

ASSESSMENT AND LISTING BASICS

A lecture given on
7 October 1968

And this is the seventh of October 1968, and I think the eleventh lecture. I want to point out with that caption, that the last lecture was the tenth lecture of three October, so nobody will think that there are three or four lectures pulled off the line up here.

This, the amount of material which I can give you on the subject of auditing, of course is quite voluminous. And it is my job to find out how to codify and communicate to you the material concerning the mind and spirit, and the beingness and the universe, in such a form that it will be comprehensible and usable. The certain communication media, absence thereof, makes this difficult. These tapes, probably have a deterioration of only a few years span. One has to be alert to this kind of thing. And additionally, we get the wild enthusiasm of somebody, of placing material on the line which is completely additive, and has nothing to do with it, and sometimes do this and sign my name to it. And we have the wild enthusiasm for pulling key material off the line, which makes other things, then, not make any sense. And these various things have occurred in the past, and you right now have several instances of this. The major one of these has to do with assessment and nulling. And we will go into this immediately, and directly.

Assessment is an action done from a prepared list. Please, for god sakes get that through your skull. Please. Please, please. For god sakes understand what it is. Because it has messed up thousands of preclears. This miscomprehension of what this is all about has messed up preclears all over the world. An assessment is an action done from a prepared list! A prepared list! Prepared by the auditor. Prepared by me. Prepared by somebody else. It is not given by the PC, it is prepared! Prepared! Made up. Listed by somebody else! Not the preclear. A prepared list! And that is the action of assessment! Assessment Assessment! That is the word that goes with that. There is no other word goes with that! Assessment does not go with anything else but that! That is all that assessment means. It is associated with a prepared list. Only a prepared list! Period! There are a number of laws and actions which go along with assessment.

There's an entirely different subject, just as different as pulling us the anchor and splicing lines. A different, different subject. Different! Different! Completely, completely, completely! Utterly, utterly, utterly! They're even years apart in development. Called listing and nulling! Listing and nulling. This is something listed by the PC. Listed, listed by the PC! PC says it. It is from a questions The auditor asks the question. The PC then gives him items, which the auditor then writes down from the PC. That's called listing and nulling. Listing! Listing and nulling! Nulling! Nulling! Listing! Not assessment! Not assessment!

Let me give you the background of this. Now the reason I'm being emphatic is because it's practically killed thousands of PCs! The confusion between these two things And they're two entirely different operations.

Now the laws of listing and nutting do not apply to the laws of assessment. And the laws of assessment have nothing to do with the laws of listing and nulling! And I never would have DREAMED anybody would have mixed up the two. They've got nothing to do with each other. In the E-meter book, EM 24, has to do with assessment, assessment, assessment! Nothing but assessments. And that is assessment.

Now let me not hear in the future that somebody hasn't done it. And done it correctly. Because it is assessment. And it is done. And guys come into the line up and they say that is old fashioned and we don't do it anymore, and yik, yik, yik, yap, yap, yap, yaps That's the additive. We DO do it. It is a key, vital piece of auditing! Assessment, from a prepared list. E-meter book number 24. And there's an exact way to do it! And it has nothing to do with listing

and nulling. Nothing. Nothing. Nothing to do with listing and nulling. There isn't any connection with listing and nulling. None! There is no listing and nulling drill in the E-meter book.

Listing and nutting has its' own laws. They're on tapes They've been on tape for years at Saint Hill! But people come along, and they've taken the laws of assessment, and they said, "Well, in view of the fact, we don't list and null them anymore. You don't assess, I dunno, yea, yea, well actually the law of assess... of list... and so on, is so actually to get something to one item on an S and D, you grind out every reading item on the list except one!" And by doing that, thousands of PCs have been ARC broken and chopped up. So I don't care to think it was unintentional. Because there is a list on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course that tells you how to list and null. And the laws which you had recently issued in an HCOB, 1968, are all there on the Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And they apply to the subject of listing and nulling. Listing and nulling. The laws of listing and nulling. You ask the question of the PC, the PC gives you item, item, item, item. The auditor writes them down, and then he nulls the list. And there must only be one item which has any read in it of any kind whatsoever on that list.

So, the PC says, "Dog biscuits, roast beef, catfish," long fall BD. The auditor then goes over the list, "Catfish", or he goes over it, "Dog biscuit, catfish", doesn't read, doesn't read. And then, nothing read on the list. Anything been suppressed on the list?" "No." So, "Balderdash", he extends the list, "Balderdash, lemons, oranges." And he goes back up to the top. "Good. Biscuits, dog biscuits, catfish, oranges, lemons", oranges reads, lemons reads. He's had it. There are two items now reading on the list. So he puts a bar over to the side, and he extends the list. And the answer is Manhole covers. And he gets a long fall BD. Now he goes back over the whole list again, clear from the top. "Biscuit, dog biscuits", right on down the list. Nothing reading, nothing, reading, nothing reading, nothing reading, "Manhole covers." That's the PCs item. It reads, he gives it to the PC. And that is the action of listing and nulling. And that is the whole action of listing and nulling, and that is the way it is done. And it is not done any other way! And these two actions are entirely, entirely, completely, utterly, different!

But I know somebody's come along and says, "We don't do that anymore. We don't do that old drill, and we don't ever assess from prepared lists anymore", and so therefore nobody knows how to do it. Because I know at this moment, 1968, that is has not been taught for at least two or three years. But they knew how to do S and Ds wrong. They knew how to do those with three reading items on the list. And then wondered why their PCs were ARC broken, the cases weren't getting any better, and so forth.

Do you get the enormity of mixing up two entirely different things? Now look, you've got to know, you've got to know how to assess a prepared list. You've got to know this. Now maybe earlier, maybe earlier I could have told you, I could have told you this separately, and so forth, and made it all very plain, but how the hell could I predict anybody was going to be a complete kook? Because there's an infinity of errors. An infinity of errors can grow up. The one line is a very narrow one.

I could give you billions of words of lecture and bulletins, trying to predict every error somebody's going to make. And we would still get one missed. So you have to know what you know. And one of the things you have to know is a thing called assessment. And it is EM 24 in the E-meter book. And it has nothing to do with S and Ds, nothing to do with remedy Bs, nothing to do with remedy A's, those are all listing and nutting actions. Those haven't, have, they're completely separate. It's as different as a ship and a bus. Completely different.

I'm using this as an example at this time to show you what can happen that wrecks a workable technology. One set of laws that has nothing to do with the subject is applied to the subject. The action to which the laws are connected is said to be old hat and not done anymore. Recently it was being brooded about very broadly and widely, "Oh well, we never run engrams by chain anymore. That's looked on as a squirrel action." How the hell are you ever going to get an F/N on an engram chain? How would you ever run engrams on somebody that was way

up the bank, very very chopped up and charged up? You couldn't get him to run a single engram. Because the engram's up in the top. You can only go through 'em a couple of times and they go solid. So you have to do it by chains. And then it goes down the line, you finally find the basic and the whole cock-eyed thing blows- And somebody to come along and say, "That's old hat. We don't do that anymore." Well my answer to that would be, "We don't audit you anymore. You can go on and fall on your head." Because it's a dirty trick. It does in every PC whose case is only resolvable by engram running by chains at the level of running engrams.

The reason you have trouble with cases is, the usual hasn't been done. The standard hasn't been done. Hasn't been done, hasn't been done. We had a case here the other day. Wildest thing you ever heard in your life. Auditors were doin' their nuts, going around in circles trying to resolve this case. This case was an unusual case, a fantastic ones "Oh a very difficult cycle, bla bla bla bla." Finally the case went into treason or something of this sort. I made it my business to try to find out something about this case. And what do you know? He was on upper OT Sections and he had never run a grade in his life. Never run ARC Straightwire, never run secondaries, never run engrams, never run zero to four, never been on Power, never run R6EW. He was an unsolvable case. Nobody'd audited him. So, you get the case who was audited with off beat tech, and you get the case who has never been audited on tech, and they alike can be failed cases. And the solution at once, to the two types of case--the one who's been audited on off beat tech, and the one who has not been audited at all--, same solution. Find out what hasn't been done on the road to standard tech and do it. And the case resolves right now. And that's how difficult it is. So all you have to know is what is standard tech, and then find out what hasn't been done in standard tech, and get it done.

Now where tech is violated, and where standard tech is violated, you have to have repair actions which put them back together again. Now supposing we have a case which has eight hundred and sixty nine lists that have been done in Balderdash, North Slobokum. And then they lost his folder anyhow, and the auditor who did listed list couldn't write, and a bunch of things like this. You thought didn't have his folder, and so on. And this case is wrapped around a telegraph pole. He's in terrible shape. How you going to resolve that case?

We haven't got the list to correct. Maybe you haven't even got the auditor who knows how to correct a list. And an auditor who doesn't know how to list and null, and thinks that listing and nutting is assessment, and who's all screwed up anyhow, he couldn't correct it by list anyway. But there is a way to correct this case. And that's very vital. It's a serious thing to lose somebody's lists. But there is a way. There is a way. And it contains assessment. It's an action called assessment. And the auditor dreams up a list of things. And he says, "Auditing, auditors, review, sessions, Scientology, Dianetics." Do you see? "Lists." And then, that is put down in a column by the auditor and is assessed over and over until one item is left reading. And that is assessment. And you, all of a sudden, got staring you in the face, "Lists". Alright, turns out to be "Lists." Good. It could just as well turn out to be auditing, or just as well turn out to be review. But it turned out to be "Lists." That is the hot button in this field- Now that will come close enough to what's wrong with him to solve it. And then you've got a thing called L-1. So you say now, "On Lists," and you itsa, earlier itsa with false and suppress on any of the reads, on the L-1. You take up each item in order from the top down. "On Lists", boom. "On Lists", boom. "On Lists", boom. And you clean each one. And all of a sudden the PC goes F/N. And those old lists won't bother him anymore.

It's absolute magic that you can undo a bunch of lists, and things like that. But it depends on the auditor being able to assess. Now is this technique of assessment so old hat? No, I don't think so.

Now I'm going to give you some sort of an idea of an assessment as she is done. I will write it down here on the blackboard and a sheet can go along with this lecture. And this is this business of assessment. This now, is a prepared list. It's a prepared list, and it's something like, "Auditing, listing, review, Orgs, Scientology, Dianetics, grades." Now, the auditor makes that up or the case supervisor makes that up. And the auditor, he puts it into a line up

like this. And he gives it, he gives it of course it's date, which is eleven, ten, sixty eight in this case, and he puts the PCs name on it, which is T.J. Pete.

And here's the other one. All of a sudden at Saint Hill, I heard with horror that this was going on. They're doing S and Ds over ARC breaks and out Ruds. I couldn't understand it! Last November. I've been trying to unravel this since last November. Why?! Because people would say, "Well, an S and D isn't auditing. An S and D isn't auditing, you know? Ha ha ha ha ha." Assessment isn't auditing. Assessment isn't auditing. It is simply trying to locate something to audit! And you can assess anybody, at any time, anywhere, and there's no session involved. Assessment has nothing, but an S and D, that is auditing. But assessment is never auditing.

You say the word right to the PCs bank. "Bombs, bombs, bombs." You can pick him up, I don't care if he's in an ARC break, I don't care what the hell is wrong with him. If your own TAs are OK you can just go bang, bang, bang, and you can get the item right out of the PC. He doesn't even have to be...if he's even doped off you can get the item. Just take a piece of paper, it's got these items on it, take your meter, and you say these things to the PC. You say the first one, like, "Auditing. Auditors. Lists. Reviews. Out. Scientology. Out." Now we've got one column and we've got two items reading. And this is assessment, this is assessment, it has nothing to do with listing and nulling, nothing, nothing, nothing! The PCs Ruds, we don't care, this can be done on a street corner if you've got some place to park your E-meter.

Now we've got two reading items, haven't we? So we go down here the next time. And, we find out where this thing is. Lists. Scientology." We have one reading item left on the list. And that is all there is to it. And that is assessment. Ain't that difficult? But let me tell you, if you can't do this there are a large number of cases you can't crack. Because there are many types of prepared lists.

Now let us get an entirely different action. We're asking the PC, "Who done it?" And this is listing and nulling. And it's in session. And we're saying, "Who done it?" That's not a legitimate question, I'm just giving it to you so you won't interiorize into your case while I show it to you. Sarcasm. A lot of people listen to me with banks.

So we ask the PC, "Who done it?" And the PC says, "Joe, Bill, Pete", the auditor marks it fall, "Toger, Lige." Now we go over the thing, and we say to the PC, "Joe, Bill, Pete", second one here with a long fall, "Toger, Bob, Lige," oh brother. We have two reading items on the list. The list is not complete. Because there's two reading items on the list. Pete and Toger. And this is not assessment. This is nulling. Nulling. This is not assessment, this is nulling. And it didn't null. And we now know there's two reading items on the list, so we know the list isn't complete. So we put a bar over here, and we write "extended" on this little bar here, E-X-T we put. And under this we get, we say on this question "Who done it?" And the PC says, "Bigelow." Long fall, BD, as the PC says it. So now we go up to the top of this thing, and we say, "Joe", second X, "Bill", second X, "Pete", "Toger", out, out, "Lige", out, "Bigelow", long fall BD, 2.1. "Bigelow is your item." That's listing and nulling. It's an entirely different operation, isn't it?

Now you ought to spot whoever told you that the laws of assessment applied to listing and nulling. Now you see how it can get mucked up? Look it isn't what I says it is, it's what works. And this operation of listing and nulling, if done wrongly, if those two items "Pete" and "Toger" are left on the list, and you simply scrub it out and grind it down so that "Pete" doesn't read and you've got "Toger" left, you give the PC that item, he'll go through his skull! Boom. ARC break, apathy, upset, become angry, out of session, and very often just finishes with auditing right at that point. That's the most ARC breaky action, is listing. And listing is a dangerous action for that reason.

You try not to let green auditors list. You try not to let them list. When a guy has really got it down, great. They can assess, anybody can assess. There's nothing to assessment. Do you see the two different actions? Well, there's only one way to do both of them. There are no additional ways.

Now when you get into 5A, running Power Plus, you'll find out that it's odd, but it's just a shortcut. 5A follows the laws of listing, but on the subject and the person and the place, person, place, subject, on those things, on those things it's just peculiar, but the first BD is always it. The first blow down is it. So to save time and because the subject is hot, and because this is a reliable action, all you have to do is grab that, bongo And give it to the PC. And you know it will be true. But it's a short cut, and it's just peculiar to 5A. And you try to do it on an S and D, and you'll very often get your throat cut. List is incomplete on it. So 5A can be done in this shorthanded fashion, but nothing else I know of can. And it's unfortunate because it looks like a, a different set of laws. But there are no different laws, it just happens that is always comes out right if the PC in session.

Now 5A can also blow on just the subject of persons. Persons. Long fall, BD, bong, F/N. You try to go past that and you're gonna rise the tone arm right up through the roof. Now these are such key subjects with an individual, that an individual can become seriously, seriously, seriously ill, or upset within two or three days after a wrong Power Plus. So if the PC comes back a couple of days later and he's sick, or something like that, you know his 5A is out. It's elementary.

But now, when you put it in again, do all the laws of listing and nulling, with regard to it. Do everything. He says, you get such a peculiarity of, "Yeah, I thought of an item." And he didn't put it down. Or the auditor, he said it and the auditor didn't write it down, or something weird went on, don't you see? It's very off beat. It was a lousy session. It's not dangerous to do 5A, it is just incredible the amount of goof by which it can be done. The PCs who get very upset, and so forth, and they've had bad listing in their past, the best thing to do is to actually get the lists and correct them. Get the earliest list ever made on the PC and find the right item off of it. Sometimes you're lucky and you can do this. Sometimes you can get the list.

And then you can be an idiot, too. You can get the first list, you can get the item off of it. It was suppressed. It's usually the first item, or something like that, first or the second item. And it's very suppressed. And here we are, first S and D he ever had. And out of that S and D he gets "The collector of taxes", or something, see? That was the item. It was never given to him. He's had twenty, thirty S and Ds since then. So, "Collector of taxes", long fall, BD, and you got the suppress in on it and so on. It was an eighteen page list. And this was the second item on the list. Ooohl Odd kind of comm. Boy, was that lousy. So anyhow, long fall, BD, you give him his item, he says, "Yeah, reads, reads, tears, yeah thatch its" Now go to the next S and D and try to correct that. It's got the same item. Except by this time it was suppressed, and you stopped putting it on the list. Every S and D he had from the first S and D he ever had is always the same item. Now he can get little local locks on this suppressed item, and that comes out to be "The organization executives" or something, usually. 'Cause by that time he's turned kind of vicious. Do you see? What the hell? Why would you correct more than the first one?

Now if you were lucky enough to get the first remedy B the fellow ever had, and get that on its' exact items. Well a remedy B for that command will be that remedy B. and that blew, and thatch it. You're handling real horse power. You're handling tremendous horse power. See, those aren't light techniques. 1950 you could overrun, 1955 you could go on and on, you could do various things. You can't do those things today. The technique is too powerful, it's too fast. Zing, boom, bung, boom!

When we got into R2-12, R2-12 runs so...something minor. Something... A minute, two minutes, three minutes, couple of items. Goes F/N and that packs up the whole subject. But somebody who had to have all of his intensive would some times get run twenty five hours on something that cleared up in two minutes. Well it was just at that point, at that exact point that we crossed the boundary line from technology which could be roughly handled and still come out, into technology which if it's exactly handled sent your PC flying. It was at that point.

Now somewhere during that period the confusion here on assessment is because of this: Assessment was something done on what was called the pre-have scale. By assessing these

things and running them, you could fix a PC up now so he could have something. So these old pre-have scales, something around 1959, '60, they became so numerous and so heavy, that I developed further technology and collided with the whole subject of listing and nulling. Let the PC put it down. Up to that time all the auditor ever did was put it down. So now, when the PC put it down, that was a brand new set of rules, and you had to know these new rules, because they didn't follow these old rules. It's quite obvious they didn't follow the old rules. So on the research line, as it came forward, you find somewhere around '59, '60, '61, you find the discussion is of assessment. And then time marches on, and later tapes when they talk about listing and nulling are talking about the subject of listing and nutting as I have just differentiated for you in this lecture. And they have nothing to do with assessment. But assessment was the pre-run. It was the forerunner. And all the laws of listing and nulling had to be learned, 'cause they were entirely different than those of assessment.

Now oddly enough, you can't much upset a PC by getting the wrong item on his list, but wait. If the case supervisor, or the auditor, is hotter'n a pistol, and he's looked back through this case, here's a folder a foot and a half thick of review sessions given at the Bide-a-Hee Review Center. And he looks back through this. Ohh. Oh my god. And then he sees some clue that the fellow was audited before that in Bull Isle, but he doesn't have any of the laws, any of the S and Ds that came from that area. What's he gonna do? You can upset the case and do an over review of a review of a review, of a correction of a correction to correct the correction, and you'll get into a hell of a fire fight with some auditor, particularly if the auditor is not very expert. Trying to get him to correct a pile of lists. He just keeps plowing it in further. He himself hasn't differentiated between assessment or listing and nulling. He doesn't know what these actions are. If he just club-footedly goes in and leaves three items reading on the list which you told him to repair, but now we've got a repair of a repair, we have actually exceeded the ability of the auditor to correct, because he couldn't list and null in the first place.

Now a very smart case supervisor, he says, "OK, this fellow's had a lot of auditing of various kinds whatsoever in various places, and has pretended to be a very tough case, and so on. The basic thing is that standard tech hasn't been applied here someplace. So let's find it out, and let's try and correct the case up so he's at least auditable." Alright, so he does a list. And the list is, "Auditing, auditors", anything he can think of that might be in connection with this. "Centers, franchises, you know, anything he could think of that might add up to this, and he turns it over to an auditor who looks bright, looks like he has a head. He hasn't got two heads, god knows. And then what's this, what's this quote, "Auditor", unquote do? He even messes up the little simple job of assessment. And he gets the item that isn't the biggest reading item on the list. He suppresses that. He suppresses that one.

The first item on the list, still, in assessment, is likely to be the one most missed, because you don't have the pcs' attention or anything, and you haven't told him what you're doing, maybe, or something. So he misses that first one. He doesn't...nothing hears it, he just sort of goes, "Blup". But anyway, there's no R-factor, you know? You got to tell somebody you're going to assess. I usually tell them, "I'm going to assess a list on you. Keep quiet." My R-factor. And I don't want anybody talking on assessment. It isn't auditing, you're just trying to find something. And the more the PC talks, the more he's going to screw it up. So you want him to shut up. So you ask him politely, with complete ARC, to shut up. You say, "I'm going to do a list on you, and there is no reason for you to say anything. I would prefer that you did not", if he is prone to be yap yap .

Now, you go, "Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark", go up to the top of it again, "Bark, bark, bark, bark", go up to the last reading, "Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark." That's the item. Now I don't care whether you give him the item or not. But somebody who is very inexperienced, and who lets the PC itsa, "itsamamnfwhfmf", and has the PC squirming about and doing other things, and doesn't know how to get a PC to hold the cans, and a few things like this, you know, little outnesses. Like, PCs itsaing about his mother-in-law, trying to run a PTP while the auditor's trying to assess a list. That's something stupid, see? You get a wrong item. All of a sudden the PC ARC breaks, because there's a hotter item on the list. There is, usually on these lists, the hottest item. And it isn't enough to get the longest fall.

That's not correct, to write down the longest fall. It's the one that's still in, because actually what happens is, is you sort of scan him up and down the track, and he eventually sticks in the falling area. It isn't that things scrub out. He will just, his mind, automatically will park where he has the most interest. It's a method of paralleling the mind. So as you go over the reading items, why his attention goes, zuuu uu. Now, if his attention was on one of these items and you give him another item, he'll therefore ARC break, because you've excited by-passed charge on the right item, and you've given him the wrong item. You try to prep check that, or do something with that, and he ARC breaks further. So you can, you can goof it up even with an assessment. So you have to know how to run an E-meter. That's elementary. You have to know how to run an E-meter, get the guy to sit still, so on. I've seen auditors doing their nut because the PC was boiling off, or doped off, or doped off in an assessment and therefore the assessment isn't valid. You know the assessment is valid. The assessment is valid on an unconscious person. You can actually take an unconscious person if your tone 40's good enough, you can assess a list and find exactly what it is. It's the auditor. It's the auditor. The auditor. That's the law.

Now the net result of all of this is simply that assessment is assessment. But assessment requires that you do get the right item on the list you're assessing. It's almost inconceivable that anybody could get the wrong item on this list, but it0 actually could be done. You could get the PC so he's fighting it, so he's suppresses it, so he does some things, so he... You know. So you can actually correct one of these assessment lists, but that becomes very idiotic. It's such a simple, fast operation, that the whole essence of it is getting in there and doing it before the PC finds out. And then he'll all of a sudden start saying, "Wait a minute. Yes." Of course, you've parked him right where the most charge is. Of course he then has a tendency to say, "I have just remembered that woof, woof, bluff, and itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa,..." Wait a minute. Woah, woah, woah. You're not processing him. You don't know what the hell he's going to itsa. You're going to prep check this thing. You're going to do something with this thing. You are gonna adapt it to a recall question. You're gonna run it on a list 1. Well he's pulling the wrong action on it already. So therefore, it's even stupid to indicate it to the PC .

I see on some assessments very recently, as why they're done wrong, I see it indicated to the PC, and he agreed that that was true, "And he told me that trot-de-dot, waffle, waffle, waffle." I imagine the PC walked out of session probably good and ARC broke. Because there's an excellent chance that this item has excited BPC. By passed charge, and so on. He don't itsa, because you're not running it. It isn't an itsa subject. He could probably get into severe trouble itsaing, because a hot subject. You wouldn't have chosen it, you wouldn't have chosen that list subject if it wasn't hotter than a pistol on his case.

Oh, there's various things you could do about it. He's probably curious about what read on the list, and that sort of thing. Aw, yeah, give him his item, in a very unexcited sort of way. But it's not an auditing action. You're trying to find something to run. And there very often will be many hours, or even a day or two intervene, between the time you did the assessment and the time he's gonna be run on it.

Well you're gonna run something real strong on it. And there is a good reason to run something real strong on it, don't you see? Now you can say, "Well yes, it'll F/N. If it just F/N'd on itsa whv not just itsa on F/N..." Aw bull. It's a key to the case. So if it's handled with the right process it will unblock the case. "But a yickety, yickety, yackety, yackety, bill code doo, yackety, do de do da do dee, do do", F/N. "Yeah, it's just the same old stupid PC as the other one, and we did an assessment, and we found out that it was auditing, and, and so forth, and he told us about the fact... Awwawaw, he said all auditors are dogs, yeah, dogs, the, the, all auditors are dogs." F/N. ARC break needle. "Yeah, we itsa'd it. Didn't do anything for the case." You see what stupidity can enter in here? So you say, "Auditors. Good. That's thanks. Now we're going in to, and we're going to do this", and so forth. You're handling it when, your PC is in session. You might do this before the session began, sort of thing, or do it after the session ended. And it usually is very puzzling to some green PC to have one of these assessments done after he has been flown on something. You've done; undertaken a major action, major action on the PC, fly the needle, wham, wham, wham, and then all of a

sudden you pull out this list, you see, and you give him a list. And you just say, "Well, yes. Now you don't have to say anything about this, I'm just going to go over this just to see what's here, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark. Thank you very much. Good. Now, to put the end rudiments in, why in this session has any charge been missed? Anything? Anything you care to say, anything?" Fellow says, "Well, no, what was that all about?" "No, we're just trying to, trying to see where you were now, and you're doing fine. Thank you very much." Evaluate, evaluate. "Good. Thank you." You don't tell him, "I am trying to find an item so that we can put it together and audit you on it in the future, because you've now continued a session." And boy, that is a grave blunder, see? So it's usually best to give it to him at the beginning of the session, really. Say, "Good. How are the cans, how are you today, Joe? Bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark, bark. That's good. Thank you very much. He says, "What the hell was that all about?" Do you have an ARC break? "Well, yeah, I was very startled. Very good. Thank you. Good, fine. That's clean. Alright, do you have a PTP? "Yeah, what was that all about? That's a problem." Well, I was just doing an assessment of a list. Trying to get some dope here. "Alright", he says, "Great, great." F/N. Now you go into the auditing action that you were going to go into, or just knock the session off. You've got the dope.

Now that dope, if it adds up right, can become a process. Now it can be done on L4A, it can be done on L1, it can be prep checked, you can pull a number of different gags out of it. But those are the major things you can do with it. "On bla bla, has anything been...?" Do you see? List 1, or prep check. See, there's various standard actions that are undertaken with this item. But the item is hot, and you want to get it as good as you can. You want to run it right down and get what you can off of it, and then get an F/N that will stay that way for a while.

Now, that is the use and value of assessment. The use and value of listing and nulling. Now you may find on Saint Hill tapes, you may find on older tapes that this differentiation has not been made, you may find it is missing in a tape line up, it may be this and that, but certainly I am making it clear to you. Now therefore you should be aware of somebody pulling something out of a line up that he himself doesn't understand what the hell it is. Do you see? There can be a serious action. It's actually wrecked I don't know how many cases.

Now I don't say that this is now going to be wrong in the future, 'cause you guys are all going to make that right, and you guys'll probably for a long time been trying to straighten up little points like this, and so forth. And I'm giving it to you as a horrible example of what can happen. The technology that applies to ARC breaks is suddenly applied to missed withholds, to give you an idea, see? On a missed withhold, is it A-R-C-U, or C-D-E-I? On an ARC break, "Do you have an ARC break?" "Well yes I do." "Weil what was it all about?" "Well, I was, they were very cross with me this morning." Very good. Who nearly found out?" You could get that really screwed up, couldn't you?

Now I don't mean to be profane about it, but I have talked to many people very sweetly, and I have taught them how to audit with great kindness, and they haven't learned. In many instances they haven't learned. So, you will forgive my emphaticness.

Funny part of it is, in this particular unit at this particular time, your auditing picks up about a hundred percent every twenty four hours. That's a very remarkable line of gain.

Now. The next action here is there are certain methods of teaching which go on on this course, and which should go on on this course, and which are exterior, actually, to the bulletins, and so on, which must be called definitely to attention. And that is, that case folders of cases supervised by myself are part of the course actions. Now, Power folders were done in another day and another time when we were trying to develop and handle Power, but they nevertheless greatly assisted people in the case supervision of Power. And they were totally removed from the course, so that nobody'd ever seen or heard of these things for over a year. And nobody knew how to run Power all of a sudden. So I call to your attention that case folders, supervised by myself, and case supervision by myself are part of the curriculum of this course. And those must be studied- And it is the best part of those, the sessions that are well done, rather than

specializing only in session that are badly done, since there can be an absolute infinity of error. There is only one single track of well done. Also, auditing at this level is not what you get away with, it's what you do perfectly. We are auditing at a different strata, a different altitude. It is what you do perfectly. You're a total perfectionist.

We don't care how the PC, and you don't care either, how the PC came out of the session and said, "Oh, I had a wonderful session." You look through the thing and it's something like this. "Do you have an ARC break? Who else has been ARC broke with you? Do you do things to make people ARC break with you?" You look over at the examiners' form, "What a wonderful session. Had a won..." There is a thing called propitiation. You are a perfectionist. You are not looking for the result. You are looking for the perfect rendition of the technology. We don't care how the PC felt afterwards. Because if it was perfectly administered on standard tech, you can, with perfect confidence, say that you will have achieved a perfect result on the PC which is lasting. But the rough TRs, the introduction of squirrelynesses, the failures to follow the exact things which are being taught, the failure to, "Do you have a present time problem? That's clean. Do you have a missed withhold?" Plunk! We don't care if he did or didn't have a present time problem. Why the hell did the auditor have to go and ask about missed withholds without getting an F/N on PTPs?

Well you say, "Well of course the PC was stuck in a missed withhold. That's why it didn't F/N." Naahhh. You're an auditor. You're auditing from a level of Class VIII. What the hell do you mean? The guy comes into session with a missed withhold? My PCs don't. They're not supposed to have missed withholds, ARC breaks or PTPs, and if I ask them about it and they tell me something it F/Ns. Not because I say it F/Ns, because it does. TRs are in.

Now, if this guy is all goofed up, and he's got out Ruds, and he's out of session like screaming crazy, and he's running the session, running the session, "No, I don't have an ARC break, but I have a PTP. Let me tell you my PTP. So and so and so and so and so and so." Of course there's a missed withhold mixed up in the thing. "Now what we're going to run in the body of the session..." There's only one reason, there're two reasons, actually that a PC does that. But we don't expect one of them to be valid, which is the auditors TRs are out. We expect the auditors' TRs to be in and perfect. But when the auditors' TRs are indifferently in, and a PC is out of session and behaves to control the session, the answer is out rudiments. Out rudiments, that's all. TRs fair... See now, an auditor with perfect TRs could probably audit over the top of out rudiments. But that's asking a hell of a lot. So if his TRs are fair, his control of the session would normally be good, and the PCs madly out of session, we know that the Ruds are out. It's one of these A equals A. Out of session, Ruds out.

Now the answer to that from the case supervisor is ratta-tat-tat. "Fly each rud to floating needle using suppress and false." Meaning simply that you don't leave one of the buttons unless you get in, it's itsa, earlier itsa to F/N on ARC breaks. And when I say it's flunk, flunk, flunk, because he said, "Do you have a PTP? That's clean. Thank you very much. Now you do have a missed withhold?" Why didn't PTP fly? Well it's either suppressed or a false read. If it didn't fly it is either suppressed or a false read. Let's get this level of think. That's a very extreme level of think, isn't it? When you ask the PC a question and the needle doesn't float, then it is either a suppressed or a false read. You've asked the PC a question, now let me put this again very strongly, and very exactly, you've asked the PC a question, and it was clean, didn't read, and it didn't F/N, then it's either suppressed because of false reads, or there is a suppressed something on it. Why didn't it F/N? Well. that's a hell of an extreme way of... here we labor and sweat and go through twenty five hour intensives, and so forth, to finally get an F/N, and all of a sudden Ron looks at us here and says, "We ask the PC a question, we didn't get an F/N, there's something wrong with that." Hey. Now get this as a different viewpoint. You ask the PC, "Do you have an ARC break?" And the PC F/Ned, 'cause he didn't have one. Now if it didn't F/N either he's been told he has had ARC breaks when he didn't have, or he's told he read on them when he didn't, so he's eventually suppressed the whole subject. Or he's got an ARC break that is suppressed, or he's got one that reads. And he's got one that reads, you itsa it, find out what it was, get your A-R-C-U, C-D-E-I, get the charge off of that, and then check it and if it hasn't F/Ned yet, you ask him, "Is it suppressed?" See? Ana get the read. "Alright,

is that false?" You got it? "Somebody told you you didn't have one?" I don't care what it is, you haven't got an F/N yet. So it's an earlier, similar, earlier, similar, reads; there is no such thing as an ARC break that reads clean. There's ARC break to F/N.

A needle that does not F/N on a question... Look at the extremity of this. A needle that does not F/N on a question has either been falsely called sometime or another, and has so been suppressed, or it is suppressed. Because it isn't an F/N. F/N is native state.

I get out of bed in the morning and grab a hold of a couple of cans, and so forth, and have a dial wide F/N. Why? There's neither suppress, there's no suppress on it. I'm not asking myself anything. If I ask myself something on the meter and it stopped F/Ning, I would know there was something there. Or, that it was false, or that it had been suppressed. Or there was an answer. I answer it and it F/Ns again.

You should be auditing a PC from an F/N, wondering why the F/N is not continuous, rather than trying to sweat it through for the next seventy five hours to possibly get an F/N. What the hell are you doing with no F/Ns?

Now I know exactly how good your auditing is and how bad it is. I don't have to need anything more than the PC did not come to the next session with an F/N. That's all I need to know.

Start of session he had to have his Ruds put in. He's losing some portion of the gain he should get. So I look over somebody who is an auditor, exclamation point (!), and I know that his PCs are going to start coming to session with F/Ns very soon. And to run a major action you have to wreck the F/N.

Now if you ask a PC who had an F/N if he had an ARC break, perfectly reasonable to do, and the F/N stopped, then you've either got a false or a suppress. See, the F/N stopped but it didn't read. Then there's false or suppress. So you'd have to get in those buttons. So now let's go back to this. The guy says, the guy says, "Do you have a PTP? Clean. Do you have a missed withhold?" Plunk, plunk, plunk, plunk, plunk, plunk, plunk. He just passed a read that's either false or suppressed. He's been called falsely, so the guy suppressed the read or something, but it doesn't F/N. He doesn't F/N on the subject of missed withholds. He doesn't F/N on the subject of PTPs, so it's false or suppressed. Do you get the idea?

Now that's a hell of an extreme point from which to audit, but that's the kind of case supervision you're getting at this particular stage of the game. If you wonder why you're developing such aeronautic proficiency, and such aquatic expertness, is because you and me are auditing from two different standards. And I'll tell you how to win in this game. You start auditing from my standard. Not because I say so, but because you will find out that it works. PCs that don't F/N when they come into session have been roughly audited. Not roughly taught, not roughly handled, they've just been roughly audited. PCs whose F/Ns don't even last to the examiner two minutes later... "You mean an ARC break's handled, and PTPs handled, and his missed withhold's off, and a good session under his belt and he's just cleaned up some big section of his life and his F/N doesn't last from the auditing desk to the examiner? Balderdash. My god, mine even lasts doing case supervision on your folders. Horrible thing to say.

Now. So therefore the methods of teaching include the inspection of these case supervision, and anything that is improved or done in any way, why case folders and so forth, which demonstrate this will be added to the course. So that this is definitely part of it. Now, something which is supposed to be taken up, something supposed to be taken up by the supervisor, and so on, to find out where the student is actually weak, and it's supposed to get him to do it in clay. The... He's supposed to get him to do it so that he understands it. It's up to the supervisor to get the fellow clarified on these things, not asking a bunch of goofy question, but get it so that he can actually take a look at it. Because the basic cognition on this stuff is it's as simple as a shot arrow. I mean, it's just simple. It's like this assessment. It ARC

breaks me, because I taught it for years and it's been done for years, and it's a very simple action, and assessment can be forgotten, or somebody can't do assessment? I wonder why an auditor would leave four items reading on a prepared list? What good it that to anybody? And then show me that one was three inches long and one was two inches long. I don't care how long they are What stayed in? What stayed in? That's the whole clue to the whole thing. That's all you ever want to know as case supervisor.

Now I assure you that every one of you, without going out of valence in the least, are going to be exactly in my boots as I am, trying to teach you how to come up the line on standard tech. Each one of you will be occupying these two boots. You're gonna have the same problems, you're gonna get twice as outraged, and you'll have to be able to do it in such case state that your needle floats through the lot. So those are methods of course teaching which I must remark upon.

Students quite normally take up case supervision folders, take up case supervision folders in a group so that each one of the cases, the auditing sessions which got well done, definitely taken up why that is a well done session. Now you will see in some of these case folders that instead of being a raging beast, I actually am not much of a raging beast, I am more than kind, because you'll occasionally see little slips I don't say anything about. See? They're so tiny, and knowing that the auditor was so over strained at that particular point, that it would seem too damn petty, because it didn't mean anything to the session. Little points of out-admin. You know? Like he doesn't put the time down for four columns. So you can't find out when the hell he did the action in the, in the session report, because he never put down the time. So you know that the action, and so forth, and then there's no time put down on the list when he does the list. So you can't find where the list fit into the session. See? These little things. I know you'll find me not saying much about them, but you should move up into that level of perfection.

Now, as far as tapes are concerned, and listening to tapes, usually the quality is so very, very bad on tapes over home recorder machines which you listen to through earphones, that this course at least is designed to play the tapes in a common hall to the students all at one time. But this poses the problem, this poses the problem of what about somebody who comes in late on a course, and therefore you could only give the course every so many weeks? Or, something like this.

No, you'll find these tapes, more or less you can, somebody can start listening to these tapes anyplace. And you carry it on through. But all the tapes should be listened to. I've tried to tell you often enough on the tapes so that you don't have to take notes, it's a very embarrassing thing in an auditing session to have to take out your notes. I remember one time, back in 1950, when an auditor who was going to audit me had to find Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health to find out what the canceler was. And opened up my book and read me the canceler as part of a session. You're supposed to know your data very quickly.

Now the student, you'll find the cases make out on the course best when students start to audit late on the course. The students who are auditing later on the course, rather than those who audited once on the course, turn in a far better session. They've got the data, the theory under their belt, and they've normally integrated it so that they can put it together into a session without a lot of questions popping up. So a student should audit relatively late on a course, not early on.

Now, when I say late, well if he was going to be three weeks on course, why about the earliest he ought to do any auditing is after about a week and a half of very furious study. And it would have to be very furious study. One is expected to go through the checksheet on this course at least three times. I consider that a minimum, I'd consider nine optimum. If you knew it by the time that you'd hit nine, boy you'd know it. And you wouldn't be worrying about it, trying to remember it. The only reason you make mistakes is your're trying to remember something that's about as obvious as can be.

Now the other thing is, is we teach auditors, not cases. And on this course, why auditors don't have cases. There are no cases on the course. And that is an old rule, but there are no cases on a course. And that's the most remarkable thing. I've tried to teach you without teaching you through my case, and you should be able to be taught without being taught through your case. Now the net result of that is, is auditors don't have cases. Every now and then a solo auditor gets going about his case, or something of this sort. Well all right, but he is also the auditor. And he can't have the excuse that he keeps bad admin and doesn't audit because his case is bad. He is a different thing as a solo auditor.

Now the whole subject of this course that you sort out eventually are the relative importances. And you should have gotten this a long, long, long, long time ago. It should have been way, way, way back when. The, the final assortment of data is actually in the axioms. And you should have learned these a long time ago. Axiom 58: Intelligence and judgement are measured by the ability to evaluate relative importances. To a lot of people a datum in Scientology is just about the same as a data in Buddhism, is about the same as a drop of water in the ocean, and so on. The position of the E-meter is an equal importance to the TRs of the auditor. In other words, monotone importances. You should know this axiom 58. Intelligence and judgement are measured by the ability to evaluate relative importances. When you eventually sort out the material you're going through, you won't find that there are fifty data that are important. But you have to know the rest of them to back it up. But there are fifty, no more, no less, than. What is important? What is important? And that is the thing you have to break through.

Somebody came in here on this course asking me questions about heredity. Well, I don't care anything about heredity. The Russians have heredity. Bysinko, I think, had something to say about it. Somebody dreamed it up sometime or another. But brother, it has the relative importance of an ink blot on a rock in the South Pacific. So your data has to be evaluated against other data. I've had somebody tell me that you could find everything there was in Scientology in Rrshnamurti. Well, it was a hell of an exaggeration, so I said, "Now show me something." And they finally dreamed it up, and they said, "Well he said something about time." And I said, "Good. We also said something about time. Now show me where he said something about time." And they showed me one sentence which was in a whole book. And this one little sentence, by misinterpretation, could be said to be the fact that time exists in this universe. But nowhere in there did he give it any relative importance. And it was just of monotone to every other thing in there.

So somebody comes up to you and tells you, "Well that's just like the Vedic something or other", they've got a lot to learn. Because they don't even know the relative importance amongst the Vedic actions. There is an important Vedic hymn, I've forgotten which one it is, about the fourth one, which gives the cycle of action. And it gives, actually, a very, very wise little piece of information. It defines the cycle of action, way back in Vedic times. And in the entire panorama of Vedic materials there isn't anything else but sand. That's a hell of a thing, isn't it? But there is one, was one datum there. Now, the people studying Vedic hymns I am sure think they're all of equal importance. There was only one useful datum in the whole line up. Very valuable datum.

Now where, where a student has to shake himself loose, where he has to get himself squared around, is to find out what is important and what is unimportant. And when he is able to sort these things out he is then able to do what he has to do, he is also able to teach. And this is a primary job which is done by the student. Under the heading of methods of teaching, this is something that is up to the student to sort out relative importances. Until he does so he is just in one horrible maze. Every drop of water in the ocean is just like every other drop of water in the ocean, and all those drops of water in the ocean, they really don't relate to anything. Well he's gotta get that stacked up, and he's gotta find out what are the important data. What are the important data? And get those things arranged. And arrange those important data without recourse to whether or not they solve his case or not. For as a student, he couldn't care buttons about whether they solve his case or not. In the normal course of events they of course will resolve his case. But they actually won't solve his case unless they solve all the cases.

Some people like to be individualists and have different types of cases. I'm sorry for those people, but we may even invent a C/S which satisfies their status-happy seeking. "We have to run on you now technique ST. And that is a technique of spotting the number of spots on spots. It's a very special process. It's for very genius people." If you did such a thing as that it would probably be dishonest, but I never let my sense of humor get the better with my case supervision. But sometimes when you hear what some people think is a missed withhold, that even I have heard half around the world, this girl's busy getting off this missed withhold, see? Well I've known that for years. I know one girl that went clear to Australia and buried herself in the bush and has never come out towards Scientology again, because she had a withhold that only she knew in company with; she never got it off in a session, but I don't think there was anybody in London didn't know it. She's down there busy hiding this withhold that everybody else knows. It suddenly strikes you with some pity, looking at some extreme action like this, that humanism and status, and a few things like that are put above power, decency and freedom. But those are the relative importances of the being. And he will sort those out as time goes along.

Now, I could go on and give you a lot of data about this and that and the other thing, but I do have some very, very important data. I've already told you that no session control is out Ruds, and relative importances, but I want to tell you something very astonishing. Something absolutely astonishing. And that is the one hand electrode, as used in solo auditing, can obscure floats to such a degree that a person overruns himself consistently. And you will find that in auditing of such people, you will be amazed, and he will be amazed, when you say there are four, five, six, eight, ten times they went clear on the Clearing Course, or something of this sort. They went release on it, or something. And he didn't see any floats. Well he was handling a one hand electrode. And it doesn't float. Furthermore, it gives a TA lie. It can be high, or it can be low. Now if you want to straighten this out for yourself, get a couple of cans with the alligator clip, couple of old tin cans the way those meters are designed against, I think it's a size eight or a size ten tin can. And they have alligator jaw lead-ins that clip to those tin cans. You take those two cans and you hold them, and that meter is calibrated to work in, calibrated to react to, two tin cans, one held in each hand.

Now when a person gets up in the OT Sections, he is insufficiently in contact with all parts of the body to register worth a god damn on a one hand electrode in many cases. You very often will find the one hand electrode is registering 2.5, that the needle appears to be relatively loose, that this appears to be OK. If you were to take at that moment two one hand electrodes, you know, two, two different electrodes which are separated, each one held in one hand, making a two handed connection to the machine, the needle might be doing a float. And the TA might be in a completely different place.

Now it's very amazing how completely erroneous this can be. The TA can be at 3, floating, on the proper two cans, and on a one hand electrode can be at 4, stuck. But because it actually is calibrated to be floating on the two hands, and is floating, and is actually floating, any effort to get it down from the stuck 4 is, of course, an overrun. Life can be marvelous, can't it.

So those electrodes are best, and those electrodes are only reliable, which are held one in each hand, or which are connected to the two opposite sides of the body. Now a word of warning, if you try to hook up an electrode against the skin it very often, I mean like under the armpit, or some tender portion of the anatomy, watch it, because it only has seven and a half volts going through it, but it actually gives a sensation of burn, and can actually burn somebody. We do have somebody who tries to handle electrodes by lashing one to his leg, and he's always been thinking he is such a marvelous special case because it burns his leg. Well my god, it always burns anybody's leg. It'd burn your leg, too. Don't think I haven't made tests of that character all the way across the line.

But this latest data here, about a one hand electrode is a result of a series of tests which I have taken in order to resolve some materials and some reactions on the higher OT Sections of research, and-I'm telling you this for the first time. It isn't that I've withheld it from anybody, but that it doesn't float as you go up into higher Sections. You don't get a float anymore. And

you get the weird action then, of an overrun, and you put... Now you, as an auditor, put the guy into a review session, and it's sort of packed up, and it's spooky, and the needle's doing this, that or the other thing, there's not only a false needle, but a false TA. So there's 'Worry about the TA' is one of the buttons which you must remember comes about in solo auditing. And you have to put into your line up. His TA. Worried about his TA. His TA is low, or his TA is high. He's worried about his TA. And it comes up as a problem and can act as a sufficient problem to operate as any other present time problem operates at no case gain. Every time he goes into session he has this problem with the TA. And in a one hand electrode he can read up to 6. Stuck. When he actually will be floating, dial wide, on two cans.

Now you will see then, this mystery of this guy was all worried about his TA, and he'll be sitting on the meter, all of a sudden he'll have a dial wide float while you're auditing him, and he tells you he's worried about his TA. Well that is the mystery of it all, is he's got some floaky electrode set up, which messes him up. Now there's some material in progress on this, and this will be resolvable. But I'm just warning you that this condition does exist, and that you will run into this condition.

Now, the actual actions of auditing on a solo level are very often very, very, very, very, very badly done. Incredibly badly done. Guys go into session, they don't put in their Ruds. The rudiments are out, and they try to use the OT Section in order to handle their PTP. You got it? And they then audit over out Ruds, out Ruds, audit over out Ruds, out Ruds. Now you get somebody that can't run an engram, can't run anything else, and he gets onto OT 3. Isn't trained, wraps himself around a telegraph pole, messes himself up most horribly. One of the difficulties is, that he will run an Incident 1 on one thetan and turn around and run an Incident 2 out of another thetan. I sometimes find somebody who says, when you're trying to run an Incident 1 on him, well he has no reality on it, and so on, and yet he claims to have done something with 3. He can't have done anything with 3 unless he ran some Incident 1s. He can very often run his own Incident 1, blow quite a few body thetans. He doesn't necessarily have to be on it forever. But he certainly had to run Incident 1! And he certainly had to run it several times!

Now, therefore, why didn't he? Well he doesn't know engram running. He can't run engrams. And not able to run engrams, my god, he couldn't run 'em on a PC, he couldn't run 'em much less on himself, he hasn't any control of his own bank, he therefore is somebody who, by reason of training and by reason of a charged case, did not in actual fact have any business being on the OT Sections, because his case is too charged up. Now his case is too charged up because his grades are out. It isn't a very difficult thing. Engrams, secondaries, ARC Straightwire, back it down into that zone, he's had drugs. They have never been rehabbed, something like this. And god almighty, he, he's trying to get through the OT Sections. Well it's something like this. Standard tech rehabs all former releases on any subject. And if those things aren't rehabbed, I don't care whether it's done early or late on the case, if the person's not actually had ARC Straightwire run, if he's not actually had secondaries run, if he's not actually had engrams run, all correctly, zero, the real processes of zero, one, two, three, four, actual Power, R6EW, no fudge to it, actually run 'em. His case is too charged. His case is too charged up.

Now one of the ways you can tell a case is too charged up is he starts to run secondaries or engrams or something like this, and he doesn't seem to be able to get much reality on it, and he sort of brushes it off, but somebody ARC breaks him, and he goes F/N. "Well, you're a clear. That's it. We've got you released now on engrams." Oh. Now you try to take him up through the grades. Kooky things like this have happened, but those are violations of standard tech. Standard tech includes that an F/N is not a valid F/N unless it's with GIs. But you say the thing did F/N, and he didn't have GIs, and when I started to run it further it packed up and the TA started up. My dear fellow, you now have found out that is was a real F/N. So, F/N with bad indicators. So you decide it's just an F/N with bad indicators, and I'm going to do something else with this F/N with bad indicators, and I'm going to run it a bit further, I'm going to do something else with this. All of a sudden the F/N packs up, the TA starts up, my god it wasn't an F/N with bad indicators, meaning an ARC broke needle. It was a valid F/N. You've had it.

Now of course, you're going to have to come off of it and rehab it right away. Bongo. Rehab. Indicate the overrun. It goes back to its' proper F/N. He's just, sort of, a sour puss PC in general. But he never has, nobody's ever seen any GIs on him. Never seen any good indicators, and so on.

Well the trouble with the case is, the trouble with the case is, it is simply super-charged. It's just a charged up case. The guy's just charged up like crazy. Well there's something wrong. And a person who has ARC broke needles is an over-charged case who is liable to go low TA. He's a potential low TA case. So the resolution of the low TA, it was very necessary to say that standard tech covered all cases. There are several ways to resolve a low TA, it is resolvable by valence shifting, it is resolvable by a proper run on OT3, it is even resolvable by PrPr6. So I have just pulled the rabbit out of the hat recently, and I've got low TA cases resolvable at the level of ARC Straightwire and secondaries and engram running. We might as well cure them up there as any other place.

So I do pull some rabbits out of the hat every now and then. What's resolvable on the upper levels, I've made it now resolvable on the lower levels. All of which is part of the standard tech which you're being taught.

Alright. Now the high TA is inevitably and invariably overruns. Inevitably and invariably. But there's a hooker on this overrun. It might be the profession of somebody that is overrun, and you have to find the person. He's just one damn too many dentists. And you find the dentist who constituted the overrun and the TA blows down. The subject of dentistry doesn't go, but the subject of dentists does. Do you follow? He doesn't blow down on operation, but it blows down on the subject of dentists. How would you find such a thing? Well you would normally find such a thing very easily by the interesting mechanism that he was PTS. PTS, you do an S and D, you get a big blow down on the thing, well he was actually overrun on this subject, and that made him PTS to it. And it's all very involved in his head. But we don't care how it is. So overrun is high TA, but it could also be the overrun of the person. You can get the phenomena of over~un showing up on an S and D, and you'll think maybe PTS makes high TAs. It doesn't. OK?

So you got the high TA, you got the low TA, and other things with regard to that. And your technique is pretty straight. Now you think in my teaching of you that I, at this stage of the game, that I have become savage, that I have become brutal, that I have become utterly mean. I call to your attention that I have taught you kindly and sweetly before.

Now I won't try to make you wrong by saying you have done it all wrong, because the actual fact before I arrange this course to teach you this, I did get a simplification of communication to try to find out where you might possibly be snarled up, and have done everything I could to unsnarl it. So I'm not trying to make you horribly wrong in everything you have learned. I'm just trying to make you horribly right by getting you to get all the gain there is as an auditor, and as a case out of standard tech.

Thank you very much.