

# ARC BREAKS AND GENERALITIES

A lecture given on  
30 March 1965

Well, all right. All right. Well, I see nothing's wrong—nothing's wrong with your morale at all. Nothing's wrong with your morale at all.

All right, this is the what of the which?

*Audience: March 30th, AD 15.*

Well, good. When we used to run whole track you used to get some very remarkable dates. This is the 30th of March, what year?

*Audience: AD 15, 1965.*

AD 15, that's better. Somebody over here said „1965.“ That's out of style.

Good enough. Good enough. Well, there's all sorts of things I could tell you about, today. Tremendous number of things. I could have told you about the conditions formulas and I could have told you about the new org board and—the wildest thing that's happened in a long time—and so forth. So I just wondered what condition you were in. Well, actually you're in a Condition of „morale“—good morale, you see—so I probably shouldn't talk to you about the one I chose out to talk to you about: ARC breaks.

I could talk to you about the new levels and they're pretty well taped and there's all sorts of—all sorts of data. I actually—actually my pen finger is the jam on the line right now because I can't get the stuff out by transcription. That usually—that transcription line breaks down. I overload it and it jams like mad. And at least when I write it out it's there on a piece of paper and it doesn't have to be transcribed, you see, before somebody can find out what it is and the mimeograph line is pretty fast so it gets out all right.

But it's simply the proposition of having enough hours in a day and I keep looking up and finding these 24—hour days and I wish they'd stop it. Lousy 24—hour days. Well, that's what you get being on a little tiny pipsqueak, periphery planet, don't you see, that's way out in the twelfth magnitude sun, you know, in the *skim—scum* of the galaxy. That's the way it is.

Anyhow, that's all right. We're still making it. We probably wouldn't make it at all if we were any closer in, man. Somebody would have noticed this.

Now, the general pace of operations is quite rapid and organizations were moving right up very, very nicely through last year and when I went down to Las Palmas for a few week's vacation and so forth, a shift of my position and so forth was adequate to put a little discouragement on the line. Now we're busy picking that up again. They went into a slight decline. Now they're coming back up again.

But what's very interesting is just—this is not apropos to the lecture I'm going to give you—but what's very interesting is—is the number of data which you can get which are completely false which throw you a terrific curve.

You get people coming around and giving—this is not ungermane to the lecture, by the way—get people coming around telling you „everybody thinks“ and „everybody says“ and „the field says“ and „they say“ you know, these terrific resounding blahhh and there's

been one bird said it. Don't you see? So that is then pretended to be—by some chaos merchant, you see—that's pretended to be everybody in the whole universe thinks this, see. It's the way they run a democracy or a newspaper.

But the point is that we were thrown a couple of curves last year and one of them was the Gradation Program. And we were thrown a very bad curve. It was reported to me from at least two sources that should have known, that the Gradation Program was unpopular. And do you know something It alone was responsible for the resurgence of organizations last year. I just spent last night doing nothing but working on it and isolating it. And that's what I finally came up with.

There was only one thing thrown on the plate last year that was new and strange. People have been hearing me talk about Clears for years, see. So nothing about whether we were making it or not would have had too much influence on anything. Some influence, yes, but not all that influence. And the only thing which was new and strange was the Gradation Program and that was brand-new. Whoever heard of that before, see? And you don't climb in the top story—I used to say this—you don't take the pc into the top of the Empire State Building when you haven't entered the front door at street level, you see.

But—and the truth of it is that the Gradation Program was responsible for a continuous rise in growth and when I wobbled the Gradation Program, acting on the very good authority that had been given me as an „everybody“ and an „anybody“ and „they,“ you know, and monitored it and modified it slightly, the decline set in—and the steady increase ceased. And it's just traceable to those two factors.

Now, there was a price shift at the first of the year. Most people think it was the price shift to show you how bad the data is in this. No, it was the way it was presented by the local organizations and Registrars. And the reason why this must be true is Saint Hill went along without any price shifts, don't you see, and its curves are just on a steady increase and they keep right on increasing. And there was a price shift in organizations in the field and that brought about a complete—oh, a very steep decline—but that was coincident with my having left for a vacation and it wasn't, therefore, totally assignable to this price shift.

So we went in to try to take a look at what this was and we found out that unwittingly Registrars and so forth had apparently used the confusion which was possible in the change of price to just lock the doors of the organizations tight and shut.

Now, a confirming data is necessary in this, but apparently people were being denied auditing.

In the first place what they did was sell a tremendous quantity of auditing on the basis that prices were going to rise. See, they did that uniformly. Well, of course, the organization has already said „Prices will be unpayable in one month,“ and then they are very surprised when the public finds them unpayable in that month. Do you follow?

*Audience: Mmm. Yes.*

So nobody need be amazed about this. You see, they've already said, „Buy it now because it's all going to go up to some prohibitive figure in thirty days.“ Well, everybody bought it now and of course did just what the org said and didn't buy it thirty days later. Do you see that? What they did was really advertise that people would not be able to get audited in thirty days. Do you follow that?

*Audience: Mmm. Hm.*

So that was a very, very bad piece of promotional handling to use this as a promotion gimmick.

And then the next point that was catastrophic and so on was to confuse the public with what they could get with what and to present this in a completely cloudy way to the people who walked into the organization, see. „Now, let's see, oh, you say, Mr. Zilch, that you want some auditing. Ah, well, let's see now, there's the international—I think it's the li-li—the—the lifetime member—no, uh—that—that—excuse me. Uh—if you—if you—

very few people can have a membership. Uh—you sure you wouldn't want to pay full public price because it's just too hard to figure these memberships out?"

Of course, I'm gagging it up but *we* have seen a letter written by the Washington Registrar that *was just as bad as that!*

Some poor woman wanted auditing and *that's all she was asking for*, and she got membership discount Confusion and that was not what she wanted so it didn't answer the auditing question, did it? The auditor's question in this case was, more or less, „When can I come in for some auditing?“ And the answer to the question is, of course, „Well, actually it's all so confusing that uh—uh. . .“ No further qualification. It's just all confusing. And the person responded as though she had been refused auditing.

Now, actually if you sorted through all these—these lines—if you sorted through all these lines and looked at them very carefully, you eventually probably could have figured out what it was and how much it was, if you had a pencil, paper and an IBM computer handy. And it upset her considerably. So she sent the letter in here, not complaining, but sort of pathetically, you know, „How can I get some auditing?“ You see?

So there's the front door, you see, of the orgs locked, closed, key turned, with a number of empty cardboard boxes, wooden boxes and these spikes that they used to have that horsemen couldn't get through, you know, when they were attacking a castle, chevaux—de—frise, they called them, you know. They were a fence of spikes sticking straight out to the public and they were marked: „We don't know if you can have it or not because we're not sure exactly how much it is ourselves.“ Do you follow that? Because the truth of the matter is the prices didn't rise. In one area they declined. That's a surprise, isn't it?

Prices in the United States dropped from 625 for an intensive or a course to 500. But the United States promoted it that there was going to be a price *rise*. I don't think it's told anybody yet that there was a price *drop!* Do you follow?

Now, this is what it takes to lock the door. What it takes to lock the door, is locking the door.

And what it takes to unlock the door is the key to how the door got locked. In this particular character it was sufficiently broad and gruesome and so forth and it was so obvious that it was written all over everything in red paint saying, „This is the barrier to the door.“ Don't you see.

So that was very simple. We just pulled all the boxes out of the way and threw them all aside and tore down the barricades and removed the chevaux—de—frise (those spikes) and said what you do when you buy auditing or an intensive is you go to the Accounts Cashier who is the first door past Reception and Reception is there, and Reception says, „There is the Cashier.“ Do you see?

The glass will be so fixed, you'll see it—I'll see that it happens, too—will be so fixed that a person going into an org will have to bend over very uncomfortably to talk through a hole, so there's no invitation there for anything and the exact data of what it's all about is hanging over to the side of the window. Simple, elementary.

And that there will be a credit membership so all you have to do is sign an invoice. „Oh, you want a—you want a course. Your name is Jones. All right, you want a course; your name is Jones. Jones, Jones, Jones, Jones. You're not here on any discrepancy list and so forth. One—one course—there.“ And the guy reaches through and signs „Jones“ on it. He takes the slip up to the D of T and goes into the course. That's all. Total.

Now, somebody comes into the org and says, „What's this Scientology?“ And the Registrar says, „There's the book. Go over to the Accounts Cashier. Pay them two dollars and seventy-five cents and there's your answers. When you've read the book, why, come back.“ Don't give them some weird idea, „Well in your past life you probably. . .“ No, let's not—let's not do that, see. See.

So the key is somebody stumbles in and says, „What is Scientology?“ See, „There's a book.“ But if somebody stumbles in and says, „I want some auditing or I want some training,“ even though they haven't read a book, you say, „There's the Cashier's window, get your accounts clearance. All right, you got your slip of paper? All right, now go up to the second floor and you'll see on the door 'Director of Training.' All right, I'll take you up there.“ All right, you turn them over to the Director of Training and they're in course. Got it? No barricades.

Now, this is going to get worse and worse because there could be then a cash payment. There could be—they could pay for it in cash or they can get it on total credit. If their credit's good, the credit discount is not as great as the cash discount—costs a little more to buy one on credit, that's all, and you get a better discount after your credit is proven good. That's all. It's just—Costs less. You're not—the org's neck isn't out now supporting a bad credit risk.

In other words, it—we'll work it out so that somebody feels they need an intensive, all they've got to do is go down to the org, sign their name and go to the HGC and sit down and be audited. Period. And that was what was the matter with Central Orgs.

Now, I always knew there was something peculiar about Central Orgs and organizations and auditors and that sort of thing. I knew they did something that I didn't do and I was—never could put my finger on it. I never, never, never could put my finger on it. And it's the fact that I never talked about money. I don't think you've ever heard me mention a course fee. I never talked about money. I myself don't have problems with money, so it never occurs to me to wish a money problem off on anybody. But somebody who is having a lot of personal problems on the subject of money would of course think of money the first time somebody popped up.

They walk in—they're thinking of auditing—so the person who has problems with money, of course, says to them, you now have a problem with money. „Oh, you want some auditing. Well, you *now* have a problem with money. I don't care what else YOU were worried about, you're now worried about money!“ Just gratuitously hand them a problem.

I don't think ever in my life I even ever held out my hand for a fee. I don't ever mention it. I've even acted sometimes as Registrar for an organization that didn't have anything to do with money and people would walk in occasionally and throw some money on the desk and I'd invoice it so they could have a receipt. I gave it to them so they could have a receipt, not so I could have any money. Now, that's about the wildest look you ever saw!

I remember auditing some people in the early days and we never talked about money and they got embarrassed after a while and they gave me several thousand dollars. That's a reverse look, isn't it?

Look, why are we shutting it off? Because if our processing on the individual works, of course he's more capable of having money, but he's not more capable of having money before he has processing. Do you follow?

I mean we have—we have actually the wide open, marvelous „open sesame“ of taking Joe Jones, *any Joe Jones anyplace in the society* and waving the magic wand and he can now make money. And *were worried about* money! Well, you'd have to have the door closed and locked and with Federal Marshals outside of it and spikes and manholes and tiger traps and signs up at the other end of the avenue pointing „Go the Other Way!“ Something over the entrance say, „Abandon ye all hope who enter here.“ You know. It'd take a *production* and I think it *has!* I think it has taken a production because this is something that never occurred to me in all the days I was auditing.

Well, just—just—actually yesterday afternoon I got a report that they hadn't done—I asked all the D of Ps in the world—I do this once in a while—I asked all the D of Ps in the world to give me reports on what they had done with Clay Table Auditing. They're very

clever people and they knew very well that that was a wide—open trap in the road laid by Ron, because they promptly told me, each and every one, that they were being good boy—except one, he fell in—that they were good boys and were only auditing people on the levels and so didn't have any current experience with Clay Table Clearing. But when they were running it earlier, before it was laid out on levels, they had the following experiences. But one says, „Well, I just gave it to a couple next door and they were doing it out in the yard with a lot of people standing around.“ Now we know. Now we know.

We know that Scientology is working out of the magnetism of this auditor. Can't be working out of its good sense, you see.

Scientology can—is so good that you can do it wrong and get someplace. That's a fact, fact, fact. You don't get very far very fast, but you can often do it wrong. You have to do it *viciously* wrong in order to not get any results. I mean, you have to work at that, but you just slip and skid a little bit and you'll still get some results.

Well, I'm just mentioning this because they ran a test—one of these Ds of Ps had run a test recently—he just passed it in action—but the process had been successful because the person that it was run on had at once gone out and gotten a five thousand—dollar—a—year increase in wage. This is in a casual report, just last night's report, see. Well, if you can do things like that, why the hell are you worried about money? Do you realize the end of the road—I hate to tell you this because I sound like some new HAS student that is now selling it to his mother—the end of the road is to hold out your mocked—up hand with some perfectly good twenty dollar bills in it that just appeared. That's the end of the road. In other words, the creation, direct creation of money. Now, I don't know whether that money is counterfeit or not.

Now, an American—an American OT will have to be very careful in mocking up gold. He will have to be very, very careful in mocking up gold, because an American is not supposed to have gold according to the United States government. So I think he'll have to practice—mock up—well, he'll have to—he'll have to settle for diamonds only. But a South African OT, you see, will not dare mock up diamonds because the IDB will be after him and there have to settle for gold. And I can see right there a tremendous trade developing between the American OT and the South African OT.

Going from the ridiculous to the sublime, that is—that is actually what you are facing. You have the tools by which people can make money and now we're going to worry about money. Now, frankly every time an organization turns around they write „Income is much better these days. We have just run the Registrar on the debility to have money. Now our income is up.“ I wonder if there's any coordination? Well, why should they have to run the Registrar on that? It must be that the Registrar is talking a lot about money. Must be that the Registrar is being pestered by the org to make some money and the Registrar pesters everybody who walks in about some money, don't you see?

So we'll leave it up to the Registrar to go ahead and get the money but we won't permit the Registrar anymore to interview people. Now, you say, „How are you going to do that?“ I think we will do it easier than the other way. Since I myself have never had the experience of registering anything, since I never found it necessary to do so, we find out that that is an additive system that must have come into Scientology somewhere along the line that I myself never did. And I have begun to be leery over the years of duplicating something or putting something into the machinery on a successful line, you know, which didn't need improvement. And believe me, the—the early line on the subject of money in Dianetics and Scientology didn't need any improvement. It was very, very good indeed. So it must have been something added on the line that suppressed it and it must have been our system of selling that suppressed it, don't you see?

*Audience:* Mm—hm.

Now supposing, supposing we got all you who will be going home and waving the magic wand over auditors so that they audit—supposing we got all you so—so streamlined and so forth that you would go ahead and audit somebody straight. End of sentence. You know, no additives, you know, you just audit them. I'm going to tell you how in a minute, but you just audit them, see, and let nature take its course without any personal consideration of how the person should be checked in his forward progress or anything. I'm being nasty now, aren't I? I've been training students too long; it's soured by temper. Not true. Joke.

I've found actually, you always did, and tried like mad to do anything I asked you to do and I have to be very, very careful to ask you—when I ask you to do something, to tell you very elementarily in no way that can be misinterpreted, don't you see, because it's actually the communication line which winds you up in doing something different.

So I very often—I used to have a system which I more or less abandoned when study came out—and I think my system was very good—and that was I explained it, any datum, at least nine times in a lecture in different ways and fashions and that way it walked around all the misunderstood words, don't you see. And it was quite a system I used. You listen to an old tape, you can just almost count the number of times I have put the important datum into the tape. Nine times—it's there, it's woven in and out, it's stated differently and that way. But once in a while a student will get very cross with me—they've taken it down the first time in their notebook, don't you see, and then the next time they didn't take it down, the next time they didn't take it down and they get flunked on the examination of the tape because they didn't give the generalized statement of it, because it's in there nine times in nine different wordings. Did you ever realize that that was a hazard, because it's the concept you're being taught, not the verbs and syllables and objects, see.

But I was very successful this way but in training auditors straight up and directly, why, I actually have to be very careful to just make my communication clear because I find out that you are as good as I have clarified the communication to you, and it's—comes home to roost so I have no business making a crack about your doing it wrong. But sometimes you will do this: where I have left a gap, why, you'll throw a couple of anvils in there. It's my—basically my fault; I left a gap, don't you see—but once in a while I will find very remarkable departures in the middle of it and I'll find goofs of various kind whatsoever but they always are appearing in gaps that have been left in instruction.

So instruction is basically trying to cover all of it very, very carefully so as not to make you feel like an idiot, see, so elementary that you feel idiotic in going over it that many times and yet not leaving anything out that can be left to chance.

And when we have had a process for quite a while that has been trained for quite a while, it is invariable done very well. But when we haven't had a process very long, why, that process will be done very oddly. In other words all the gaps of how you do it and all the possible misinterpretations haven't been ironed out of it yet, don't you see? That's the difference between a new process and an old process.

Now that we're in the business of relaying an awful lot of old processes now—the new levels are just composed nothing of but old processes—why, we're in clover, because most of these jumps have been gotten around and if you really got too curious about how something was run, why, just go back over the fifteen or twenty different periods of Dianetics and Scientology when the same one was presented and take out the one that seemed to work for you best. You know that could be gotten around to this degree because it's been gone over and gone over and gone over. In other words, you basically do very well.

Now, in a—in an approach to auditing in general, if you did this, if you did the processes that work on case after case after case, you see, and you just did those, and reeled them off and got them done and you never Qed-and-Aed with somebody ... For instance, people got a remarkable idea these days that a Class VI Auditor only audits Class VI processes, you see. We have a Class VI Auditor, I heard an organization—I shouldn't be

too—so general and say an organization—Los Angeles. I read a letter the other day off the lines that wasn't to me—sees all, knows all, you know; and to the „see all and know all,“ you add a crystal ball and quite a bit of information comes my way—and this was—this was actually stated, this actually stated, this was actually stated that we have a Class VI Auditor but we don't have anything for her to do yet because nobody is ready for Class VI. Direct quote, I have the letter. *Caow!*

The reason the public would want a Class VI Auditor is because he'd sure know how to run Class 0. In the first place, Class VI Auditor would not run Class VI—not run Class 0 without an E—Meter. He'd use an E—Meter at Class 0. Sounds real weird. No, it's only a Class 0 Auditor who doesn't use an E—Meter at Class 0. Class VI Auditor would use an E—Meter at Class 0, of course! Only he wouldn't do anything different at Class 0 but he wouldn't have any canned list in his hand. He'd go pocketa—pocketa—pocketa down possibilities of this and that and he would do an assessment which of course lies down there around IV and III, don't you see? And he'd do a red—hot, fast assessment and he'd say, „Oh, Communication Process OA, there's the assessment, bzmmmmmmmm. You—here's the auditing question, bang *thrppr*.“ Clear. We've had Clears at Level 0 run this way.

So a Class VI Auditor is worth pearls, don't you see? Because naturally he's classed all the way up the line, so he can run the exact process of the level with the command of anything he has. Now, he can't run things on the pc which the pc hasn't got command of. That's the only thing that's different. In other words he can't run the pc on Clay Table. The pc doesn't have any command of Clay Table, see. He can't run the pc on *The Book of Case Remedies* straight off the bat because how the hell does he know this pc can even talk? Do you follow?

He wouldn't do perception and indication steps of the environment or something like that again when he didn't know the pc could talk. But the processes which are exactly found at the levels, and so forth, of course can be run with all the tools the auditor has to hand, which is an E—Meter, he can run them with good and bad indicators. Why, if some guy who was educated at Class VI to indicate whether or not the pc has got the wrong item certainly would never run five minutes too long on having found the wrong terminal. Do you see that? Because his indicators would be up.

So of course a Class VI Auditor should get more money than a Class 0 Auditor.

Now of course, I—if I were—if I were somebody—somebody charged up to me and wanted me to audit them at that particular level or stage and so forth I—“You want me to audit you, you sure? All right, all right, I'll audit you.“ And I'd go ahead and audit them. And I'd run Level 0 on them. I've learned my lesson. It's the pc that can't do it, not me.

Well now, after I'd audited them for a while, why, he could make more money and he'd pay me. Do you follow? Because I know very well if I—if I ran Level 0 on somebody—just straight Level 0—I know I wouldn't goof on the indicators or the terminals. I'd make the right terminals and so forth. Run Level I on somebody. I'd run Level 1 and finish all the tone arm action on Level I. What do you mean, „Tone arm action on Level I?“ Yeah, just that. Doesn't have an E—Meter. When a—when a Level I—Grade I pc is run by a Class I Auditor, you haven't got an E—Meter there, don't you see. Well, they can make it. That's what's weird. Don't you see?

Don't you see that it'd be an enormously faster procedure if somebody was sitting there saying, „All right, now let's see. What have we got here. We're going to run a Touch Assist on you,“ and you've got a one—hand electrode on the guy, you see, so he can point and everything, „What are we trying to do here. Something about your—uh—you say you hurt your foot recently, huh? Your foot? Your head? You hurt your foot, your head, your shoulder, back ... ? Oh, noticed when you came in your hand was—hand. Hurt your hand recently, huh?“ And the fellow said, „No, I hurt my foot.“ And you say, „All right, very good. And what happened with your hand?“

„Oh, that was just before—I'd forgotten about that. It was just before that.“

Well, it's well now, so why run the Touch Assist. He'd forgotten he hurt his hand. Do you follow? You all of a sudden blew a memory into view. I'm giving you a very sloppy forward progress but it would just be on the basis of guiding his attention here or there while watching the needle on the meter, you know? Very rapidly.

Touch Assist. Touch Assist. How would you do a Touch Assist if you were a Class VI Auditor? I don't think I'd just do a Touch Assist on somebody. I think I'd look him over. I'd find out if there are any bruises or scars to Touch Assist. Even if I didn't have a meter, don't you see? And I'd also find out that it was different two sides of the body. I'd know that probably it was hung up on one side. And I just did one, by the way, I think last night. Touch Assist.

I'd found out it wasn't going away. Indicator. A burn area was ceas—it was not ceasing to be red. In my experience it should cease to be red very rapidly. It wasn't ceasing to be red. So I tried to find out why. Well, how did I try to find out why? Well, I just wasn't getting any, you might say, tone arm action. I didn't have the pc on the tone arm but there couldn't have been any tone arm action if the burn area was not getting well. There couldn't have been any action there. So I was running a process with no tone arm action, regardless of whether I had the pc on a meter or not.

Ah, well, heh—when the pc did this, I wonder if the pc had a withhold. Well, here's a rationale that comes from up at your next level up, see. Here's a rationale from a higher level. Pc must have had a withhold. Must have had something. Must be an overt connected with it. There must be something connected with this thing. Yeah, but how do you run this out at the lower level? You can't go running „What have you done? What have you withheld?“ or something like that, see. You're just running Locational type processes.

Well, there is one that'll blow it into view if it exists. „All right, where did it happen? Where are you now? Where did it happen? Where are you now? Where did it happen? Where are you now? Where did it happen?“ You see. „Point to where it happened“ is the exact auditing command there. „Point to where it happened. Point to where you are now. Point. . .“ See, it's sort of a Touch Assist on the environment, knowing the thing probably is held up on the environment. And all of a sudden pc tells me, „I was hiding when I burned myself“ Looking for an overt and found a withhold, you know. How much withhold can you have? Withholding the entire body.

What was very remarkable is, is the whole incident then blew into view. I came back and finished the Touch Assist. I flattened the tone arm action on the other process, you see. I'd already run by all the rules. I'd taken the tone arm action out as far as it would go out on the Touch Assist but it'd—if it wasn't getting well, then there must have been something wrong. So the tone arm action was gone as far as I was concerned. Now we'll do something else to give it a booster. Now we'll run the tone arm action out of that. And when I say—using that word „tone arm action“ very advisedly, because the pc is not on a meter, don't you see? Doing it by comm lag—three commands, see. Or cognition. Pc'd gotten well at that point I probably would have quit, too. And then come back to complete the Touch Assist.

It's very remarkable. The red faded out of the burn just *bzzzzzzzzz*. But it was also held up for a moment, it stayed pink—toward the end it was pink—so I knew there was something here I wasn't doing and I suddenly found out I wasn't touching—it wasn't right leg, left leg, right leg, left leg, but it was back of the leg, front of the leg and back of the left leg and front of the left leg. It was the front of the leg where the charge was stopped. You

get the idea? Well, there's also not only two sides to a body but two sides to a leg and there are two sides to two legs making four sides. So I just ran my Touch Assist on a four-way and *boooooom!* and that was the end of the red spot. The blister didn't entirely go but I never expect the blister to entirely disappear and what do you want for a nickel? A miracle?

But the tone arm was—action was flat. The pc had come up to cognition. The pc was very, very cheerful and very, very good in communication so we gave the pc the win and ended the session.

Well, that's quite remarkable. But that's high-level class auditing low-level process, see. You use everything you know without making the pc run something different than the pc would run at that level. See. Quite allowable at that low level for a pc to s—to point where he was and point where he is. That's just a Locational, you know. As long as he's pointing, it's objective, see. He isn't doing it in his skull. He's doing it out here. You get the idea?

*Audience:* Mmm—hm.

So of course a Class VI Auditor would be worth his weight in gold at Level 0. Do you follow?

So that's—anybody—the public charging in, saying, „Oh, you're a Class VI Auditor, you've got to run me on GPMs.“ You say, „I'd be very glad to run you on GPMs, never refuse auditing. It will however take you quite a few intensives, I must warn you, at that particular stage. I'll be very happy to audit you on GPMs, and it's going to take quite a few intensives.“

„Well, how many would you say?“

„Well, I'm not prepared to say how many it would take you. Well, it's—it's going to take you quite a while. And you've got to start in and the thing for you to do is to start in on it. Yes, I'll—I'll eventually audit GPMs on you but I can't, of course, start with that now, because you've got to go quite a ways. I'll eventually audit GPMs on you if you want me to when we get there, but of course, you may want somebody else to by the time we get there. We never know.“

„Well, all right, all right.“ That's all right with him.

„Oh, okay. Now, are you all set? Now I'll have to take you to exactly what I'm supposed to audit on you so as to get you up to being audited in the HGC.“

„Fine, fine.“

„All right!“

Level 0. You follow? It doesn't take forever to go up those levels. Might take a few intensives. Might take a Saint Hill Course, but you'll eventually get to GPMs.

Now, the datum that was very vital that we missed last year and that a curve was thrown at us on is that the Gradation Program was not popular with the public. I've now compared some other data and I have found out that the public, whatever the public is, included more people who told me, „Oh, thank God, I know where I'm going now,“ than it did, „Oh, that's horrible! You mean, have to be trained some to—in order to get processed. No.“

In fact, no member of the public told me so, but two different people on communication lines did, who themselves had no opinion on it. And they reported to me that „the public“ had said so. And one of them attributed a tremendous decline in an organization to the fact that the public didn't like the Gradation Program when the organization in actual fact on inspection was found not to have declined. Now, that's the wildest one!

„Well, the reason we're having this tremendous emergency and no money's coming in and the Telephone calls come in and people, they're so confused. They can't sign up in the HGC and the reason we're having this tremendous emergency up here and so forth is this Gradation Program and nobody can possibly understand any part of it and so forth, and they're just having an awful time and that's why we're in a slump and you've got to do

something about this fast.“ And last night I remembered this and I went back and looked at the graphs of that organization and that was a steady, continual rise through that whole period. Now boy, that’s sabotage! There’s a place where stupidity ends and sabotage begins. So there you are.

I’ve just got through checking through this on the basis of the fallacy of ever accepting rumor as the final fact. Rumor may be enough to cause an investigation of something, but it would never be enough to cause any—to base any action or decision on. Rumor is something that you must never base any action or decision on because you can do more damage basing an action or a decision on a rumor than anything else I know of. So it reduces us down to the point that we’ve got to operate on statistics.

And what are statistics? Statistics are particularities. And we find out that an organization will cause ARC breaks amongst its staff if you can’t get a statistic on everybody present—week in, week out, a statistic. My God, it sounds like a slave factory. A statistic—terrible!

„You mean the Letter—the Letter Registrar is . . . , First thing you think of. „Oh well, the Letter Registrar has to get out so many letters during the week and that’s the statistic.“ Yes, that’s the statistic. That’s fine. „The Letter Registrar’s department has to get out so many letters during the week. That’s the statistics.“ No, brother, that’s rumor. Why is it rumor? Because it doesn’t staticize every person in the department. „The typing pool got out 1,000 letters.“ Perfectly useless datum, a completely useless datum! You now know nothing. First place, you’d have to know how many they got out last week. That’d be—add a little meaning to it. In the next place is *who* in the typing pool—who’s the typing pool? You very often find out on very ambitious org boards and so forth that one little girl is the „typing pool.“ Well, that’s all right but she’s been wrongly staticized then, hasn’t she? She’s been called „the typing pool“ instead of „Letter Registrar’s typist.“

No, I’m afraid you’d have to be able to look through the entire Registration Department and find the statistic on every personnel there, otherwise you would start rumors and upsets and all sort of things.

To take gross income of an organization—this is the way businesses run—aw, business. I don’t know how they’re alive!

It takes a singular genius, see? You know? To which we add a little bit of Scientology and we can get a fabulous situation, see. But frankly I don’t know how these businesses are here! I’ve been writing up this sort of thing and developing the various philosophies and administrative procedures and so forth, and it’s becoming more and more incredible to me. How are they here? How do they live at all? And the answer is, they don’t. They don’t. How do people live at all? They don’t. How does the civilization exist? It doesn’t. Unless you consider the civilization on the basis of the life of a mayfly—which is just about what they have here on this planet—mayfly type civilizations, you see. Three hundred and fifty years, thousand years—gone, see. They usually don’t even last that long, see. That’s a long civilization here on this planet.

On the whole track—sorry to go whole track on you—but on the whole track I was studying the org boards and so forth that I had known in going over org boards and methods of putting together org boards and a lot of things like this and I suddenly remembered a relatively successful org board. And it had lasted for eighty trillion years and I considered that was fair. That was pretty good. It was a Galactic Confederation org board. And it was a very nice board and then I took the board apart and find out what made the organization collapse. And I found it. And I found it.

They made no provision of any kind whatsoever for the alteration or improvement of anything. And there was no place on their org board where anybody could suggest an improvement. And that was why they collapsed. Eighty trillion years, so that was pretty

good. So that must have been a fair org board. It actually only had one principal element missing from it.

It was, by the way, an interesting org board, very interesting org board. There were about two billion staff members in its central organization. A lot, huh? That was just one org. That wasn't their—that wasn't their district offices, you see. That wasn't their continental office or system offices or something like that. You might be amused. The datum on the thing that it was in projectors, multi-eyed projectors that looked like a fly's eye, you know? Fly's eye with a thousand lenses. These things were on tracks in back of a huge screen and they repeated the internal parts of the organization's schematic and there'd be several of these projectors and they would interlock. The image would be interlocked, don't you see.

Now, if you wanted to change one of those, what you did was bring it forward till there was only one of this type of unit and that was the one showing, and you wrote it on the front screen and it held that in memory and you erased it on your front screen and it held it in memory on its screen and then you shoved it back on the track again and its thousand eyes would project it onto this huge screen making that one notation repeat all over the galactic system, making each office the same. Isn't that interesting? Gimmickry. And having—remembering this elaborate machinery and remembering what it took to make an org board and remembering how many people it took to keep one up and remembering how many communication lines were simply devoted to the org board, I said, I'm being asked to do one here on two dimensions?

You say, what's that got to do with our org board? Well, let me tell you, an org board would be no good at all if it wouldn't go up to two billion staff members. It wouldn't be any good at all. It'd be useless. Why? Because sooner or later up the line its design is going to trip the expansion of an organization. Might only you'd get it to two hundred people before it'd trip the whole expansion by having a fault in it. But if you could blow it up easily without confusion to two billion staff members, that would be fine. So I had the problem of blowing it up to two billion staff members and blowing it down to one guy. And that was the problem I set myself.

I had one for a while that could be—an organization could be reduced on this org board to three people and it could go up to about a hundred and fifty people. And I thought that was pretty good. That was more than we had. And then I finally got it from one person to two billion. It'll slide all the way up and down without an alteration which I thought was pretty fair. But a galactic civilization, of course, had a flaw in its board and so it only lasted eighty trillion years. And we can't take that chance. We mustn't have these germs of destruction around.

Well, that's a little bit of space opera but very interesting space opera. Happens to be true.

But the main—the main thing—the main thing that we're interested in with regard to this is that if you can't staticize—that is assign the figure, not to its units, not to its departments or sections or groups, but to the people who are there—then you're going to get some kind of an authoritarian atmosphere and there's going to be injustice and there's going to be weird things happening and people are going to be cutting each other's throats and the organization is going to be a tiny little bit ARC broke and so forth. Why? Because it's entered into a generality. The data is a generality.

Now, if we assign, as they commonly do in business, the entire success of the organization to its chairman of the board or its general manager—the entire success of the business—we'll only be about 70 percent right, 60 percent right. This guy must have had some ideas and he must have been on the ball, but what about those other 30 or 40 percent? Well, that's a margin for error. We could say Gestetner Limited is making its way very well because its managing director is the—is a very good man. And then we go around and in

some 30 or 40 percent of the time we'll find a managing director—not of Gestetner Limited necessarily, I don't even know a man—but he spends all of his time raising cactus plants on a balcony and never even reads a report. And we find out that Gestetner Limited had nothing to do with this man at all.

In other words there's 30 or 40 percent error that can enter into it. You see, if 50, 60 percent of the time, you see, 50, 60, 70 percent of the time we might be able to say this. We say it's a good ship because it's got a good captain, see. Well. It's got errors in it. It's potentially false, see. It's right often enough to almost operate and so that datum is practically worshipped in this civilization at this particular time. *Gyah, ta, dya, tyah tyah—Oh my God!* I mean get down and burn the incense and joss to that datum. That's practically the senior administrative datum of this whole organization.

„MacArthur won the war.“ I don't know if he did or not—I was there! In a sort of a divided frame of mind about having saved Australia at the present time—they'll never quite live that down, I'm afraid. I was demanding some data the other day from Melbourne and I got a bunch of papers in about the inquiry. I was looking for statistics by which to pick the organization up and that's what I got back. I got data about the inquiry. It was *very* useful because it said at least they were mailing things, that they still knew our address. Oh, I'm being cruel. Actually they cabled me the other day on a compliance so I shouldn't be too mean, but I was actually expecting other things than a bunch of legal papers, don't you see. And in they—in came all the legal papers.

No, MacArthur didn't win the war. He was a fairly bright cookie and so on and he probably had a lot on the ball, but I notice he didn't win the Korean War. So there—he must have done something just enough wrong in World War II so that when this showed up again in the Korean War, why, it went by the boards and we find out what he did wrong. He wasn't a good politician. He couldn't take Mr. Truman and chuck him under the chin and throw him the right brand of Missouri corn.

That's right. That's right. Actually he was talking to a man who wasn't a military man, who must have been incited against the whole thing before he took a crack at MacArthur. My God, here was practically America's hero number one and he mowed him—Truman mowed him down. Well, what did he do wrong? Well, he was in an emergency called the Korean War and he didn't promote, that's all. He probably tried to reorganize before he tried to promote. I mean if—he disobeyed a condition formula. I'll tell you about those someday, they're very interesting, see. But he should have promoted. He should have promoted MacArthur, he should have promoted the record, he should have done a promotion of a new idea.

One of the ways you do that kind of thing—I'm very well accustomed to handling political figures in some spheres and so forth. I have an enviable record in this direction in some areas on the backtrack—enviable, absolutely. Guy could inspect the whole area and never learn a damn thing, you know. And go away thinking everything was beautiful when everything was falling to pieces. But it sure did keep interference ... Because all a politician can do, being generally inept, depending on the generality „the will of the people“ which of course doesn't exist either.

This bird, all he—all he can peddle is interference. And if you've got a situation somewhat under control and it's very difficult to handle it, some politician coming in and interfering with things can knock it all in a cocked hat.

In first place, he doesn't know his job. Now, if they'd—if they'd send you somebody who was an expert on this kind of thing you could sit there you know and you could go chitter—chatter with him and get ideas and he'd get ideas and you'd toss them back and forth and you'd come out and you'd wrap this thing up, don't you see? That would be a different proposition. But so what—you're going to get some unknowledgeable personnel

around who has a tremendous amount—unlimited power and so forth, it takes great skill, you—great skill in handling this bird and it is a skill.

For instance, you pass through the word that the pilots of his plane, who also are attached to your outfit and so forth, feed him the data, the rumor line as he is flying along, and you fix it up so the hostess or the Wac that goes along there, she feeds him the rumor line and your customs officers all feed him the rumor line—he's all inspected the place before he ever gets there.

„Nice how well things are running in Syria, isn't it Mr. Truman.“ You know.

„Boy, we're sure going great guns in Korea these days. Yessir. Yessir. MacArthur is doing a good job over there, isn't he, Mr. Truman?“

Public opinion! What's it made out of? Somebody's hat. Give you the idea. Then the politician arrives and he says, „Well, I'm glad you got it all in hand,“ you see, as he goes around thinking he's looking at things. „Glad you got it all in hand.“

He knows it's all well in hand because he's got his favorite liquor in his hand. He goes away and does what you want. In fact, if you rig it right, he'll insist you carry out—he'll advise and insist upon and dream up the exact campaign which your strategists have just got off the drawing board a week before he arrived. He'll insist on this and threaten you with court—martial unless you do it.

What's all this? What are we getting at here? What am I talking about to you, anyhow? I'm telling you that there's troubles of various kinds, aren't I? I'm trying to show you there's little problems around. What's the common denominator of all these problems? How does it apply to you? There's a great moral to be learned in all this: generalities. When you try to explain a condition with them—see, not all generalities are bad—but when you try to explain a condition with generalities which do not apply to parts and bits and piece, particular—particularities, you muck up the whole situation. I mean you could muck it up at will. That's what a propaganda minister is in Russia. I know now, by the way, that Russia is going to take the United States like the United States once took the South. They got a better propagandist in charge.

That's the wildest, dopiest stuff I ever saw in my life. A Russian walking outside of a damned satellite. Why? What is the scientific value? All they did was needlessly risk a man's life. They should have tossed a dummy out. Don't you see? But you could have put birds in a—in an airless tank or something like that. How do you know that a—that a metal bolt head or something like that wouldn't have fractured that was holding that line and so forth. Well, wing walkers have been known in flying circuses since World War I. So they put a wing walker in space. It wasn't even a—wasn't even a clever idea. I'm afraid to my shame that I probably would have turned it down, if it had been okayed by me, as being too stupid. Actually I would have turned it down on the basis that it was risking somebody's life needlessly but I probably would have come back with a better one.

But they got a better propaganda minister and they're promoting communism and who's promoting democracy? Nobody. No. Mr. Wilson, I think his name is, and Mr. Johnson, I think his name is—these are rather obscure people I'm talking to you about who will soon be gone from history, so I might as well immortalize them by mentioning them on a tape. Greater contempt I could not think.

These birds are reorganizing a co—an economy during a period of decline and according to the Condition of Emergency the order is promote, change the things that are pulling you down, economize and prepare to deliver something.

That's the formula for being in an emergency. And both of these countries are in an emergency and they've both forgotten to promote. They're not promoting. There isn't anybody over there saying—overseas at the present moment saying—I don't know, exporting something, you know, a rah—rah. A big advertising program, you know. I bet—I

bet the British government hasn't bought a penny's worth of American TV time. No promotion, but a lot of economy.

„Crisis! We're having crisis! All they're doing is advertising a crisis. Well, don't God's sake ... Our Accounts Department's sometime or another are just going to get into serious collision with me because they every once in a while tell you or tell a staff member or tell somebody that they can't have that because we're broke. And you know that very often they say that with thousands of pounds sitting in the bank account. It just isn't true. It's a lie. Not only is it the wrong thing to say but it's a lie. And in a Condition of Emergency, Accounts's always saying, „Well, we're very poor.“ That's the wrong thing to say, because it's the postulate that they're poor and they'll get poorer. If you don't want to be something, don't postulate it. That's all. It's as sensible as that.

And what's going to happen to you if you're broke and you owe a lot of bills and you rush around to all of your creditors saying, „Gee, I'm awful sorry I'm so broke. But I have a couple of cents I can give you.“ What's he going to do? He gonna call up his lawyer and he gonna sue. What did you do? You didn't promote; you advertised the crisis.

And this Wilson up here: „Great man, great man.“ He's done nothing but export crises. That's England's primary export today, is crises. It inevitably lowered the pound and so forth. A good propagandist in the right position or a good manager who really knew his business wouldn't have exported a crisis. He'd have promoted like mad something that he could deliver—something he could eventually deliver. And he'd have promoted it like mad and then he would have cut down—he would have made the changes on things that had pulled him down, right now, and then he would take a good solid look at his economy and he would have quietly put that back together again so that it worked functionally. And then he would have stood there and prepared to deliver what he had promised in the promotion. And that's what he would have done—one, two, three, four, bang.

That's the short formula by the way. There is a slightly longer formula that merely takes those same steps and expands them slightly. That's the proper action in an emergency. That's—whether it's a personal emergency or not, doesn't matter.

The other thing you can do is to—after you're out of the emergency period, to act like you're still in the emergency period when you're actually in another Condition and apply this Emergency Formula to an entirely different Condition. That can get you in a lot of trouble too. The United States never does anything but apply an Emergency Formula—to its own internal businesses and so it never, of course, really gets up to Normal Operation for the excellent reason that it never ends the emergency.

Business firms never end the emergency. They always have their salesmen on emergency programs of some kind or another—huge advertising budgets and that sort of thing. And they never have a—never have time to even out. So actually what they've adjusted to is a normal emergency which drives everybody frantic and because they stay in an Emergency Condition after they're actually quite capable of assuming a Normal Operation, then they actually don't expand. They wonder what's all this. And they never get a chance to expand. Because in Normal Condition you behave quite differently, quite differently. You handle that with kid gloves. Promotions you handle with sledgehammers on—that is to say an Emergency Condition on a promote, why, that's a sledgehammer proposition. But you don't do that in Normal operating conditions, you see. That's the way it runs.

So anyway, make a long story short, what's the long—what's the long and short of the difficulties in which people have. What's the—what's this add up to? What's this have anything to do with? Well, it has to do with „have to know what's going on.“ And you never can really find out what's going on with the mass of something. You can only find out what's going on with the individual bits of something. Because if a mass is not related to anything but the mass, then you never understand anything about it. Because it hasn't

anything bigger and it hasn't anything smaller and it doesn't have anything anything. So it's just a mess.

When the Russian starts talking about *the people*, if he starts to talk about *the masses*, watch it, boy, watch it! Now, he can of course compare the *masses* of Russia to the *masses* of the United States, don't you see. Why, I don't know how you compare the mass of a bunch of Russians to the mass of a bunch of Americans, except you can put them all in opposite colored but similar uniforms with similar weapons in their hands have them shoot at each other, then you could figure it out. And that's the net result of talking about the *ma—a—a—a—sses!*

So anyway, seems to be there's something wrong with this thing called a generalization. A generality is a very general term for a generalization. You generalize something that can be particularized as to its Condition and you get in trouble. Now, we in actual fact have found certain principles that men have in common. And this is quite remarkable. But that's only because we have studied the unit „man.“ You get what we've done? And actually when I say—when I say „men“ I mean a thetan plus a body in this universe, you see? And „its, its characteristics are ... ?“ Don't you see. And to the degree that this is dead—on and so forth, this person with certain characteristics which are just those characteristics, sit down across from you in the pc's chair and you utter certain auditing commands to that person and that person promptly responds and improves because this is because we know „a person.“ Do you follow that?

Now, the closer we get, the closer we get to know that person—he isn't the average person—he couldn't be anything else but that person, because a thetan is that thing and a body is that thing. So to this degree we could generalize. But look how wrong you could get in generalizing on the character of man. It'd have to be the character of an individual.

One of the things very interesting is Scientologists who attempt to approach groups to do anything with the groups with Scientology quite normally fall on their faces. But you can approach almost any individual with Scientology and, bang! Well, there are two reasons for this and one of them: Scientology is not a study of *ma—a—a—a—sses*. It is a study of the guy. You see? And we know what the map of this bird is—right there.

But now, let's make a generality about generalities, understanding that. And we find something very interesting. We find that only an ARC break can worsen a graph. There are two data. One is that if a graph is unchanging, there was a PTP—present time problem is what keeps a graph from changing. This has been observed over and over many times and so forth. I first observed it in 1955 in Washington, DC. You don't get any graph change in this pc—his IQ doesn't go up, doesn't go down, nothing happens on the thing. He's got a present time problem!

And if the pc's graph worsens, the only thing that can worsen a pc in auditing, so that his graph worsens markedly during processing, is an ARC break. You already knew those two data, but that means that of PTPs and ARC breaks it must be that the ARC break is really a bit more important than the PTP. And yet oddly enough until recently we didn't know anything much about it except it was bypassed charge and it was this and it was that. Yes, we knew its mechanisms concerning this and we knew those mechanisms were in common but we didn't exactly know precisely and bing what an ARC break was.

An ARC break is a generality that should be a particularity.

Now you see, there's nothing wrong with saying a generality. See? It is that it is substituting a generality for a particularity—and that's an ARC break.

Now, you can go in reverse and substitute a particularity for a generality and you'll get an ARC break, too. So it's this both ways. Does—it's the same meaning. Don't hang up on that. And that's all an ARC break is. It's substituting a generality that should be—I've written this up in a bulletin. I haven't really stated it quite that well in the bulletin. It'll serve. But you're liable to get hung up and say, „Well, when sun shines, skies are blue.“ That's a

generality. Well, it isn't that kind of a generality. There's nothing wrong about that because it shouldn't be a particularity. As a matter of fact it'd be quite false to say, „When the sun shines only this sky above us is blue.“ That's not right. So there's nothing really wrong with a generality. I'm just adding that to the bulletin content that you will get shortly. But it's a generality that should be a particularity or a particularity that should be a generality.

Now, what's a particularity? Well, just call it a single. It was a single; it was called a many. See? Now, reversewise you'd think there was a many that was called a single—would reverse it, don't you see. It was a many that was called a single and so forth. Because you so seldom run into that, that you can practically neglect it. And the one that you'll be working with and so forth is the generality which should be a particularity. And that's what causes the ARC break. Bang! And the reason you don't carry ARC breaks well in your fellow student is you just don't ask that next question. You shortaudit it all the time. You would have discovered this if you'd asked the question about two or three times more, and if you'd known exactly what question to ask and how to ask it, but you just stop short. You never found the bypassed charge.

Let me give you an idea: „Oh, I'm all upset and so—and—so and so—and—so.“

„All right, what are you upset about?“

„The Instructors are mean to me.“

„All right. That reads on the meter. I'm indicating to you the bypassed charge. You're ARC broken because the Instructor's mean to you. The Instructor's mean to you.“

All right, the guy says, „Yeah, yeah.“ „You feel better now?“

„Oh, yeah, they're sure mean to me.“ „You feel much better?“

„Oh, yeah, jeez, damn 'em.“

You've seen this, haven't you? Next day, he's not there. He's blown or something. Well, you either—you have to come to two conclusions now. Either ARC break finding doesn't work and it's not possible to find an ARC break, which some people stupidly come to the conclusion on—well I shouldn't use the word stupidly—sillily. Or that you didn't find the bypassed charge. One or the other. And unless you knew the exact character of the bypassed charge you could still occasionally miss so you'd think there wasn't—there was something else wrong besides this thing called an ARC break and you could still make a difficulty with it, don't you see.

That thing that's missing is that there was a particularity there that was into a generality, it was being falsely called a generality. And that was what it did. And if you'd ask him the next question—you see, this is what I mean by short auditing him—you said, „Well, I have an ARC break and that reads on the meter and 'the Instructors are mean to you,'“ see. The one—the example I just gave you, short—handing it. If you'd ask him, „Who is 'the Instructors'?“ Sounds like weird English construction, doesn't it? And it is. It's—this is the trick you have to know. It's very easy to do because it's just relaxing and Q-and-Aing. But it's „who.“ See. „Who is, who is 'the Instructors'?“ It isn't even good English, you see? And they'd say, „Uh, it's Pete.“

„Well, that reads,“ and so forth and if you went into your song and dance, „All right you're ARC broken because of Pete, you see.“

He'd „Yeah,“ he'd say, „yeah, that's sure right. I'll go and find him and knock his head off, that's what I'll do.“ You've just short—questioned it. You haven't found it yet. But you've reduced Instructors to Instructor. Now, what does Instructor represent? And you ask this question again, whatever it was, „Well, has some Instructor said something to you?“ Usually ask it like that, you see, or „Has some Instructor failed to answer you?“ Or something like this, you see.

„Oh, it's not the Instructors, it's the *students*.“ Bang, it reads.

The auditor: „All right. Who is 'the students'?“

Pc says, „It's Agnes, heh—heh. I'd forgotten completely. She said I was a lousy auditor yesterday. By the way, let's go outside for a smoke, shall we.“

This is the kind of response you get. And you'll for the first time, some of you, will see an ARC break just fade magically before your view. And this is the wildest magic you ever saw anything of.

Now, one of the things that's interesting is you'd think it'd work in reverse. And you say, „What generality has been uttered?“ See. I'm sure—I'm going to have to say this because somebody's going to come up with it and do it. That's—I'm sure. And the person being asked that question of course is just into the dispersal of anybody who has ever pulled a generality on him. And he just goes *bзее* and he can't see anybody. You follow me? People who are around saying „everybody“, „they“—these wild generalities, and so forth—you should do this as a drill, don't ever try to audit anybody on it because it's murderous. Just ask somebody, „Who says 'they'? Who uses generalities? Who says 'everybody'?“ Any such question. And you'll see the person ... Because oddly enough the person has uttered a dispersal, you see. He can always find somebody eventually. But don't expect to be tremendously relieved because that person is probably a generality in the mind, you see, of the person who did utter the generality and it probably isn't it again. You follow?

But it—this doesn't work well when you say, „Well, this person's ARC broken at home all the time.“ All right, „Who uses 'they'? Who uses 'everybody'?“ This is the indicated procedure, don't you see as it—and it doesn't work because it's too cotton—picking general.

Generalities are too general on the track and you just asked this bird to face up to his whole bank going straight back to VI because what is basically wrong with VI? All the GPMs are generalities! You didn't expect that one, did you? That's why people ARC break so *hard* on R6. It doesn't say who's supposed to be this way or anything else, see. But main thing wrong with it, it probably wouldn't ARC break anybody then if they weren't reverse generalities that one really couldn't believe. They're enttheta generalities, these things. They're not „to be pleasant and sweet and be a good girl“—the type of goal we used to find on some pcs here, of course. It's „to be a nasty bee.“ That would be more in keeping, not to use end words on you. „Be blank.“

Now, I don't want to swear on this tape because some young man might hear it. You girls, you can generally absorb that kind of conversation—don't want to corrupt any young men. Anyway, the main point here is that you have a fantastic weapon in your hands for clearing up an ARC break. Now, just exactly how this produces such a cataclysm, I leave up to you to watch. I won't try to describe all the mechanics of it. I'll just tell you that's the mechanic—that somebody should have used a particularity and they used a generality. And this just ARC broke the living *Godfrey* out of this pc.

I'll give you an idea of a typical ARC break. „The Instructors tell me that they're going to put you on a special unit to catch up because you're doing so badly.“ The guy sort of caves in and it's all right with him and he goes off and he's not quite sure what's happened to him. He feels kind of bad about it but ... Well, a person who will do that sort of thing is probably in the first place telling a lie, and probably nobody's mentioned it. But the reverse side of the coin is if the person did say it, it must have been from one Instructor. We can't remember four Instructors or something like that all standing up in a row, don't you see, all saying this at the same time. Even if all the Instructors were present it would have had to have been one Instructor, don't you see. So the theta hearing this, of course, gets an insight into the fact that it's impossible. And while receiving it, because it's startling, also resists it because it's impossible. Do you see?

Usually it violates his good sense. There are a lot of other little factors mixed up in it. But it takes that particularity—generality thing to trip it off. You find there's normally enttheta tied up in it—the degree of the ARC break has to do with that, it's how frequent this

occurred, you know. There are a lot of other little factors but they measure intensity, just the intensity of the break. They don't measure the mechanics of it. The mechanics are just the generality which should have been a particularity.

Now, a person who loses things, and this also solves loss, produces the reverse side of this coin which is the only other reverse side of the coin and that is: when you lose a pen and you can't find it, it might be *anywhere* and so becomes a generality. So a single pen is then a generality. So it's a generality, you see, which should be a particular—and trying to find this generality and so on. One of the ways to cure yourself of an ARC break, by the way, is remember that it can only be in one place. No matter how lost it is, it can only be in one place! It's quite a remarkable observation when you come right down to it. It didn't become a hundred billion pens just because it got lost.

But that is the trick the mind plays on one at such a moment. Girl disappears. Guy no longer sees girl. Now this girl might be anywhere and that's why it's an ARC break. It's not even that the girl is gone. As a matter of fact if you questioned him closely sometimes you find out *that* is quite a relief. But it's „*Where is she?*“ Do you follow?

So you find that most people after they've had a breakup in their love life or something like that will develop colds. And that is the direct mechanism of the lost item. It's an „*everywhere*“ that should be a particularity, see.

So when you take a particularity and make it into an „*everywhere*,“ when you take a particularity and make it that way, why, you get an ARC break because it's a lie, of course. And when you take this particularity that should be there and it all by itself becomes an „*everywhere*,“ why, it's again—different type of lie—so person ARC breaks. And all you—uns got to do as an auditor is find that—un.

Now, on R6 it is enough to say—after you found it—that it's—GPM—it's just a bypassed charge, an end word or something like that. It isn't whether or not the pc can or can't remember it or anything of the sort. You get the pc trying to remember it—somebody out in Chicago was terribly ARC broken because of the last three minutes of one of my tapes. And the auditor—he was calling up Washington trying to get a copy of the tape to find out what the end word was on it so that he could cure the ARC break. Well, now if they'd spotted it, that would have been that. They wouldn't have to have known what the end word was. They'd have to push his nose back into it to find out what—it was unimportant what it was! If that had been the charge that caused the ARC break all he'd have to do is say all right it was the last three minutes of the tape. That'd have been the end of that, see. Boom! You *follow*?

*Audience: Yep. Yes.*

It would have gone.

So the test of what was the bypassed charge is: When it is located, does it—the pc cheer up, you see. That's the only test of whether or not it was the bypassed charge. So having to find more about it, you see, immediately tells you you haven't found the bypassed charge. More about the bypassed charge that you have found, see. If you don't follow it in on the particularity and finally find the particularity that it was, why, it'll continue to be an ARC break.

Well, this is a very happy view so just press it home just a little further and ask your questions to turn those generalities into particularities and learn this little gag. You'll have a bulletin out on this in the next day or so. My bulletin line's a little behind. But the particularity, find what the particularity was and you say, „*Who is 'the Instructors'?*“ see. „*Who is 'everybody'?*“ See. Because you're using a sort of a Q and A to—a repeater technique from Dianetics if you please—to get the generality repeated at least once to the person. So you use it back at him again. It's very nasty but you're in an ARC break and you're not auditing anyhow so of course Q and A is perfectly normal.

And let me assure you, let me assure you this, if it isn't quite magical in the way it knocks apart ARC breaks, if it doesn't knock apart your pc's ARC break, then please look over the whole subject of particularities again and generalities and so forth and go over it real carefully because you must have missed something. This'll cure an ARC break in a cross-eyed mule. This would even cure Wilson's ARC breaks. That's right. Right. Marvelous! So you won't have any trouble using that, just remember what its mechanics are.

Well, all the rest of this is is the staticizing of life. If you don't find out exactly what is going on in life, if you can't assign values to the particular parts of life and if you can't take a look at what Joe is doing that is different in his production and so forth than Pete, why, you're liable to get into a sort of an ARC breaky generalized condition about life and not really know very much about it while thinking you know a great deal.

Our whole observation is based upon what are the characteristics of a thetan—I wish to point that out to you—and on top of that he can build the wildest generalities you ever heard of but we've got him right where the Chassis sits.

So then it is for us safe to indulge in these things about a thetan, see, this *is* the thetan or a thetan—the generalities about people *and masses don't go*.

Thank you.