

STANDARD TECH

A lecture given on
12 October 1968

Well you will be very happy to know, brethren as we are assembled here together, that we have to bow our heads in prayer for none of you at the moment since you've already gotten, each one of you, a well done. Now all you have to do is get your 85% on the final exam, and in any event you can make your airline reservations for the sixteenth or the seventeenth, whatever aircraft you can get on.

What lecture number is this? Sixteen. Fifteenth? Sixteenth. Gee, I thought you'd slipped, or I had. Sixteen. Lecture number sixteen. And this is twelve Oct. correct? A.D. eighteen. And the subject of this lecture is standard tech.

I do not envy you going almost single-handedly into an organization at this particular state of affairs, and having dumped on your lap what you dumped on my lap when you arrived here. (Laughter.) But I'm afraid it is that exact situation.

Now what you lack, because I've been too busy with your folders, you lack a big chart which gives you the A, B, Cs of C/Sing. You lack that chart. I've not been given the space, nor the time to get you together with a big C/S chart. The, a great deal of the auditing which you have been doing is OT section auditing. Nevertheless, the simpler actions apply to the lower grades.

Now remember that you've got to be backed up by the examiner. Very often a session will look OK to you if you don't look at the examiners' report. Now it's quite remarkable, but those sessions which were done today, I think all of them it is reported, got to the examiner with an F/N. The whole, sweeping lot.

Now when you're really hotter than a pistol they come back to the next session with an F/N. They'll not only get to the examiner, but they come back to the next session. That's asking a lot, but I'm telling you that it's quite a triumph to get all the guys to the examiner with an F/N.

Now you must realize that if the report looks absolutely flawless, and by the time the person gets to the examiner, he's fallen on his head, that you have a false auditing resort. And the most likely two things that have happened is the auditor talked too much, and the auditor didn't talk at all.

It isn't really that he even did something else. It's just that he did too much in the way of gib, gab, gab, gab. He got the PC distracted and upset, or he just didn't give him the commands. Now the other type of additive you can usually spot, because it's very often in the auditing report. "Do you have a present time problem? What postulate did you make that gave you that problem? What counter postulate was there to this. Very good. Then give me a problem of comparable magnitude to it. Fine. Alright, good. Now invent a problem. Good." You know there was actually a folder around that's got that in it? From a Class VI auditor. Wow! And of course the PC just fell on his head. Well that was easy to spot. Don't you see? That's easy to spot. The hidden one is all of the stuff that didn't get into the report.

Now you can very often tell all the stuff that didn't get into the report by the time of the session. The session is one and one half columns long, but consumed two hours. It doesn't make any sense at all. How could they have only one and one half column of work sheet, and worked at it for two hours? See, that's impossible. So therefore that's a false auditing report. Just obviously on the face of it.

Now you are to use the examiner to investigate this sort of thing, and you can ask your examiner to ask the PC things. So you send the folder back to the examiner, and you say, "Examiner, get the PC in and ask him..." Do you follow? So then the examiner, and you just,

you can even make together a little, a little form. You can mimeo a few forms off, you know? What you want the PC asked. See? You can get, you can get another point of view on this. You can get the examiners' point of view.

Now don't think that the examiner has to be very skilled. People think they have to put Class VIs on, or something like that on the examiner post. No, all you want is an honest person on the examiner post. He doesn't even have to be trained in tech. 'Cause what's he doing? He's reading a meter, he has to know the state of the needle, and he has to be able to write the language you're auditing in. He also has to know that he must not make an evaluative glares and sneers, and he mustn't ask a lot of silly questions, unless he's been told to ask some questions.

Now when you, you can have a PC brought to the examiner. You get this auditing report back, and you say, "Oh my god, what the hell is this all about?" And you're trying to figure out what the hell. It's this thing within two hours. And you have one and a half columns of work sheet. And it didn't seem to work out. And the guy got to the examiner with a D/N and the TA at 5. What in the name of god happened? He left the session three minutes before with an F/N at 2. but now it's at 4. What the hell is going on? What is going on? Alright, well you don't know, so don't hang yourself up in a mystery. Any question you have about it, write out the questions and get the answers from the examiner. You don't call in the PC. You send the folder with some questions down to the examiner. Examiner calls in the PC, asks the questions.

Now you normally will get these things just on a straight examiner form. That is an additional line I'm showing you exists, don't you see?

Now, if you've got five, six, seven folders, which have appeared to you totally well done, and the examiner report was great on them, and you notice all of a sudden that four of these five are back in review within about forty eight hours, what do you do about that? You convene a board of investigation, or a comm ev. 'Cause brother, you're dealing with false reports. It goes straight onto the ethics line.

You can ask the ethics officer to interview these people. It is the least action you'd take. And you can convene a board of investigation, because your neck is out a miles. Your neck is out a mile. People suddenly start accusing you. You see, you get the condition you don't assign. That's the horrible part of it. If some guy's in non-existence and you don't assign nonexistence, first thing you know you're in non-existence. It's a weird, it's a weird mechanism. And it happens. It's actual factual.

So therefore, if you get the thing stacked up, now don't go around grinding your teeth and snarling to yourself quietly, and so forth, just put it on the ethics line very forthrightly. What the hell happened? And you will just be amazed at the grossness of the error it took.

The auditors, all of a sudden, were writing all of their reports long after the session to make them look good. There's a collusion with the examiner. Something weird has gone on here, see? And the faster you cure it the faster your tech lines are going to work. So you just are alert all the way along the line when you're doing C/S work to these oggilty-boggeldy weirdities. And don't you try to get weird to solve the situation on tech lines. These oggilty-boggeldy, what the hell is this? A guy has Power, 5A, three days later he's reported sick. Well you know the items of 5A are out. And although it looks good in the auditors' report, it might even have slid by the examiner somehow or another the fact that he fell on his head in any way shape or form. He got sick, he turned up as an ethics case, something like this. You know treaty a false auditing report.

Now these are the fine points. These are the fine points of being a C/S. Where you have to be clever in being a C/S is avoiding anybody pushing you into a position where you give unusual solutions. 'Cause every time they goof they'll ask you for an unusual solution. You're being asked to dig them out of it after they haven't done anything they should have done. Only they won't tell you they haven't done anything they should have done. So you could easily push

yourself into a situation where you are being required to give unusual solutions when all you really are dealing with anyhow are false reports. So any unusual solution which you give, which is, which is based on a false report, will just wind the guy up in another ball. That's what I mean when I say take it easy. Take it easy on your "He's got to be audited this afternoon." This thing looks sour, looks like something unusual's going to have to be done, and so forth. Well you can have the PC called in and re-examined on a set of questions. On the basis of that if it doesn't true up you can turn it over to the ethics officer. You don't get any satisfaction there you can turn it over to a B of I or a comm ev. Do you follow? When these situations become consistent you make it a B of I or a comm ev. Don't let anybody get away with it. The next thing you know, you'll be doing your nut.

Now I'll let you in on something. It's only the lousy sessions that consume C/S time. It's only the lousy ones. It'd be interesting to look at the time dates if you knew the exact sequence of times, if you took a bunch of my C/Ses you would find that the well dones take about two minutes. And the lousy ones take up to half an hour. So, that I would be able to get through a tremendous stack, and I have done as many as forty six, forty six cases, C/Ses in one evening, with great care every line, don't you see? And the lapsed time was about ten hours. Now the funny part of it is, is out of that ten hours the easy ones didn't consume an hour of it. And the rest of the whole time was in trying to unravel the lousy sessions. And it's interesting that right at that state of time, not your folders but another zone of folders, and so forth, were being filled with false reports. And that was what was the trouble. There were a great many additives in the sessions which weren't being recorded. And very shortly I alerted, looked up, and got ethics in with a crash. It straightened out. It will straighten out. It'll all come out right now.

But when you find yourself then with C/S consuming too much time, and it's rust a hard job plowing through this, know then that you're dealing with out tech and false reports. You just are. You could actually stack up the folders that are probably false reports. It didn't make any sense. You told him to do something Monday, and Tuesday it comes back as apparently done. And Wednesday, why the case is misbehaving most remarkably, and that hasn't worked, so you say something else, and it comes back to you on Thursday. And this TA is way up and everything seems a bit awry. Well the first thing it tends to do is shake your confidence in what you yourself are doing. You can get into a "what the hell", you know? I have. "What in the name of god is going on?" Perfectly valid sessions, they're all written up beautifully. Only those sessions didn't take place. Do you follow? Now that's pretty gruesome. That's pretty gruesome. But somebody can throw you an awful curve this way.

Now there isn't any unusual remedy for the situation. A certain percentage of this sort of thing will happen, so you simply take care of it that way. Any time, you make it rule, any time you're asked for an unusual solution you turn it over to the ethics officer or the examiner. You get a note from an auditor. "This person is waf waf in waffle waffle waffle, and yowf waf waft and you've already C/Sed the folder twice let us say. Two times, and it's waffle waffle waffle waffle. Don't you go waffle waffling. Your line to that PC is being cut in some fashion or another, and you'd what not or will not know until you get some further information. So you, the least thing you can do is turn it over to the examiner and have the PC interrogated.

The next thing you can do, maybe after you've done that, a second action is turn it over to the ethics officer. Let him look into this. What's the ethics records involved here? See what I mean? In that way you'll stay out of trouble. It'll all go smooth as glass. Standard tech is in or it's out ethics. Do you see? You can't get standard tech done while ethics is out. Somebody's giving you false reports, somebody's getting away with murder, and it's just amazing. It's amazing what can happen. Amazing. You will find all kinds of weird things. I've been through all this in organizations all over the place. I don't think there's anything much could happen that hasn't happened in infinite variety. I've had tremendous numbers of wins, tremendous numbers of successes. But some of these points really stand out.

One time I found that the D of P couldn't possibly aet much done. Yet there were thirty five auditors on staff. But there was very little happening. And you know I found the registrar was scheduling the PCs. They weren't being scheduled by tech services, they were being scheduled

by the registrar. And the registrar would schedule them this way. A person would come in, and the person didn't, wasn't even asking when he should be audited or when he shouldn't be audited, and the registrar would just automatically volunteer, "Well how much time, how much spare time do you have?" And the person would say, "Well I don't know. I'm usually free after seven o'clock in the evening." "well very good. Let's see. Eight o'clock Thursdays. How is that?" Every Thursday they were going to have a one hour session.

See, here was complete out-administration. Well nobody could run that HGC. It was impossible. They had to have this vast number of auditors who didn't have anything to do. They didn't have anything to do because no PCs ever showed up. In processing at any given time there were eighty or ninety PCs. Well my golly. You would have figured that thirty five auditors would have cleaned up eighty or ninety PCs in one awful rush. They would've been out of work by Thursday, don't you see? 'Cause the sessions weren't all that long. But it was so fixed that an auditor was only about doing an hour worth of work every two days. They could have gone on this way for years. And they also could have gone completely broke. Do you see?

Now a situation like that makes it impossible for a C/S to keep anybody busy or live. So this is the other side of out-admin. Now you, in the first place, don't care how much time that PC hangs around, as long as when he is to get a session he gets the session, and what happens in that session is what you said was to happen in it. And then, you take a look at the session, and then the next time he's to get a session, somebody brings him in and gives him a session. In other words, your tech services is operating against the action of C/S and the availability of auditors. Pongety pongety pong. Well that's all an administrative action.

Now it can go the other way around, where you have somebody else entirely, who is completely out of a zone or area, who's doing all the scheduling that hasn't anything to do with anything. You know? It's all being scheduled by the HCO Exec Sec. And therefore you can't get people audited when they're supposed to be audited. The less days you leave a bad 5 out of action, the less, the better. If you've got to correct 5A, or something like that, and you want it corrected now. That evening, if possible. So somebody in tech services has got to be on the ball and be able to call in whoever it is.

So they have troubles. So, tough. That's tough. You don't care how much trouble they got. You're whole action, you're whole action is getting the C/S done. Getting the C/S done, and getting the case gaining. Do you, do you see? So your administrative play, you see, falls in against the tech. And these two things are coordinated, one against the other. Now you don't want tons of auditors sitting around on PCs who are falsely and weirdly scheduled, and so forth. The scheduling of PCs is very much in the hands of the tech services. And it's very much under the orders of the C/S. Just recently, believe it or not, in another zone I had two PCs who just plain goofing it, boy. They were goofing it up most gorgeously. And another PC who was pleading that he should go to the hospital and have his throat cut or something. And he had this as a thing. And, you ever once in a while go into a hospital and you ask some of the patients. "Well I'm going to have an operation, ha ha heh." So you say, "Is anything wrong with you?" "I don't think so. Oh yes, I've, I've got something. I don't know what it is, just something. I had something else last week, but they're going to operate on me." Guys are just dramatizing, see? So I was ordering these people to be audited, and audited now. And boy, you would be surprised at the amount of force and pressure I had to bring in to get them audited, and the guy who was pleading to have an operation, they didn't get around to him. He went over, and the next thing I heard, he'd had his operation. Ah! One useless hole.

So you see, tech services, and so on, can fail to back you up. The auditing doesn't occur in terms of time when you want it, or they are trying to force you to get the case audited in some speedy fashion or something, to suit the convenience. You don't care how inconvenient it is for the PC. You get it? You don't care how inconvenient it is. You don't care how hard tech services has to work. This is to hell with it. You understand? And if it's a matter of straightening that case out carefully, you want that case straightened out carefully, and you want to watch every step of the case as it comes along the line, to then the ratio that the less

trust you have in the auditor, the more actions and the more times you want to inspect it. Why sell down the river everything from zero to four? If you're going to sell anything down the river, let's sell the Ruds. Let him goof the Ruds. Let him goof a little assessment of some kind or another. Why sell a grade down the river?

Now this is all part of setting the case up to have the major action done. And you as a C/S have the job of setting the case up to get a major action done. Do you understand? So if there's any insecurity on your part that the case isn't going to be set up for the major action, and somebody's just going to slap-happy the major action on through the lines, bah! At that point you start putting on the brakes. See? Fly the Ruds. And give him any. Give him anything. Don't give him a grade. So you fly the Ruds and... Don't give him a grade.

So there's two ways you can use little prep checks and L-1's and things. (Laughter.) In actual fact, in all respect to this class, I haven't been doing that just to give you something to do. I have used them meaningfully to set the case up better. But I wouldn't, I wouldn't think twice about it. Assess the following. And we've seen some, way back here that the PC was once a bank cashier. And seems to have failed at it. 'Cause it's back in some kind of a withhold he was giving. But when he was a kid he didn't want to be, he wanted to be a banker, but now he tells he better not. Because so on and so on. Well good. Alright. Alright. You got some clue. We don't care where they got the clue. You can even issue interrogations to get clues. You saw me do it recently. "What is your state of OT?" And I picked out the physiological illnesses and audited straight in the direction to set the guy up, to bring up a section or zone of his case which must be holding him down from exteriorization.

Alright, now I gave you a drill on this, see? Now that isn't a standard form to amount to anything. But you can call it a standard form. You can make up these forms. "What careers have you followed that you have failed at?" Turn it over to the auditor and get it assessed. Prep check it. What you gonna get? You're gonna get the rehabilitation of a failed purpose. The guy is immediately going to be less tired. Well when you know when these things are the interplay is very simple. Once again under this heading, you're looking for a zone or area to audit so that you can test fly this PC. What's he gonna do?

So you never want to hand out major actions. "I have come to Saint Hill to have Power. I'm going to want my Power processing." "C/S, he's going to have his Power processing." Alright, somebody's going to try to tell whoever is C/Sing around there that it's really not necessary to C/S the folder before he gets his Power processing, because after all he hasn't had any Power processing yet. You don't know where this guy is within seven miles of being set up for Power. Power only works like a bomb, and only works fast.

I'll show you how you can save time. It only works fast when the PC is set up and pointed. He's got to be all straight as a die, and then send him through Power, and pongo! You really get results- I've seen a PC completely change his character when he was set up for Power and had Power.

Alright. Now a PC who isn't set up for it, it doesn't even change his ARC breaks. So your proper action is to make very sure that anybody coming in for Power, has his folder at once turned over to C/S. And that the folder, whether or not you are the C/S or not, just make sure that the folder is turned over to C/S. And then they would test fly this guy. So we take some completely unlimited process, you know, like assess a list, prep check it, do L-1 on auditors, anything, you know? Assess a list, auditors, auditing, yowowowow. Do a list 1. Brrrrr. See? Item by item, item by item, item by item. To F/N. Well Christ, you can tell by the length of that list how near he is to being acceptable for Power. The auditor, it didn't fly until item fifteen. Wow! This case is charged up like a galvanic battery. I'll bet you he has not even vaguely got his grades. It was hard to do, don't you see? You could look over on the assessment, and that all seemed a bit difficult. But they managed to finally settle on 'auditing'. And then the L-1 on "auditing went the whole page. Each one reading. Oh wow! Now do you see as a C/S you have an estimate of charge? How charged this guy is. Bow long does it take him to clean up his ARC breaks? How long does it take him to do this? How long does it take him to do that? It

takes him a long time, case is heavily charged. Doesn't take him very long, case isn't heavily charged. It's elementary.

Now supposing the case has "been rehabbed" in Keckuk on all grades. And your first action of a prep check took all morning and half the afternoon to get it to F/N. Well I wouldn't, I wouldn't say your auditors TRs were any good doing it. But this is against, also against the fact that you must be dealing with a, a very charged up case. So alright. Let us rehab or run ARC Straightwire. Not as you've been getting ARC Straightwire to four. Fly the Ruds, rehab ARC Straightwire or run. Get the folder back. Boy, you're now liable to find the damndest things you ever heard of, see? Well we actually, actually either he didn't know what ARC Straightwire was. There was somebody that told him he was once run on a recall process, and he couldn't remember very much of the auditing. And it didn't F/N. The TA hasn't gone up terribly, and nothing bad has happened, and so forth. Now you're left with a riddle. Has he ever been run on ARC Straightwire? Hell now if the case is charged up you know at once that he hasn't actually gone up through the grades. There's something missing on the grade line. Now if you don't trust the auditor too much you're going to make that; you're not going to throw away the whole rehab. You're gonna get ARC Straightwire rehabbed or run. Fly the Ruds, rehab ARC Straightwire or run it.

Now, if you really didn't trust the auditor at all you would say, "Check the state of ARC Straightwire and send me back the folder." Now from that data we could determine whether or not to rehab it or run it. So we could say, "Rehab it." Or we could say, "Run it." Do you follow? You could, you could slow it down to that, that almost nowhere. So the amount of action which you assign to be done is proportional to your confidence in the auditor in turning in a result and a factual auditing report.

And the action can get very damned complex after a while on this sort of thing. You can say, do this, do that, do the other thing, do the other thing, do the other thing, only god, they don't have a ball, see? Because auditing which is administered quickly without any chance for any intervening PTPs or anything like this, really flies the guy. But also, auditing which administered very badly is better done in little pieces, so that you can straighten it out before it all goes sour. Do you follow?

So this is the degree of approach, the degree of approach in case supervision. Now what you audit, what you order to be audited probably is occupying your attention. It probably is. I can turn you a chart out. I've been too busy working with your folders to give you a chart at this time, a chart will be in existence at the time anybody is listening to these lectures. And it's just an A, B, C proposition. One of the reasons I don't get busy on it, and so on, it looks too simple to me. The simplicity is so simple, and I see people bongle-binglina around on this. Well, my god. What could they possibly be floofing about? You know?

And yet I see, I see early on in the Org 8 Course and with other experiences I've had recently teaching this, the most complex damn C/Ses you ever heard of! People, you know, they, they look at the-administrative blunders of sessions as something that must be remedied. I don't know why they have to go back to 1962 to get a comma corrected. What the hell is going on? Don't you see? I mean, I'm very puzzled about what is this surer complexity I suddenly see in my lap? And it's interesting, that for OT cases, for OT section repair and so forth, it's interesting that nearly all of your suggestions here, toward the end of this course, are dead on. See? You're calling your shots dead on. And the only place I am in disagreement with it, is I find another piece I can take off. And you didn't quite see that I was heading cases for exteriorization by discharging them. So I was looking for another piece I could take some charge off, before I'd finally let it go. See? You get, you get what I was going, see? 'Cause I'm actually trying to set you up for 7 and 8. And this, this is really the auditing you're getting. I'm just setting you up for that.

It isn't, it isn't that it's terribly far to go, or anything like that, or that you're in bad shape, or anything like this. But in numerous instances we have actually been able to bring about exteriorization and all that sort of thing. And I've been working on that, and so on.

Well this is not necessarily the target that you will find a lower grade case working toward. What he thinks is wrong with him, what he thinks is wrong with him will be of one or two categories. He isn't total OT in the last ten minutes of the first session, you know, so that gives him a lose. And it was totally unreal to him. He wouldn't even know what the hell an OT was. But it's usually he's measuring his gains about whether or not he worries about his wife. You know? So all of his gains are measured against something like this. Or, in the morning he has, his foot hurts. And after he's been audited does his foot hurt? See? This kind of thing.

So he has a tendency with his terrific complexity to start backing you into the field of healing, or something. And your stable datum, your stable datum on that is, is the case will right itself by you simply finding any available charge. You don't find any available feet. You just find any available charge.

Now I've tried to teach you a few times. Somebody comes in with a cold, or somebody comes in with an ear. Do you follow? Alright. Now I say, I say so and so and so and so. "Find an engram or chain and run it. First available that you can find. Just any engram chain that you run. Any engram chain you find on this case will have the ear on it." Do you follow? Yeah. So it's, it's so...

So it's any available charge does anything. You see it's that gross. And in doing case supervision and in auditing, and so forth, you don't have to grope around to find the head or the bottom of the pencil. It's just what I've been trying to teach you. It's where can you get some charge off? How can we get some charge off?

Alright, if we can get some charge off of the guy, well we can straighten him up. If we can't get any charge off we won't. There is no magic button which makes a case well without taking charge off. See, all magic buttons, they might be awfully magic. But they will depend on the amount of charge they got off the case. Do you follow that? That's, that's the whole of it.

Now there's various things that actually mechanically render this, that and the other thing. Let's take an out of valence case. A case that is out of valence is already heavily charged. He'd have to be heavily charged. Now the exact mechanics of this are very, very interesting. And I'll let you in on one little series of processes.

You may or may not know that Power processing, in its' entirety, was synthesized by myself without using it on one single PC, and with having no subjective reality on it of any kind whatsoever myself, because I was already clear. It is one of those wild tours de force in the field of that. I set up what a case will be in the state of, and then figured out what it would take to bring about certain exact end phenomenon. And then wrote up each Power process, and then wrote up the three 5A processes on the same thing. Without a single test, without a single case, with no subjective reality on it, I didn't have any case that could be run on that. A little bit afterwards, to give you a laugh, I decided that I should probably be run on some Power processes to get a subjective reality on it. And about two commands later I was wrapped around seven telegraph poles. It did not function, boy. Because I was already clear and I've noticed this before. When they try to rehab Power after clear, when they try to run Power after clear, it normally throws a guy into a rag bag, because his case is not in the shape that it takes it. So it's sort of cleaning a clean, it makes him look for things that aren't there, there are computations he no longer has, so to try to run them, he sort of has to mock them up, and when he does that, why he says he doesn't quite own them. And it tends to make them solid, and you're liable to put him in the damndest black mass you ever heard of in your life. And then you're going to wonder where it came from.

But below clear, Power was totally synthesized. Every single step of it. And then, I wrote up the bulletins of Power, and they were all experimental bulletins, and put people onto Power, and did my first Power cases, and so forth, and they all came out like that. And I was watching it like a hawk, because I was doubly, trebly critical of it, because it'd been totally synthesized. How the hell did these end phenomena be so exact? He so right on? See? They were perfect, on

the line. So that was the way they were supposed to behave, and that was the way they behaved. And it wasn't because I was saying so, because I was saying they shouldn't behave that way. And they went right on up the line. Bong bong bong bong bong. And we had Power processing.

Now, this is an interesting tour de force. Now there is another zone where this has just occurred in the low TA case. In order to teach this first Class VIII Course I had to know what a low TA case was. I knew what a high TA case was. But I had to solve, once and for all, what was the low TA case, so I could give you the hot dope, because that would make a zone or area in doubt, which was in the technique which would continue to worry you. Now I could handle a low TA case at OT 3, because it's forced into one position or another by body thetans. Either the body thetans are gone and he's still standing back thinking they're still there, you can do various things at this, but I had to know the identity of this. Well first it could be cured, more or less, at Power. Pr pr 6 has a tendency if run exactly correctly, to cure a low TA case. And it cures a few of them. But I had to find out exactly what this was. So I sat back and I figured out exactly what is a low TA case. Exactly what is one? And I want to teach you this exact mechanic, because this was totally by synthesis. I hadn't had a low TA. Don't know anything about them. No reality on this of any kind whatsoever. So I had to figure it out from scratch.

And here is the basic background of the low TA case. Now let me Now. Let me show you here, let me show you here what we will call a time track. Now, this time track here is wide, from the bottom up, in terms of time. We don't care what gradients they are. This is the actual time track in which he would be in valence. You got it? He would be in valence. OK? Now, at this low point of the time track we have an area where the individual has had an incident on his own time track, which is so gruesome that he has gone into the behavior I have seen on some preclears. Some preclears desert their own sphere and action to a point where, in the engram, you pick it up originally, you find they're a little girl in the crowd at this execution, and they can't quite tell what kind of an execution it is, but they're a little girl in the crowd. And you run it through the next time, and you find out that there were actually a post on they think maybe, the gallows. And then you run it through again, and you find out they finally discovered who they were. They were the headsmen's axe. And it's a beheading.

And then you run it through again and you find out that they're the headman. And then you run it through again, and so help me Pete, there they are on the block and down comes the axe. In other words, they've gone out of valence successively and repeatedly, further and further out of valence. You got it? That was because they wouldn't want to be that, they couldn't confront being there, and so on. Now that experimental data is from way, way back. Way, way, way, way back. 1952, and so forth. So I would action, "What the hell is this low TA?" I know when the guy goes out of valence. I have this much check on it. When he goes into valence of a body thetan, or he goes out of valence, he goes into a low TA. Well what the hell could this be?

Alright, well what it was is he had this horrible experience. And he moved off there, off the time track. He moved from here over to there. He went. He says, "To hell with being that guy. That guy gets into trouble. I'm somebody else now."

So there he was safely over there. Now that experience then keys out and, you see by a dotted line here, he comes back onto his own time track. And then he lives for a little while on his own time track, and then one day somebody's selling headsmen's axes or something, and he goes flip. And actually he goes back into that incident. It's a lock. He's now out of valence again. Do you see? You got it? And every time you have a lock on this you charge that up some more. Charge the basic incident up some more. See? So that's another bar. Another bar on the side over here. See?

So now he comes up the line again, and he comes all trustworthy, and everything is fine, and he thinks life is gorgeous, and everything is OK. And all of a sudden he gets himself into... He finds himself standing on the platform of amongst a crowd. And he says, "Oh my god!" You know, reality break. "Ahhh!" Break. No where to go. Another lock. Puts another one on here.

Down on this basic one. See? We'll try to label the engram. And this is lock one, the first time it happened, lock two, the second time it happened.

Now he comes back over here more cautiously. But when he runs into a little girl like the one in the crowd, he goes bango! Out here, out of valence, which is lock three. Got it? Each time it's takes him longer and longer and longer to come back onto his own time track, and to be himself. Do you see? And every time this happens, there was lock one, lock two, and lock three. They're adding up charge down here.

Now after a while, down here in the engram, the guy, that thing is just so charged up with locks he couldn't get anywhere near it. He just couldn't come close to it. So that if you tried to get it by normal engram running, he just wouldn't go near it. And anybody who even faintly invalidates him, he's in such a state after a while, anybody who faintly invalidates him drives him out of valence. So his tone arm goes down.

So on such a person invalidation knocks his tone arm out of sight. That means that there is such an incident as this on the track. It is so neglected that even though he knows he's mocking things up and so forth, he doesn't even know enough about it to know that he's still mocking it up. Do you see that mechanism?

Well I figured this all out synthetically. This is all synthetic. Cause I don't have it. So what I did is I put together a whole bunch of words which when assessed would make a guy have the idea of moving on his own time track over to there. Overwhelmed, driven out, wiped out, anything you could think of, whereby he was gone here, and appeared over here at the engram.

Now when we assess that, this is the way it, this is the reason it works. When we assess it by, wiped out, overwhelmed, list LX1, when we assess this thing, why we get the basic postulate that's got him over here. We've kicked the edge of it. It's something like boy I don't want there to be anymore of that, whoa... And which comes under dislocated, see? Or denied, or some... He's expressed it in some fashion, do you see? And now, here's the oddity. In order to run this engram, or get near this track, we have got to discharge the locks off the top of it. So we recall being whatever assessed. And that wuf wuf, that puts as you see these big X's, that knocks that off. Then that also knocks that much charge off the engram. Now we find the engram of being, he goes right there, and you get the engram wiped out. Now all of a sudden he can get into valence.

Now just to make sure that he isn't also hung with the overt, you can also run the overt chain of engrams, doing each one past an F/N. That is to say, you've got an F/N on the locks, you got an F/N on the, on the motivator engram, and you can get an F/N also on the overt engram.

Well by that time all of this slide out of valence every time I turn around is cured. And then he can get back to as-ising his own time track, because the trouble with this guy is, is every time he goes out of valence or is the least bit invalidated, he can't get any case gain. The auditor sits into the session, and slightly invalidates him, he slides out of valence, and therefore he doesn't as-is what he's running. So it won't F/N. He actually ARC break needles. He's just dead body. You got the silly mechanics of this?

Well, apparently that's the way it is. That's exactly the way it works out. The wildest thing you ever saw in your life.

So this type of action is as part and parcel of discharging a case. Do I make my point? (Yes.) Now this was an important zone or area of discharge, because I found there was some people that even though you did a four rundown, nothing much happened. So we had to figure out, because that coordinated against the fact they were low TA cases.

Now the odd part of it is you can do this exact action at engram level. Now this really puts one into your hands, boy. That takes a case that's all the way down there at the bottom of the grades. Well you can undoubtedly run it again, up along the line someplace. It will have

changed. But this actually will run clear down at the level of Dianetic engram. So you've got a powerful tool in your hands.

So you find this guy and he just can't seem to make it. And he's got a black field, and he can't see anything. Well of course what he should do is get OT 3. But as the chances of running OT 3 on him without proceeding up through the grades is so slight as to skip it. You couldn't do anything with it. He'd look at you incredulously. He wouldn't believe anything about anything. But you can do this. He'll run very shallowly, he'll probably stay in this lifetime. The engram will erase. He won't have any real idea of what's happening. But boy, will he discharge enough, and all of a sudden he isn't the black field case. Now that's your rough case. Not necessarily the case with the black field, 'cause he intends to be very often high. But they're alike overcharged. They alike don't as-is. But if you get your low TA case, that's the one you use. Got it? I tell you, it'd work on either one of them. But it's your low TA case special. Any such put together as you see in LX-1. And the handling of it is one, two, three, four. And you know exactly what it is.

Alright, now let's take another case. Let's take this, well let's take what used to be the black five. There's the invisible one too. See? But there's the black five. And he's way up through the roof. And he's reading at 5 on the TA. Now that comes down, ordinarily, on the process, "What has been overrun" Rehabbing each one.

You're going to have your heart broken here and there where you give that process out, because somebody's liable to just make a list. The worst you'll see on it is, they make a list and they don't even put down what read, and they don't rehab any of it. And they've made you your list. You could even explain it to some guys and say, "Now look. You list what has been overrun this way. What has been overrun? It is not a legitimate listing question, it merely gives you an assessment. It's a sort of a, of a horrible thing, which lies between listing and nutting and assessment. See? It's neither fish nor fowl. It is simply an auditing question which you happen to write the answers down on. That's all." You could do the same thing. You could write the answers down to level zero. See? And, you'd find one agreed and another agreed, and it wouldn't come out to one item. 'Cause it's not a listing question. But you can use this.

So, the PC is asked, "What has been overrun?" And then he lists, and he gets a long fall. Maybe he lists the first one, and it doesn't read at all. So you don't touch it. And then, long fall, "Alright, very good. Peeling potatoes." You simply rehab peeling potatoes. And you know, I've seen the most complicated rehabs recently, and I suddenly remembered that the earliest rehab bulletins, and so on, have not been condensed and rewritten. There's too much tech in those things. Those, they contain the actual complete steps of a rehab, and a rehab does go that way, but it isn't that hard to rehab. It's just how often was he released on the subject is all you need for a rehab, and it goes F/N and that's it. So you don't have to follow those, those early, early rehab... Remember, those were back written just about the time I was synthesizing Power, and for the first time found that auditors had been overrunning F/Ns. And experience since that time has brought more data to view, and the data which we have brought to view is simply that it is only necessary to ask them the number of times they went release while doing something. And they F/N. particularly if you make them count up the times. It's very simple. So you could, you could actually overrun rehabbing if you get it too complicated. And the only reason people don't rehab, and why it had to be trickily rehabbed, is because the rehab itself was hard to deliver to the PC. So it's been very simplified. "How often were you released?" See? Count the number of times. "How often were you released that didn't F/N?" Or, Were you released? Didn't F/N on that, so count the number of times.' And a guy counts the number of times, and all of a sudden you get an F/N and that's it. And it's an elementary action.

Now while you're doing that you have to watch it, 'cause there's one thing that you don't at this time do, is you have to watch it to make sure that your TRs remain in. You watch it. Because you see, you could rehab operations or something like this, and get an ARC broke needle on it, and not notice it. But an ARC break needle's very easy to establish. Because you've got bad indicators with it. Alright, rehab bad indicators with it. Why just ask if there's an ARC break or something, in connection with this subject. It's as easy to do as that. And,

you put in the Ruds before the release. And it then flies. And the actual mechanism which you're using is, if you, you know, it won't rehab or something like this, and the F/N is an ARC break needle, there's trouble here. Some kind or another. Just put in the Ruds on the subject. And that's quite allowable, because it's on that subject, so it limits it.

Now when you try to put in the Ruds, if you put in the Ruds generally, something like this, made me cough to think about it. If you put in the Ruds, something weird like this, "In living... You know, "In living... Hefore, before living, was there an ARC break?" Enough to make anybody cough.

Now this is a silly one. See? You see, you could ask the guy in any limited way. So in the taking, in the taking of ether; he's an ether sniffer or something. And it won't F/N, something like this. And you could ask him, "Well, in the taking of ether was there any ARC break or something like that?" Because you've limited it. And actually what you'll do is put in the ARC break, and so forth, and you'll get your F/N probably on the ARC break. To hell with the ether, it probably doesn't have any F/N in connection with it. Do you follow? So that you can slide and get yourself sideways out of a rehab by putting in the Ruds in the vicinity of that rehab. You got it? So you don't get caught in a trap of having a no F/N. I know it's, it's rather... It's, is it a going to?

I tested this out one time on the subject of death. Well it was obvious that any mass existed because there had also been a release. It's true, because it makes a sort of a GPM. Freedom, trapped. Do you see? It's a sort of a GPM sitting along here. So anyplace a guy's got a lot of mass he must be comparing it to a release. So in any area of mass there's a release available. Somewhere in it. Now it takes considerable glib auditing skill to all of a sudden say, "Da da da da, been released, and so forth?" "Well yes." You get a fall on it. The only reason it's hung up is there's also a release in it.

You ask this fellow, "Well now, you say you were taking kerosene for kicks", and then it releases, and the needle doesn't move and nothing happens, and no, no there isn't anything to that. It's all the same. Well don't try to force through a release, 'cause there is none. There's gonna have to be some needle action, but if there's mass there there's also a release there.

You can ask yourself if this guy is so stuck in the stuff, how does he also get to here? 'Cause he is in PT. He is in present time. Well how'd he get here? Well he must have moved out of what he was in. See, that, that's quite, quite obvious. So of course if he moved out of what he was in he was stopping it, because it was overrun, as I gave you in the last lecture, so he has the mass, which he's got a stop on it. But remember he's still here, he isn't there. So obviously you can find a release point. Do you see? There's nothing much to this actually. But if you sweat at it too hard you get him up to stopping it. And you can get the stop point and then it won't release, and the TA will go up. So it's a rather slippery action.

So you count the number of times, or something like that, and you don't sweat at it very hard. If it won't release it won't release. And you're going to run into this sooner or later. Find somebody who won't release.

Now there is a way that you can still get a release on it. You say, "Well did you take anything earlier on the track that was similar to kerosene?" "Oh yes, yes. We used to take balderdash in the old days. I just remembered. Yes." F/N. "Thank you." You can get yourself out of that one. Because the overrun is so overrun, that the releases are no longer available in it, don't you see? But these few well chosen approaches to the subject give you a road out.

So, we do what has been overrun. Anything he'd list can be rehabbed. If it reads it can be rehabbed, because he's no longer stall with it. So there is a release point which is registered in it. All you got to do is make it do its' release point again, and he'll come off the obsessive stop. He'll cease to mock it up.

Now if it's driven down to an ARC break needle by this it will be because there's roughness in the session, normally. But you can now put in the Ruds with regard to it, or the session, and it'll rehab. And if it just won't rehab at all, then you just think, "Well what was similar to kerosene earlier on the track?" And you can rehab that, and that will rehab kerosene. Do you understand? That's a very simple action. You've probably been amazed to sit there and watch those F/Ns happen so fast. Well it is a tribute to your smoothness as an auditor. But you're going to have a grade 2, a Class 2 trying to do this for you, and so forth. He will really be sweating. And he'll be saying, "But how could it?" You know? "What if it doesn't? What if I don't get an F/N on it?" That will be the question which you will be having to answer. And the answer is, "Well you better had." And you just tell him to ask for, if it was and how many times. And if he can't do it, to cease and desist the session at once and knock it off. On the first one. Don't let him go through twelve of them. If he can't do it he can't do it.

But the mechanism of it can be so exaggerated, and there can be so much data on it, you know? Wow. You have to have the idea however there is such a thing as mental mass. The mental mass is there because it's hung up on the track because of a GPM. The guy did get out of it. One, he was released before he got into it, and two, he was released when he got out of it. And in the middle of it someplace he may have been released a half a dozen times.

So anyway, the net result of this is, that you have a lot that you can do. Now after the guy's gone along, I mean in C/Sing you've got a lot of it. When a guy's gone along in auditing for six and a half months, and he hasn't had a session for that length of time, and he comes back in again, and his TA is up and so forth, the probability is that there's an overrun in between. And "What has been overrun?" is a completely unlimited process. You're just trying to find out what can we rehab on the case. So the guy puts the item down, the item reads, the auditor rehabs it. Do you see? "What's been overrun?" "Weighing fish baskets." "Very good. Alright, is there a point of release on your weighing fish baskets?" "Oh yes." F/N. "Alright." "Oh yes." No F/N, "How many times?" "Ff ff ff ff, one, two, three, four, five, six, every night. Every night there was a moment of release, I would leave work." F/N. "Thank you." So you're getting off those overruns, one right after the other.

So, discharging the case with anything that would handle throwing him out of valence, it's your LX-1 approach, and they can do more than one of those. That's your low TA, that, he R/Ses easily by the way. A low TA case also R/Ses easily. And then your high TA, your high TA is overruns, and it is vital that you rehab them. Now your normal TA, your normal TA might be just nasty tempered or something. But he is readily solvable. Readily solvable. But you still might have to discharge this. So setting us a PC to have the arades run gives a gain on the grades, the like of which you never heard of before. Wheee!

Now it's a shame to see somebody use the grades to take the TA down, or something dumb like this. Oh, I've seen it done. I've seen it done. It's a shame to see somebody who has come through the grades, and all he's handled is his current PTP. He's actually worried about getting back to Keokuk, and all you see in the arade responses is "Getting back to Keokuk." "I could talk about getting back to Keokuk, my wife will worry if she gets back to Keckuk," it's a service facsimile, "I could make people wrong by not getting back to Keokuk." So the case isn't set up. So you can always get an estimate, not on a personality analysis, but you can always get an estimate. The length of time in session, the thickness of the review forms, and so on. And the number of actions which you take is proportional to the numbers of actions which have had to be taken. It's a direct coordination. So you know immediately it's a resistive case.

Now some people are going to resist like mad, having a resistive case run on them, because they think it's an evaluation. So you can call it a special case. But it doesn't mean anything. It just gives you something else to run. And in a great many of these cases they won't solve even vaguely before you pound right through on that resistive case. That's your real resistive case. Boy when you do the assessment on that thing, and it says "former therapy", fall, fall, fall, fall, fall. You're liable to find something on the order of, when you're dealing with the public at large you're liable to find wild ones. Nothing can... Guy's in scientology in fairly good shape, but boy you can find some wild ones in people walking in off the street. They, after

every session they have to go see their priest to get their throat cut, or something, you know, it's a crazy business. You know? They can't have, sometimes only learn about it. They can't have a session on Saturday because then that's when they go to see their orthodontist or something. And you say, "Who's this?" And then you find out he goes to a person who puts his feet in a machine and turns on a bunch of electricity in order to straighten out the bones. And this is the general somatic which you've been trying to handle on the case. So you can get some weird ones going. And they are interesting. And you can get very involved with these people. But actually he's doing something else, he's mixing therapies. That's for sure. But when you find these things are out, why you can correct them one way or the other.

But when you get right down to handling the actual C/S of the run of the mill case, the only thing you're trying to do is get enough charge off so that it can run the grade, and then boy, will it make a gain. And there's several ways you can do that. I haven't enumerated all the ways that you could do it, but they're equally simple. They're all the simple idiot order of things. Like you do a little assessment, you prep check it. You take things like, well items connected with his profession. Do an L-1 on it. Now what determines what you do on it is relatively the mood you're in. You say, actually I'm not gagging with it because there is a determination on the thing. One of the reasons you prep check the thing as it comes through, one of the reasons why you prep check it as it goes through is one, the action is easy to do and it's totally unlimited, and you feel that the item is suppressed or is pushed down. The reason you do an L-1 is you feel that he's upset about it or ARC broken concerning it. You got it? There is, there is a reason behind the two things. I'm giving you a gag, I should be careful of my gags.

Now. But they're simple things. And they can apply to anything. Now you've got, in the, there are several things which have won out well. Trying to pull a missed withhold by force and duress and so on, is very often, winds you up in the soup. Very now and then, because you may be going up against a low TA case, invalidation involved gives you R/Ses all over the track. Or something dumb like this is liable to occur. Did it ever occur to you to prep check the missed withholds? They'll come out just the same. You discharge it to a point where the guy is willing to look at it, because he's sort of out of valence on the whole subject.

So your best answer to hard to pull missed withholds that you can't get out, and that sort of thing, your best answer to it is actually a prep check, rather than an auditor pushing him up against the wall with a pistol. And a prep check works very well on it.

Your upset conditions are ordinarily best handled with a, upset conditions are best handled in ordinarily actions, with an L-1. Or some species of list like an L-1.

It can be handled in two ways. One, while the PC is upset in the session, it can actually be assessed by general assessment to one item, which you then give the guy as what is wrong with him in the session. That actually can be handled that way. To handle a session ARC break that you don't seem to be able to get to first base on. That can be handled that way. And that was actually its' first reason for design. Couldn't talk to the PC anymore, but you could still assess it. And you could go tearing down the line, get the one that was left reading, indicate the by-passed charge to the PC, and you with just absolute magic, the pc'll just cool right off. That can be handled that way, can be handled in auditing with an "On or in sessions has...", and then just take that line and clear it. Take the next line and clear it. Take the next line and clear it. Take the next line and clear it. Those are the two methods of handling an L-1.

You can always take any list and assess it. Now the one thing that is adventurous to do is to assess a green form. That has proven very unsuccessful. A green form is very successful. It's handled itsa, earlier itsa. On cases that do not have very many remedy B's or anything like that, they haven't had S and D, something like this, they are connected to a suppressive or something, such hatting of that is best handled by an S and D with a W. with your withdraws, unmock, stop assessment. Which one is it, and then you do that remedy B. Now, and that's done by listing and nulling, of course. I said an S and D. It's done by just listing and nulling.

Now your remedy B. if environment beads, if a guy hasn't had too many of them, and so on, your best bet at environment and so on, is, in actual fact, a remedy B, new style, and what you've got for your student who can't seem to dig it, is to find out what : the hell subject he's trying to dig while he's trying to study Dianetics and Scientology. It works like a bomb. You have to find the former subject and what is misunderstood in that. In other words, the study remedy B.

Now you can also take the Dianetics remedy B and you can run it on an psychologist. And if you're ever gonna teach him anything you damn well better had. And you handle it the same way. This doesn't seem to, this hasn't been too heavily stressed, but you could take "In psychology...", do you see? Why, "Who or what's been misunderstood?" Something like this. Then you take that item and you're past, but you wait a minute. We're already handling the guys' past. No, no the guy's got some earlier subject than psychology. See, there was some earlier subject already hung him up. So you could say, "In psychology who or what's been misunderstood?" And you'd get an item and then that straightens out the subject for him. A sort of a remedy A with regard to psychology, you see? Or you could make it a remedy A, and you get something, and you get an answer, and then you list for the earlier subject. It was earlier in psychology, and then you can find out what was misunderstood in that. So there's several ways you can play this cat. It's all the same thing, it's all the same action. So that we take a psychologist, he comes in. He's unable to understand what we're doing, he can't dig it any way or whatsoever. You can run a remedy A, as though he's studying psychology. Do you see? And get his misunderstood off the field of psychology. And then he can study this. But that didn't work. So you do the deeper one. Do you understand?

Now, your rule in case supervision simply follows this. Is, the reality of the case is proportional to the amount of charge off. You want to undertake, if possible, the simplest possible action. Undertake the simplest action available and don't undertake the deeper action until the simpler action has proven ineffective. And then you've still got a shot in your locker.

Now the next thing about it is, is all cases going in to review, or something like that, should be run on some such formulization as a green form. You'll never find out what's wrong with him. But you'd have to teach people to run the whole green form with no lists, before you could trust them with it. Otherwise you're gonna run us fabulous numbers of remedy Bs, fabulous numbers of S and Ds, get into all kinds of fire fights all over the place. Do you understand? You'll get over-reviewing, only because there's listing on the green form. Do you follow? Then you don't ever permit anybody to eve- send anybody over and say what Qual should do with them. No. Do you understand? I mean, some organizational executive cannot send the whole staff in for sea checks. Cannot send the whole staff in for disagreement checks. Cannot send the whole staff in for, you got it? To hell with that. 'Cause it causes the case supervisor infinite trouble. He's got more cases to straighten out now than you can count. So you've had given too many sec checks.

So therefore, you make it a firm rule that nobody can order Qual to do anything, and then to do that then you have to hold Qual to a green form. And then you'll have to force Qual never to run a green form past an F/N. And then don't let them list. Because that's the one they'll goof up the most. And then teach them itsa and eariler itsa.

Anyway, do you see the hang of it, the administration and the general handling of the case supervisor? (Yes.)

Alright, very good. Thank you very much.