms—the only thing I'm showing you is these mechanisms of acknowledgment have a great deal to do with life and existence. And there's some rather astonishing things to find out about that. You have to be very careful what you acknowledge as an auditor and very careful to acknowledge certain things. And therefore your acknowledgment can't always be „good" because it's sometimes insulting. Little Arthur tells me he's had a horrible day at school, I don't dare tell him „good." Do you see? Because he gets upset with me, I'm insufficiently sympathetic to be talked to, don't you see? And I say—I say something on—"Well," making sure that I did, „well, you had a horrible day at school, I'm sorry about that. I'm really sorry about that. Well, at least it's an ended day, isn't it?"

„Yes, that's right!" He's already told me about it, I've received it and to that degree acknowledged it and it instantly goes onto the backtrack. In other words you as a person or you in an organization or you in civilization have the power to put somebody's past on the past track and to give them a future. And if you want to kill them dead and so forth, why, you never fail to acknowledge everything with a crash. And this, of course, gives them no future no future no future no future. And you haven't got them stretched out on the track—you've got them stacked up on the track.

Supposing you always acknowledged, „Well, I'm awfully glad you're going to be a painter, that's fine. That's a very, very good career. That's—painting is a good career, thank you for being a painter." Or even, „Thank you for dreaming up the idea of being a painter." Guy would feel suddenly lost. He wouldn't quite know what happened to him. Well, you've cut his future out from underneath his feet. You could do this.

The thing to do is worry about how he's going to become a painter. And you'll find him take off in a steep spiral. They just go, zing, right on upstairs on the subject. You don't be doubtful about it. „Well, all right, you're going to be a painter, eh? That sounds—you're going to be a painter, you say. What—what—what's the best schooling or training for that kind of a career, you know? What's the best schooling or training" And get involved in some deep argument about what would be the best schooling and what would be some style that would be best to master, or something of this character, and just keep on talking in that line. And then when you break it off of course, acknowledge the Conversation, not the action. „Well, it was good talking to you!" See, that puts the conversation on the backtrack and doesn't leave him hanging with it, see? There's a fine art here involved with the handling of acknowledgment. And you could handle your environment quite markedly and quite remarkably with acknowledgment. It's something that needs quite a bit of study, but it is an interesting weapon. And it is a very interesting way to help and it has many, many uses and many ramifications and many complexions.

Now, recognize then that something that had quite a few uses and so forth would be very easily gang agley on the backtrack. Very, very easily go off into the wild blue yonder, very easily get perverted. Be—very easily get twisted. Very easily get messed up. When it gets messed up then you have a thing called a hidden standard—is one of the many things which arise out of the immediate result. Amnesia is one of the things that arises out of it. Guy's shot—that's too much of an acknowledgment for his former lifetime, so of course he forgets it. That's the basic mechanism behind not remembering a past life.

Now, things that aren't acknowledged because they were totally out of agreement, while good things that were in agreement were acknowledged, bring about a Condition where everything disappears out of the person's past except the nonacknowledged things

that people thought were silly or something of this sort or protested or were upset about. And so this gives you a decay of personality as the fellow moves along a time track.

Therefore, whether you had GPMs or not—and the GPMs account for it—I'm not talking to you about what you might call native aberration. A person would be subject to these things anyhow, but not to any vast degree and he would be able to recognize them and do them and undo them almost at will, don't you see. You couldn't do very much to a guy to hold him down, but he will nevertheless be prone to these things. If he didn't know these things, he could use these tools the wrong way to, you see. And get into a mess again—but not to the serious degree that he did, but he would find himself going downhill a little bit and so forth. Well, he should know some of these things. And one of them is, he would have a tendency to collect all those things which were never acknowledged.

Now that's because, of course, he has some dependency on the communication formula. When you've licked that why, of course, you've probably risen above this line. But I still think you will want to communicate with somebody. And as long as you have any desire to communicate with somebody or do communicate with somebody to any degree or are having an association with anybody, you will be liable to certain parts of the communication formula, one or another, and when they go awry, why something is really going to go awry, you see? That you don't retain this as aberration is the future state of affairs. You won't retain it as aberration, you see, it won't go on and on and on, and you won't be aberrated on it forever. But one could regulate his conduct and so forth by knowing what parts of the communication formula were good and what parts were bad, what parts would natively get him into trouble and wouldn't get him into trouble.

In other words, if you're going to—if you're going to associate with your fellow being—and we can assume jolly well that you will—if you're going to associate with your fellow being, why you are then going to have to use a communication formula. And you can work it out any way you want to, it's going to wind up as the communication formula. You could have it three—way and try to dream it up in seventeen different ways, but you would eventually come around to the same communication formula that you've got, which is cause, distance, effect, with intention and attention and so forth, and this can have certain things go wrong with it. Nothing's going to change about that. And therefore, the material I'm giving you now is native aberration rather than made—up or agreed—upon aberration, and so on. Well, the agreedupon aberration and so on, GPMs and so on, they have a tendency to hold enough foundation so that the bank tends to retain these minor aberrations which collect, you see? And you get a hidden standard.

Now basically, you're talking about what is insanity. Well, insanity could be two things. It could just be this collection of unacknowledged things or it could simply be the outright overt commands in the GPMs, you see, to be nuts, which exist, you see, in the GPMs. And you've got then a direct source of direct aberration—got a direct source of direct aberration—and then you've also got—that's the GPMs and the basic reactive mind, you see—and you've got this other thing which could stem from a native Condition of the being. He's liable to this type of aberration, see?

Now, when you get both of those things working together, the GPMs or the basic reactive bank can hold the collected aberrations or nonacknowledged things and so on, in firm position and make them assume tremendous importance and make them quite aberrative. So insanity actually could be defined at first surface glance, don't you see, as just that collection of things which have never been acknowledged and the person is not in agreement with the physical universe about. I refer you to many years ago; we've had many lectures on this subject.

Person is—if nobody agrees with anything a person does, of course he's crazy. They all brand him as crazy. Well, they don't acknowledge those things and they don't realize that what he is doing is the collection of things which have never been agreed with and therefore

never been acknowledged. Now, knowing that about aberration—knowing that about aberration—you can actually take aberration apart bit by bit in almost anybody. Well, you know that he's going to run into aberration at the level of Level VI and Level VII and you're going to have this type of aberration appear which is just a collection of not—agreed—with things. In other words you've got two areas that you can work with here. It's either the areas which are from the fundamental bank and fundamental universe; those areas. And you've got another area which is the incidents of livingness. The accidents and incidents of livingness and what happens to him in the progress of life.

Of course this—there's no doubt about it that that's about eight billion to one. But the funny part of it is that it's eight billion volts worth of reactive bank, you see, and only one volt worth of accumulated locks. See, that would be the relative effective power of the thing to make him run crazy. You see, the bank is there, that is it. But there's this other, you see, there's this one volt proposition, too—it's also there. That's this native liability for the collection of aberration by the thing that nobody agrees with certain holdings and so on that he does. Nobody ever acknowledges these things and so on. Well, that's there.

Well of course, when an individual is very pinned down, you'll find that the reverse is what he thinks it is. You see, he thinks that it's the one volt worth which has got the billion volts of charge in it, and that the bank itself couldn't possibly be making him do anything like this. It must be life, it must be the fact that his mother denied him peanuts all during his youth that makes him crazy and so on. You've seen people around, they're always assigning their aberration to what they can confront. And they can't confront very much and so you listen to former schools of the mind and you'll get the rather interesting view of man is this little flimsy straw in the wind, you know? Corporal coughs unduly hard one night on night patrol and it frightens a person so much that he's been a shock case in a mental hospital ever since, you see? And you get an idea that man and beings are not hardy and that they can't stand up to certain kinds of mental shocks. Matter of fact they can.

But they've already stood up to too much shock just by the basis of having a reactive bank. Now, therefore you can take a human being apart or handle a human being, and so forth, in two different ways. You can unburden the charge of the reactive bank, which is to say clear off these locks, key them out—however you want to call this thing—but just detach them from the reactive bank, get them sort of blown up and put into place and proximity and so on—and by doing this you tend to key out the reactive bank so that it's not immediate because these little locks make a connection between the individual and the bank, don't you see?

And so you could knock those out and you could sort of pat the bank back into place and the individual will feel pretty good and he'll tell you—he'll look pretty good and so forth, and of course, that's eight billion times what anybody has ever been able to do before for a human being. And this is so fantastic ...

You know, many people don't realize that what's gone up is not the delivery. We've been delivering pretty well at the level which we were delivering. But what's gone up is what we could deliver. And this has gone up so high and the nomenclature that describes it is so unchanging, and the states which can be attained are so unimaginable and undreamed of, don't you see, that it looks like maybe we haven't delivered the lower states. Do you see how this could be?

There have been people cleared up of aberration since time immemorial which is all that Clear meant. Well, Clear would just be this matter of kicking out these little things, keying them out, disconnecting the fellow from his bank, giving him a better, more rational look at the existence, permitting him to perceive the physical universe around him. And after awhile, why he considers he's pretty much a human being, compared to what he was before.

See, we leave out this comparative thing, we're now running, you see, the human standard on the—I mean the hidden standard on the person. You follow that? So nobody

will then admit that you have reached any state because nobody has ever told you what state you were supposed to reach in the first place. That is to say, amongst your fellow human beings. What state were you supposed to reach? And then the hidden standard with regard to a state, people have a tendency to put the hidden standard in place of the actual standard.

If you want to know what a state of Clear is, it's just a free needle, with the tone arm at the male or female read. That's all the state of Clear is. There isn't any other standard connected to it. Not today. You see, this has been the test for Clear for many, many', many years. And if you keep rushing at it and plunging at it all the time and hammering at this individual and running processes over his head, of course his tone arm is going to go up and the needle's going to stick. If you keep trying to assign his aberration to the wrong areas and you don't just key out the thing, and so forth, why you're going to make his tone arm climb. He's going to feel worse. He's not going to be Clear. Do you follow?

So this kind of a cycle sets in: You finish him up in a session, he feels good, then he runs into the human race after the session. And they run a hidden standard on him and they make—try to make him prove that he's maybe now in a better state.

This medical doctor—I almost laughed in his face last night. I actually did. I sm—I smiled—I went on talking to him but I almost roared in his face. He had the cast—iron nerve to ask me to prove the workability of Scientology and actually my jaw dropped, you know? Now, of course these guys are in the dark on this sort of thing, and so forth, and all that, and we can understand all that. But nobody's done that to me for years. He set up—he wanted me to do some kind of an experiment and so forth, and I know why he wanted me to do an experiment: he's in trouble one way or the other cause he brings this up every time he talks to me, he wants some auditing. Sooner or later I'm going to have to audit him. Or get somebody to.

But this bird, this bird was asking for proof. Well, the day passed a long time ago—long, long ago—about proof. And the public and so forth that suddenly starts telling you that you should prove to them it works and so forth, well, at least be up to a reality where you feel like laughing at them. Because it's what—all they deserve. Now, anything that's been in existence and been shot at this hard for a period of fourteen years must have been workable all the way along the line to some degree or another—must have been more workable than other areas and zones of work—so the comparison must have been pretty good; and anything that went up from a few hectograph copies of a little tiny book to organizations on every continent with comm lines that reach from here to the moon, certainly i,9 not an unworkable activity.

If it were a totally fraudulent activity, the government would have shot us down long before. They still try, but they flub. They miss. They're missing all the time. They cant make it. We couldn't ever stand up to any attacks if we were that way. And yet we just stand up to them all and sooner or later they all blow over.

But the point here—the point here—is that we must have been better and we must have been furnishing more service and the funny thing I woke up to the other day is the fact that Scientology, done very wrong, is far better than anything man ever had before. That's something for you to wonder about. I mean, it could be alter—ised to a fantastic degree and still work, you know? Well, what it will do when it isn't alter—ised is fantastic, see? I mean it's exclamatory. And it really, in the public view, has never emerged into that state. But in the state it's been in it has built an empire of considerable size.

So somebody coming up to you and saying, „Well, prove that it works," start laughing. Because it's funny. It's funny. What proves that something works is demand. If it didn't work there wouldn't be any demand. I know I can do an awful fast sales talk. I know that. But believe me, people getting faster sales talks than I'm giving them right now and it's brought right into their home at vast expense by TV. The American Medical Association spends far more money blowing up the doctor, far, far more money advertising the doctor

and so forth, than we ever dreamed of. And their sales talks are so fantastically greater than me at my highest points of optimism; face it. Really fantastic, the comparative line. And they're shrinking and we're growing. They're shrinking. And they're advertising an appeal budget and organizational setup—and the budgets and so forth they get from governments are utterly fabulous—and they're shrinking.

They're about to fall apart in England. Did you ever realize that this symptom—of fall apart ... They permitted themselves to be taken over by a government; now they want out, now they're striking. Striking against the government? What kind of a position ... What are they, some mendicants or something or other? Carrying banners outside of parliament? „Pay us more money so we won't starve." That's a very, very shabby look for a professional organization. Frankly, they are going to pieces. You say, „Well, they couldn't possibly be," and so forth. Well, they never look better before they—just before they fall on their heads. They have decided to become a monopoly. They have decided all sorts of things. And all of these things backfire. They're not delivering.

If you go out amongst the public and count public noses, if you counted a Scientology group, counted noses, you'd find some small percentage in that group had not had delivery. See, it'd be a small percentage in the group. Let's just take a random group someplace or another. I don't—wouldn't even venture what the figure was because I'd never done it, see. Not like Gallup—can't make it up according to which party pays me the most.

But I know if you went into the general public, which is the doctors' group right now, about healing and so forth, and counted noses, you'd get nothing but sour grapes, the figure would be fantastic. The percentage would be quite reversed. The number of successfuls would be our number of failures, and our number of successfuls would be their number of failures. You see, and the percentage would be just reverse. You've got to deliver. That's all there is to that.

Now, what is delivery? Well, delivery is tremendously interfered with with this idea of a hidden standard. You'll find out that a sales talk or what you've offered to the individual, has nothing to do with it. Being Clear, being a Release, being anything else has nothing whatsoever to do with it at all. This is all a pale shadow. There's no reason to talk to them about this because they're going to set up a hidden standard around this thing. To some people Clears are OTs; and to some people, a guy, perfectly willing, golly, he doesn't have an excruciating pain across his eyes—thank heaven he's now Clear, don't you see? Another bird, why, he'd have to be twice as tall as the Empire State Building, you see, and be able to do ballet on the top of a milk bottle—there's all kinds of these things.

And you say, „What are all these definitions of Clear?" Well let me tell you frankly, you can't settle one down. It bucks straight up against the hidden standard, see? You can't settle this thing down. Because you've talked to a man basically about freedom and his optimum state that he envisions for himself. And that's different practically for every human being there is. He has to find his own optimum state. But you use this statement of Clear and it means what it is. It's an adding machine term. And you clear off certain aberrations and you clean off the reactive bank of the accumulated locks, which are also part of the bank, but connected intimately to the individual that key it in. You clean those things off, you had cleared those things one after the other, don't you see?

And when you've gone as far as you can go in that direction and this is pretty clean, and it will show on the meter as a floating needle, and—I remember I was Clear as a bell, I don't know, several years ago. You didn't know I ever heard this—but I was demonstrating the E—Meter during one of these lectures and so forth and I put myself on the E—Meter and Herbie was sitting over—way over—corner—to the side where he could see the meter. Well, the needle was floating and it had been floating for some months, because I hadn't gone on with investigation in any other upper line. It was about the time I was taking off into the total investigation of reactive banks and goals, you see, which of course messed the tone

arm read up. So he's sitting over there, he told Mary Sue afterwards, „Oh, there's something about this.. ." I forgot exactly what it was—I overheard this—first I heard his brain go snap and I looked back at the meter quickly to see what he had seen, you see, and the needle was floating, you see, back and forth. Well, it'd been like that for a long time. I could probably put it back into that Condition rather, rather easily, and so on. I'm just not particularly interested in ... It is so variable on read, it all depends on exactly what I've been doing in the last twenty—four hours with the reactive bank of what the meter reads. It'll read anything from 5.0 to 2.5, don't you see? And the needle practically—knocking on wood—just won't tighten up. That is very often very difficult to do—to get the needle so that it will read properly. I have to key something in to get a read.

All right, so that gives you a standard. You've got a standard. You've got a meter which will behave in a certain way, and you say, „All right, well, that's Clear." That's about the only thing you could say.

„Well, are you worried now about getting worse?"

„No, I'm not now worried about getting worse. Scientology works, I'm not worried about getting any worse."

„Good, you're a Release."

The only standard that you could have would be this type of standard. Now, you're going on up to VI and you're going on up to VII, and so forth. Those standards are very obvious. They're very, very apparent and they, of course, soar well above the hidden standard but take a long time to attain, because there's so darn much coal, as McPheters was saying the other day, to shovel out of the way. And he just was trying to see a little distance between himself and the coal pile. Well, he's only been at it a month or so—guy's being a lousy optimist. You're going to see distance between yourself and the coal pile? How can you see distance between yourself and the coal pile? You have to rake the coal over to yourself so you can burn it up, you're the only flame around there.

Now, he's never looked on the other side of the coal pile. If he looked on the other side of the coal pile and he'd find that side was getting less distant. See, but he's always on this side of the coal pile, pulling it in toward him. And it's pretty arduous. And you go through various phases and so forth and you never went through so many changes of beingness in your life. And it's pretty arduous. And you can—you get—you get to battling around with this stuff

It's very discouraging in some instances. Extremely discouraging because you can start—all of a sudden your eyes just start burning and burning and burning and burning and so forth and you feel terrible and you're all exhausted and so on. The only crime you can pull is not taking responsibility for your own case and picking up a meter and finding out what it's all about. Because you'll find it out. Sometimes it takes you two or three, four days to find out. Sometimes it takes you a couple of weeks to find out what the devil. You straighten that out and then because you're now in an erasure ... See, this is an erasure Condition, negative gain. You're always experiencing negative gain. You never realize how much better you are than yesterday because you're experiencing negative gain. That's no longer wrong with you, so of course, you are not now worrying about it. And you're aware of the fact, dimly, and all of a sudden you'll hit something where the gradient goes up suddenly a little steeper. And you'll become aware of the fact that you've made a sudden gain. Or one day it'll suddenly occur to you that you no longer have a hole through the back of your spine, you see? You say, „Hey! There's no hole in the back ... Well, that's very interesting. Now, as you were saying about politics ... You were talking about . . ." I mean, just have no more concern to you than that.

See, things are only of a concern to you when they're—when they are pushing at you or having an *effect* on you. Things are not of a concern to you if they are not having any

effect on you and particularly if they never again will have any effect on you ever. And believe me—that you become very disinterested in.

You see, there was only misery there to remember, so when the misery is all gone, there isn't even anything to forget. Fantastic situation.

But hidden standards operate as to who you are going to be in order to audit them. Hidden standards exist with regard to what condition they should be in in order to have had a ease gain. Hidden standards exist for any condition you have described to them as a better condition in Scientology and a hidden standard exists for known standards. Now, take it up to there. Because the individual becomes so aberrated about this or another type of condition that after you've said, „It is a pink sheet, that is the standard which we require, a pink sheet," they keep bringing you in green ones. They say, „Is this what you wanted?" Send something off to a printer someplace and get the chit—chat back and forth between you and the printer of what you want. You've described to them cleanly and clearly that you want a paperback of certain dimensions and so forth. Well, usually they can encompass this. But you say heavy paper and they give you light. And you say big type and they give you small. And you do that—there's always some wild point here.

Well, they're altering your standard. Well, they don't know they're doing it. Well, that's with a visible mest object that they're doing this. So think of how much more easy it is to do for an actual standard to exist out here someplace, to be totally misunderstood and misapplied. Well, that's because the individual with his concatenation—his string of nonacknowledged ideas—adds up to a nonobservational point. He can't observe from this point. He can't tell how he is, he doesn't know what you're saying to him as to how he should be and he's just all mixed up and he's just like a fire drill in the Swiss Navy, see. Mess completely.

Now, what would he do? What would he do? Well, he will do one thing: He will keep on trying to bail himself out, providing he's—can see—he isn't overwhelmed by that he is asked to bail or providing you don't give him nothing to bail. In other words, if you don't give him too much to bail out of the rowboat at a time and if you don't give him too—well, nothing to bail out of the rowboat at all, that's no auditing, then you get to the happy condition of—he will continue to bail within the realm of his understanding and ability to confront. And if you don't exceed that amount of bailing required he will eventually float. That's all you have to remember. It's just no bailing at all, that's *verboten,* too much bailing demanded all at once—can't confront it, doesn't even see that it's there, and so forth, up to his neck in water and he says—or you say, „All right, now just get a bucket from someplace and take all the water and throw it over your shoulder and get rid of it." And he's up to his neck in water and he says, „Well I—over my shoulder? I can't do that."

In that way, you don't even Q—and—A with his hidden standards. Now, very often when an individual sits down and tells you that this has got to be run and that's got to be run and something else's got to be—the pc—and this has got to be run and I can't make any advance unless this is run or that's run or something else is run, and so forth. All you're doing, all you're doing is trying to match up to some unimaginable hidden standard that he himself can't even grasp. And the guy who sits down and sets as his session goal—you're going to do an assist, you see, he's hurt his foot—and he sets as his session goal, he just gratuitously sets a session goal, and he says, „Well," he says, „I want to make OT in this session."

Well of course, he's just gone crazy on the subject which is just another—another Variation of hidden standards. So the only thing you can do is to assign a very exact action which is to be done in order to attain an acknowledgment. And that goes in a little cycle and it goes in a big cycle. In other words, it goes in a process cycle. You've started this process and you assign this action and then you now tell him that that process is complete when it is complete. The tone arm's gone out of it, it's complete. All right, Level 0, why, he's no

longer getting comm lags and he can answer and do these things easily. That's complete, so you say that process is complete.

You can do that, you see. He was able to do it and he did it until he was able to do it very, very well, and if you carried it on much further he'd be bailing nothing, don't you see? And you give him too high level a process and of course he's given too much to bail too suddenly. And he's got himself a Condition now where he can work, see? Well, you run this process. This is the process we run. This is the next process we run. All right, this is the next process we run, and then now you've run all of the processes of this level and we give him a certificate to that effect; a certificate to that effect.

„You've done all the processes of Level 0, all right. We now hereby certify that he has run—big letters: LEVEL 0—and is all ready to attack Level I." And acknowledge it. You'll be surprised how much that will also kick out on the backtrack. See? That knocks out the sessions, the auditing, it keys out the whole lot. You've just acknowledged the whole lot, good, bad or indifferent. You say he didn't do it well, he didn't do it completely, he didn't do it thoroughly. You say, „You did it—thank you very much." You've acknowledged everything that's happened during that period of time. That's that. So he's still got the gain. Nothing can take that away from him in Scientology. Anything that wasn't a gain you've also acknowledged, so you haven't set up a hidden standard of auditing. Tends to wipe that out. He's—never afterwards will have to have the same kind of an auditor under the same conditions, don't you see, in order to say that he has a gain. Because you can set up auditing conditions.

I've seen a pc get a resounding win with some auditor and ever afterwards be pestering a D of P or somebody to get that auditor back and insist on running that process! My God, the process was flat in 1951. But he's got to run it. Why? It's the hidden standard of what is auditing. So you can't Q—and—A with these hidden standards. You can make it easier for the person. You can do whatever you can. You can acknowledge what kind of an auditor would have to be able to audit him. You can patch this thing up one way or the other in numerous ways. You can just get him to announce, „Who would I have to be to audit you?" Remember that old process? And acknowledge the living God out of every answer, see. See, just acknowledge that, see. „Well, good! Hey, that's pretty good. All right, that's fine. I'd have to be a voodoo priest. Very good." Repeat his answer even.

Now, if you acknowledged that properly and you were doing that thing very smoothly, it would have a resounding gain because you are operating and working right in the field of major therapeutic beingness, see? Big, big gain, big gain. Various ways of handling this particular aspect. But the only safe way to evaluate case progress is a mechanical method such as a meter—that's because of hidden standards—and a completed cycle of processes. He's completed them.

Now, it so happens—it so happens that if he does complete this cycle of process he will reach a better ease state. And it so happens that this can be strung out along the line of levels, now, to such a degree, and sufficiently accurately, that you don't have pcs that are different. I mean, you've got such basic and fundamental processes strung out along this line now that you're not getting different pcs all the time. So he's working to complete a level. Well, if you get him interested in completing a level you're all set. That's all he has to be interested in. Well, you just complete this level. „Yeah, I—oh, you've had bad headaches lately. Well, that's too bad. Bad headaches, huh? Oh, that's pretty bad. I'm sorry you have headaches. Well, you've had bad headaches. All right." Not, „Well, I'll see what I can do about that." That's a fatal remark, you've now continued the headache.

The only safe thing to do is just to go on and audit them up the line level by level, and let them take those processes and not go steaming and snoring and snorting and shouting and so forth and saying, „I'm not Clear and I'm not a Release," or „I'm not…" He is a Level I pc who is working to become a Level II. That's what he is. And that's a state of beingness

that any fool could figure out. And it's a state of beingness that he doesn't have to be a wise man to see, but he doesn't also have to be a fool to see, because he sees he's making some progress. And he would make progress.

Now, this is basically the use to which levels are put today and this is basically what's going to happen; that's what's going to happen here. Now, on the subject of hidden standards you very often feel that there is a hidden technical standard that you don't know what it is, and so forth. Well, that comes from an alter—is. When you get an alter—is of the technical standard, you see, then you must believe that there is something back of this that is being alter—ised. But let me tell you what your hidden standard is right now technically. I'll tell you exactly what it is technically and so forth. It's not very hidden. It's not hidden at all. It just isn't totally released. And the reason it isn't totally released is there is so much work on my plate and my finger can develop just so many calluses and I'm getting it to you as fast as I can. So to that degree, it is hidden. Do you follow that? That's all there is to that.

There is probably two or three more paragraphs to write on the subject of Level 0. Boy, you've got a lot of stuff that the public could be taught, and that sort of thing. But there's, just as far as the technology of Level 0 is concerned I'd say two or three paragraphs. Nothing. And there's, however, the rack—up of the remaining levels and the exact processes which fit at the level and the exact condition the pc's supposed to reach, I haven't written that. I'm going to make a rough draft, write—up of that and issue it to you so it'll no longer be hidden.

Anyway, get a difference between an nonissued standard, which somebody knows about—and it's merely slow coming on the lines—and a hidden standard. Because nobody's trying to hide any technology. But there's tremendous numbers of hidden standards which you confront as an auditor. I just threw the other one in for an example. Tremendous numbers of hidden standards you're going up against, and the thing to do is not Q—and—A with them.

Not go in a spin about them. Just hold a very standard technology, that is your best answer to all of these things. Hold it very standard, when you've got it, you see, and then run processes in just that sequence, finish them off, issue the guy a certificate and run your next level, and the fellow is going to make it willy-nilly in the end. It's very simple to do today because we have the answers. We are in that enviable position.

Thank you very much.