

THE BASICS AND SIMPLICITY OF STANDARD TECH

A lecture given on
13 October 1968

What's the lecture number? (Seventeen) Lecture number seventeen. And the date? Thirteenth of October AD 18. And this is one of those, what day is it? (Sunday) Sunday. Well I guess Friday the thirteenth came on Sunday. Alright.

OK. Actually I've told you everything you need to know, and I have no notes, and really I'm just filling in time because I like to talk to you. Our problems are all before us, really, as we finish up, come to the end of the course. They're not behind us, in front of us. For the excellent reason that as case supervisor, and with your course supervisors, we faced at the beginning of the course if anything less trouble than you face. So I am trying to make it as easy for you as I can. And trying to give you anything I know which might make your lot a little bit simpler.

And the main thing that makes life rough is the apparency of a failure of tech. An apparency of the failure of tech. And that's what throws it all out of line. That is the one thing that throws it all out of line. Whatever else might be thought to go out of line, that one for sure throws it out of line. The apparency of a failure of tech.

Now I say the apparently of the failure of tech, because it always is just an apparency. There are many reasons why tech doesn't go in, but they are all under the head of it isn't applied. Somebody gets reasonable. There's a false resort somewhere on the line. These are the two chief sources of how an apparency of failed tech occurs.

In instruction or supervision of courses a supervisor can be so enturbulative that he can actually invalidate the straight data and then, because the straight data is gone, pull into line a great deal of squirrell data to take its' place. And we have seen that happen before. A remark like, "There's no reason to study your basics. What you want is the upper level theory." That's completely bonkers. There isn't any upper level theory. There is basics. And when the basics are in it's in, and that's it. The main thing about it is, is you are working with and trying to get auditing results from and trying to get coached actions out of people who are so overburdened with confusion, that whenever you try to put in a stable, simple datum, a lot of confusion is liable to fly off. It's the old Problems of Work, confusion and the stable datum. So you try to teach somebody, now look. Confront consists of sitting in a chair looking at the PC. And actually you'll put two people in a chair, in two chairs, facing each other, and you say, "This is all there is to TR 0. Now you've got to confront him, and you've got to confront him. And you've got to do it for a couple of hours, and that's that."

Now do you know that more god damned balderdash; we'll have to edit out all these swear words, I got to preserve the image of being saintly. A very hard image to preserve. It's so out of character. The simple action of two people facing each other is so intolerable that it backs right up into supervision. So they sit there and break their confront by one flunking the other. It's an additive. The actual action of TR 0 is two people who can sit facing each other for two hours, without doing a damned thing.

Now do you get, the second it starts to, you start to put in that simplicity, from there on it gets into a hell of a confusion? Now I don't know how you've been taught doing it lately. That's no criticism of how you've been taught doing it. I'm just showing you the basic drill was simply to sit, looking at the other fellow for a couple of hours, without a break, without a flicker, without anything.

Now if there was anybody observing it, it would be not the coach but the supervisor. And any time a guy batted his eyelids and went twitching and scrunching and fell out of the chair, and

started to talk, and anything of this sort, it would be up to somebody else to start him on his two hours all over again.

Now if there's a coach and a student involved, you can reduce it to this so as to take the strain off the supervisor, where one is doing the confronting and the other is doing the coaching. Well now you could add it up, now you see how it goes, you could add it up to where the coach doesn't have to do a confront but the student does have to do a confront. And the coach, he flunks the student every time the coach can't confront. I know that isn't quite right. Let's take a look at this. And we start from two people who are going to sit facing each other, because that is the one thing men have an awful hard time doing. Sitting still doing nothing. And yet it is an essential, because out of the failure of that drill comes an auditor trying to be interesting, and trying to enturbulate a session. So an auditor who is enturbulative to his PC, whose TRs are out, cannot in actual fact sit for two hours and do absolutely nothing. Let's get back to basics. How basic can you get? That is the basic on that drill.

Now in trying to engineer it, and in trying to make it work various ways, why a coach is appointed who policed the other guys confront. Do you follow? Now you could complicate it further by, the coach would do various things to try to break the other fellows' confront. But supposing they did those two things without getting that first one? Supposing neither one of them could actually sit there for two hours and not be interesting, and not do anything, and not say anything? That's the acid test. So even TR 0 can fly upstairs to a later complication and forget the early action. Right? So you get down to a simplicity. The most successful ACC that was ever conducted on the subject of TRs had this as its' maxim. Every question a student asked about TRs, he was simply read the TR. The supervisor was completely stopped from saying anything in answer to the question. He simply got the TRs back. And in bafflement, in ARC break, in upset and otherwise, the guy finally had to study the thing out for himself, and by golly we got TRs in. They really went in in that particular ACC. They were doing a pretty good job by the time it ended. Simplicity.

Now of course there can be an additional on confront. Yes, of course. Of course there can be a coach who flunks the other guy for not confronting. Naturally. But let's start it out where it belongs. Can two people sit facing each other without doing a thing, without twitching at all, for two, solid, consecutive hours, without a whisper? Now if they can do that, then you can do something else with TR 0. Do you see how basic the basic is?

Well what happens? You'll ask him to do anything as simple as that, and immediately a bunch of questions and confusions start blowing off. I don't care how you've been taught your TRs here. It is completely irrelevant. I'm just using it as a point. I'm just trying to show you a demonstration here. Now the auditor who's got to be interesting, who can't administer, who can't do this, who can't learn his meter, who can't get his TR 1 or his TR 2 in, actually can't pass that test. Can he sit for two hours, absolutely doing nothing? Now if he can do that, great. And if you had somebody supervising that operation who started his two hours out every time he flunked it... You put a clock up there for that session. Like one of these photo timers. And the guy, all of a sudden, started going this way, or started doping off, or something like that, somebody simply hit the button to begin the two hours. You would wind up with unenturbulative sessions.

Now to that ability you can add speaking, replying, handling origins, handling a meter. Now if you can do all those things without any question and with great calmness, then you can add to it the admin necessary, and you've built it up from somewhere. So all I'm trying to show you here is just an example of how you build it up.

If you started in on this basis, this individual, you're trying to teach this individual just one thing. You're trying to teach him that an F/N must be put down on the report form. Now you obviously have got to show him what is an F/N, he's got to know what an F/N is, you've got to know what a report form is, and he has to be built all the way up to there or you can't teach him.

Now it's very remarkable that we have just found a case which has had a bit of trouble with auditing and has been a little bit difficult to handle in session. And I'll be a son of a gun if there weren't about three lower grades that had never been run. Here the person had gone all the way up into the OT sections with three lower grades hanging fire. Now it'll make a tremendous difference, tremendous difference, because those three lower grades have now been put in. It will now make a tremendous difference to the case in its' progress, because what happens is, is when some lower step is missing on the staircase, and the fellow doesn't make it, he just more or less keeps marking time on that step.

Now the grade, what they call the gradation chart, is the only ladder anybody is climbing now. And I can actually give you, and will, a simplified gradation chart, which gives you the exact whats and whiches as it goes up. There are several of them struck out on the original issue. One is the CCHs in lieu of problems. It's not in lieu of, it's not in lieu of problems at all. If you had to run the CCHs in order to run problems you would run both the CCHs and the problems process. You can't run the CCHs and then say the guy's a problems release. Do you follow? Doesn't make sense.

But I can give you a simplified gradation chart, and will. But where those blocks are missing on the line the case is not going to do well. And the higher they go the more trouble they will have. And then can even get up to a point of where they're trying to make clear and keep falling on their heads. Try to make clear and fall on their heads. Try to make clear and fall on their heads. Try to make clear and fall on their heads. There isn't enough charge off, that's the whole thing. Not enough charge off the case.

Now, look. You know about that. I've told you all about that. But let's look at training. And let's apply the same gradation idea to training. Where you leave out a basic simplicity the guy will now have a complexity, and his training will go around the bend. So we find this fellow who cannot, in actual fact, turn in a session. It's always some weird thing. PC falls on his head afterwards, and so on.

Now we're going to look for some very complex reason, because that's all we're going to get off this fellow. That's for sure. All we're going to get off of him in explanation is very, very complex reasons. "Well you see, I really don't hold with the idea that man is basically a spirit, or basically good. Actually he might or might not be, and that has always been difficult for me, and therefore my training..." Well, that has something to do with male cows. He can't audit because he's got basics gone on his gradation scale of training. There's something, brother, he doesn't know nothin' about.

Now you could take your little handy, Jim Dandy made up assessment, and you could actually find out what it was. This is getting very clever. This is the case supervisor fixing a guy up so he can be trained. And we do an assessment. And it has the steps of training, see? "TRs, E-meter, administration, reports..." You get the idea? You just go along the whole thing. And you could even rack it up 'till there's a gradient sort of scale of the things you learn. Assess the thing out, and you'll find the hole. And it'll be a big hole. All you have to do, all you'd have to do then if you are auditing it of course, is prep check it. Something like that. And you will find out exactly what it is, and so on. But you weren't doing it for that reason. You're trying to find out where he's missing on training. And you find out, it'll be something very stupid. It'll be something very stupid. He'll finally tell you that the week he was supposed to go through the Comm Course in the academy, actually that week he had to be out, and there was a good reason for it, because he actually had a suit going at that time, and if he hadn't been present, so he wasn't able to take the Comm Course. It's something stupid like this. And it'll be something big.

Now when you know the standard steps of something, the reasons why somebody can't attain it look like boulders. They're not tiny little pebbles that are very, very hard to find. They're all through their auditing reports. They're all through their training reports. It becomes very, very obvious. But you have to, in order to appreciate that, break down what are the steps. What are

the things one has to be able to do in order to audit? What are the things one has to be able to do?

Now, you could do something this simple. This is all under the heading of standard tech. That would be standard auditing. There are certain things you'd have to know how to do. You'd have to know how to run an E-meter, and you'd have to know how to write, and you would have to know, you get it? You'd have to know these little simplicities. You could make a list of what they are. And they're not many.

Now, on a case, what does the fellow have to be able to do? The fellow has to be able to relax enough in order to... Well he has to be able to talk. Let's start lower than that. He has to be able to extrovert to some degree, so that he can find out that there is somebody trying to talk to him about something more than a social conversation. Now you pick up many a PC, and when you first start, when you first start; this is gonna blow your head off in a minute. When you first start auditing them they audit very slow, and very badly. And then you run what you've got. And you run ARC Straightwire. The old style is the one that really makes the gains. That is, "Recall something that was really real to you." See? They're not the little, tiny, shortened commands. I don't know where they came from. It's the long ones. "Recall something really real to you." A time when you were, "Recall a time when you were in good communication with someone." Those are the real ones.

And all of a sudden the guy extroverts enough to find out there's an auditor there. Now he's still introverted, but you run some secondaries to F/N, you find moments of loss. And I'll show you how this can be skimped. Somebody can get the locks by "Recall a loss" run, and then mark down that the fellow has gone release on secondaries. And you know I've seen it on now on folder after folder? The guy was never run on a secondary in his life. They just said, "Recall a moment of loss." And the guy F/Ned on it, and they said, "That's it. He's been run on secondaries." What a damn lie. You've seen the mechanism working right now.

You run a guy, we can recall a moment of loss and then you can go back and run a guy through an engram of loss. Pardon me. You can run him through an engram of loss, you can run him through a secondary of loss. You can run him through both. I have something to tell you about that tonight. I might as well you now.

One of the reasons we know that every secondary, which is a misemotional incident, has below it an engram, is because every once in a while somebody falls through the ice. You're trying to run a secondary and you find yourself running an engram. It just happened on a case today. It isn't something to really blame an auditor for, unless he forces somebody from the secondary into the engram. But every mis-emotional moment has a moment of pain immediately and directly underlying it. There's pain and unconsciousness on the earlier track than every secondary. But a secondary can be run independently. The deaths of loved ones, and that sort of thing. Boy, you can make a PC shed buckets of tears when you really run a secondary. But look how, look how it could be skimped. "Recall a moment of loss. Yes. Thank you. Good. That F/Ned." A fellow just recalled losing a paper clip. Then he F/Ned 'cause he didn't think it was important. See?

Now you say he's a secondary release, ta da, ta da, ta da, ta da. God damn. I've seen a woman who looked like she was about sixty five, when she was about thirty five, run on a secondary, a real secondary, and run through it for blood, for real, come out at the other end looking like she was about twenty one. There's a terrific gain to be gained there.

Alright, this extroverts the person some more, don't you see? Now you take the available engram and you're going to find, this is also going to include his psycho somatic illnesses. If you really run the available engram. This is gonna be the chronic ache or pain that he complains about the most. So you run that, you extrovert him some more. Now you've extroverted him to a point of where he can really see the auditor. Now he's ready to consider communication. Up to that time he could do the commands, something might get some place. But you now have, for sure, extroverted him. You've extroverted his attention. You would be absolutely amazed,

but a certain percentage of PCs who walk into a session, and so on, never see a wall. They see a picture of a wall in front of a wall. And you have to interrogate them very closely to know what's going on, because it seems too usual to them to be remarked on. So they see a picture of the wall in front of the wall whenever they see a wall. Now don't think that these characters don't make mistakes when they start to handle machinery, and plow cars off the road, the guys who can't drive on roads and have accidents on roads are exclusively just doing this. They're doing it with wild abandonment. They're driving on a mocked up road. And they're driving with mocked up controls. They're confront is not up to looking at the control panel of an automobile or at the gear shift or through the windshield. They depend on looking at a picture. In other words, it's safer to look at the picture than it is to look at the actual object. Because the actual object, they think, could kick them in the teeth. There are lots of these guys around.

So you sit down, and you try to short it all up. And you say, we're going to run a communication process zero, without setting this case up. Well you could often find, you can often find a case is not running because its' sub zeros are out. The case hasn't been extroverted enough to really be audited on something analytical. Something like communication and so on. You've got to dig them up. Dig 'em up and audit 'em is your process of line.

Now this is what'll knock your head off. Do you know that there's tremendous numbers of cases running in the OT sections that cannot define an ARC break? Do not know what a missed withhold is? Do not know what a present time problem is? So that you ask them for a missed withhold, you get a PTP. You ask them for an ARC break and you get a missed withhold. You ask 'em for an ARC break, you get a PTP. You ask them for a PTP, you'll get an ARC break. And I have seen auditors sufficiently foggy on the subject to ask the person for an ARC break, get a PTP, and then run ARCU on it, and wonder why he can't get a read. That's why you can't get the Ruds in. Talk about the blind leading the blind. If the auditor doesn't know what these Ruds are exactly, why, and then the PC never has had the command cleared for him, how could you ever get the Ruds in? It isn't that the words are addressed to some tune. You actually have to get these Ruds in. There are real ARC breaks there. The PC doesn't know what to call them. And he doesn't know that those are ARC breaks. Do you see how auditing could be screamingly out?

Now have you ever heard of clearing a command? Well why don't you clear rudiment commands? See? That's an omission. Well it's an omission because after it's been done a time or two on a PC, it doesn't have to be done anymore. Nevertheless, if I was auditing a PC and I got some kooky answer, I ask for an ARC break and the guy says, "Yes, I can't make up my mind whether to leave my husband or not." Wow! I would know dog-gone well, I would know dog-gone well that this character had never had his rudiments clean. And I wouldn't take it up so as to ARC break him or drown him or force him or knock him in the head in a session. I wouldn't. I would let him get away with it one session, and then the next session I would clean those rudiments up by command until they ran out of his ears. You understand?

But in order to do that I would have to know what they were, wouldn't I? So let us take such a thing as an ARC break. What the hell is an ARC break? It's a break in affinity, reality or communication, or understanding. And that is everything it is, and that is all it will ever be.

Now that's a break in affinity. Now what is a break in affinity? It is represented by emotion. Now any emotion below affinity is of course in the range of the field of emotion. And do you know I had somebody the other day defining an ARC break, and defining affinity as unhappiness, upset, ow wow! Awful. What the hell? So somebody, when they say, "I'm trying to attain ARC with somebody" would be defining it as something they didn't want to have. So therefore you would get a backwards answer to every ARC break. If they like somebody they would have an ARC break because... So we would get into some wild, screaming mess here of some kind or another.

Now here's an even worse one. Here is a worse one. Believe it or not, just today, I did a session from another zone, where recall was defined as going back on the track and going through it. And the auditor was a little bit upset, and he didn't catch it and straighten it out. He

didn't redefine it as remember, he didn't do anything to square this thing out. And I think very often auditors consider trying to clarify the command as evaluation of some kind. What you're trying to do is make the English come straight.

We ran into a guy not too long ago who couldn't run havingness because he didn't own anything. That is to say, he had no bill of sale to it. He couldn't run havingness 'cause he didn't have any bills of sale. Another thing is, we have a child's dictionary on board, and the damn thing says source is starting point. You can't define it to a child and then run Pr Pr 4, because that's a mis-definition of source. So somewhere along the line I'm sure going to have to write down the accurate definitions of these words in English.

Sounds absolutely incredible that you'd have to rewrite the English language for the English speaking people. It's in their big dictionaries. We're not using it incorrectly. Affinity is affinity. But somehow or other people get this thing going.

Now let's look at this recall as a return. Do you realize that you could never then do an LX-1, set the case up? Couldn't. How could you do an LX-1 and set it up with a recall process and then run the engram? You couldn't, because he'd always run the engram.

Now look at the horrible mess this case would be in! He goes through life recalling or remembering things by going back on the track and going into the engram. Look! Now that's what we mean by basics are out. The command is not understood, the command is not delivered, the command is not answered. This guy was actually asked to recall an LX-1 thing, and defined it as going back on the track and going through it. Was asked the recall question after giving this definition. He answered it just once, and after that they had to run the engram. He ran the engrams very badly because they wouldn't, couldn't be set up. And here was a marvelous point of education. This fellow had never heard of recalling. He's never heard of remembering. He doesn't remember. So what the hell good is a reviews? The review would be pointless. You could review this guy endlessly. Forever! If you just hunt and punched, and punched and hunted, and... The commands that he's been given have never been cleared with him. He never answers the auditing command. It doesn't matter what you do with him. He can't discharge the bank, all you do is plunge him into it.

Now the reason the reviews would be no good is because the second he leaves the session, and suddenly remembers that they didn't take up Aunt Hatties' death, he promptly throws himself into the secondary to remember Aunt Hatties' death. This PC doesn't know how to remember.

Now I've run against cases like this before. And I make them run the engram of having come in the room. Mm. Make 'em run entering the room for the session as an engram. Do you realize there're people around who live in the physical universe as a perpetual engram? Each successive moment of the time track is just another moment of pain and unconsciousness. It's the wildest thing you ever saw. And this person inevitably would give you a recall process as returning. They're charged up like a galvanic battery. You say, "Did the letter come?" The fellow moves back down the track to when the postman appeared, and moves through the incident in order to give the answer. And the funny part of it is, is this guy always has this weird comm lag which you never can quite figure out when you try to talk to him. And that's what he's doing.

Now of course this stuff doesn't erase because it's too late on the track. He's moving through life as a perpetual engram. Now when you actually throw him into an engram that has a violent fire fight of some kind or another, he really falls on his head. And the only way he gets an F/N is by bouncing. Bounce into PT, or bounce into the future, or something of this sort. And then you get a sort of an F/N with no GIs.

So you get a case like this, see? And you audit it. Or you get somebody, if you're trying to train, how do you get this guy going? How do you, how do you actually get him to audit? These are very difficult problems unless you know the magic answer. There is something missing along the line of the ordinary. Which they're making very extraordinary indeed. Or

there's just something missing. 'Cause you believe that somebody has turned up pretending to be a Class VI, pretending to have been fully trained in academies and on the Saint Hill Course, pretending to have gone through and been audited on every grade up to OT 4? Who knew nothing about an engram, nothing about a meter, nothing about auditing, nothing about nomenclature. This was a mysterious character to have walking around in the environment. A person is allegedly about OT 4, and they're supposed to know about auditing, but they talk to Joe Blitz, and all of a sudden after talking to Joe Blitz, Joe Blitz in some incalculable fashion is ARC broken, and you say, "What did you tell him?" "Well I didn't tell him anything, I just told him his English actually wasn't up to being able to answer the auditing commands, and that he'd better go study his English a little bit more." And the guy was an Englishman, you see? You get a fend off of some kind or another. His ARC break was no auditing. 'Cause he blew him but good. He's never studied, hadn't been to any academy, never been through the Saint Hill Course, never been audited on the lower grades, and had never opened the cover of a single OT section. But had simply received them and turned them back in.

This was revealed when pretending to have a Class VI almost, except for the last item or two on the checksheet, we sent to Saint Hill to get that checksheet. And voluminous correspondence ensued, and the people at Saint Hill looked all over for that checksheet, and they couldn't find that checksheet. And we finally checked it up and really got the facts on it. The reason they couldn't find the checksheet, is she wasn't on the Saint Hill Course long enough to be issued one. But had simply walked onto the course, been told she had to have a checksheet and had blown.

Now a character like this makes a fantastic spoof, because that character's pretending like crazy to have had this, that or the other thing for various reasons, and so you as case supervisor, or you as a training supervisor come along and you'll take this on its' face-value. But it doesn't go anyplace. There is something very missing, and that is what will give you your apparency of tech failures.

You will immediately consider the preponderances that something has been done wrong. No, the majority of these apparencies of tech failures is nothing was done at all. It's the craziest situation you ever really cared to walk into. It's a sort of a situation that haunts you after a while. But look at the ARC break this person must lay into the environment. He has allegedly been trained. Alright, if he's been trained, how come he doesn't know? If he's an OT 4, how come he goes around trying, pardon me, not OT 4, but if he's a grade four, how come he's going around trying to mane everybody wrong? Do you see? The people in his immediate vicinity become mystified. And it operates as an invalidation of tech.

Well, that's serious in its' own area. It has an affect upon morale, and it lays a mystery into the environment. And this happen all too frequently I assure you. But that isn't actually the basis of what I'm trying to tell you. This is the one that really bugs you as a case supervisor or as a training supervisor. You get this guy and you have him do a session. You get this guy and you have him do a session, as case supervisor, and it doesn't come off. The session doesn't occur. And then you do your nut and you try to force him in, and you put him in a condition and that sort of thing, and you try to straighten this thing out. And you give him another chance and something else falls on its' head, and you can't quite figure out what the hell is going on here. Well I'll just give you a stable datum. It is the missingness of the basics.

Do you know I found out one time some fellow, it's very true that any auditing at all is better than no auditing. That's still true. You can sure wrap a guy around a telegraph pole, but brother, he'd be in a hell of a shape if he wasn't audited at all. That's still true. But you can get, you can get some of the weirdest ones. And boy they really puzzle you. 'Till all of a sudden you see a tremendously long session, or some auditor who is not too bad, is trying like screaming crazy to get something done in that session, and he goes on and on and on and on, trying to get this thing done. And he can't get this thing done, and the person just doesn't seem to be able to follow that line. No, this person's, this person... Don't always blame the auditor. -The auditor to some degree may be to blame. You can keep trying to smooth out the auditor, for sure. But man, there is something out. There is something very, very basically out. And

you now better make is your business to find out what it is. And your business as case supervisor then is trying to find out what in the name of god is out with this case. So you can order a check of cases, just had one. Just ordered this. And it came off very successfully. And so forth. The person was actually given, "Check all lower grades", and then the next C/S was, "Run any of those found not to have been run." And there were several lower grades that were out, and they have now been audited. And you'll find now the person will fly.

But you seldom look as far as the person has never answered the question "Do you have an ARC break?" See? The person has never answered the question, "Do you have a present time problem?" So look, if he can't answer the question, does he have a present time problem, is he a problems release? Well he couldn't be a problems release, because problems had never defined for him, he has no definition of problems so he's never been run on problems. He doesn't know what they are. You ask him for a PTP, you don't get any answer. You get some balderdash. "Yes, I have a problem. I didn't tell you yesterday."... Now your response to that in training is simply make these guys define these things within an inch of their lives. Make them define 'em in clay and so forth. And it straightens it all out. And after that all of a sudden, why things start going along great that weren't going along before. Or, in the subject of auditing, get each command cleared and make the auditor write down the full details of clearing the command. And there's too many auditors think clearing the command is just getting what the PC said and writing it down on a piece of paper, and running it. I could boot such an auditor. And he's supposed to get a dictionary, and he's supposed to go into these words, and he's supposed to get this thing clarified as to what is the thought he's trying to put across.

And today I saw Pr Pr 4 blow up. Power process 4. Blew up because of source. Source. It was defined as the starting point. And the PC was sitting there trying to figure out a race track, or something. The actual truth of the matter is that Pr Pr 4 did not get run on the case, but 5, 6 and 5A did. That's a hell of an omission, isn't it? But it didn't get run. It sort of went, actually it F/Ned on the PC saying they felt good before he started this. Rehabbed, in other words. Now Power that is thrown out this way is practically not repairable. There's very little you can do about it. You can't fool around with this. But somewhere up the line that's going to show up on the case. Pr Pr 4 not flat. And the time it does, why we trust that the auditor at that time will clarify the auditing commands and run it.

So how out can an outness be? Well you have to figure out what does an auditor have to do to audit, what does a PC have to know in order to answer the question, and you really got, you really got your fundamentals. An ARC break is a break in affinity, reality, communication or understanding. What is a break? Well it means a drop. An end off of it.

Now, if you have a person who is completely impossible to run, and is not educated at all along this line at all, you've still got the clear the word affinity. Cause it doesn't mean any other word. It means affinity. A feeling of sameness with.

Now the reason an ARC break takes place is only because there's been ARC before it. And what you're doina is mending the flow. And if there... All ARC breaks have to be preceded by ARC. I don't think you could have an ARC break with an enemy who had never been a friend. That's why civil wars are so bitter. Because they're fought over an ARC break. But a foreign war is very often fought with great gallantry and so forth, and back a few centuries aao there were commanding officer of an infantry company was doffing his hat to the other infantry company, and saying, 'Gentlemen you may have the first shot.' But they don't fight civil wars that way. The Russian Revolution is the damndest piece of cruelty I ever heard of. Because it is ARC break. There was ARC, and now it's busted. There are no fights quite as violent as those which follow a great love.

So therefore somebody has to know this in order to run it. He has to know what affinity is. A break in affinity. He has to know what break in reality is concerned. And there is another way of running it, which is perfectly legitimate. You see, we have a portmanteau word because we understand it. ARC break. A break in affinity, a break of reality, and a break in communication, and a break in understanding. An upset, you could say, in affinity, an upset in

communication, upset in reality, an upset in understanding. Or, you don't have to say an upset in understanding, you could say a misunderstanding.

Now this is so far out that the other day I gave an auditing item, I said, "Assess something or other, and then get anything that was misunderstood in it." And the auditor, so help me Pete, I don't know why he departed from the C/S, but he ran ARC breaks in it. I said, "Anything that was misunderstood", and the question was never asked the PC. But instead, "Did the person have any ARC breaks with it?" I was already talking about missing ARC breaks. It would've all come out clean. And it came out all of a sudden, finally after two or three columns of hard sweat, the auditor not having asked the question he had been told to ask, the PC cognized like mad that she hadn't, that there was a big misunderstanding on the subject, and that she didn't understand it. And it F/Ned.

Now, this is a matter of basics. These are a matter of basics. And anytime you're trying to put something together, don't go into the airy-fairy wonderland of it all. Do something simple. A guy can't, I don't know, he's somehow or another he just doesn't seem to be able to run ARC Straightwire. Unsatisfactory result. Something kooky. Well, let's get a definition of this word recall. What does he mean by it? There can be an infinity of variations from the correct one. Oh, a fantastic number of variations on the actual definition of recall. I'm sure. I'd hate to be given the task of dreaming up all possible variations on a correctness on anything. Because they are infinite. Absolutely infinite. So you've got to find what is the wrong one, and get the right one. Your wrong one would just be some invariable.

Now the weird part of it is, that if you just clear the command "recall" on some PC, just order that the command "recall" be cleared, and it is cleared, the PC goes F/N for the first time in his life. Why? He's never recalled anything before. He didn't know how to do this. Brand new idea to him. And that's the truth about this PC that I C/Sed just today. His whole case lies straight in that weird definition of recall.

So there're quite a few very simple basics. Now you're going to get a hold of somebody sometime and order that an engram be run on him. And your auditor's going to send you back a fire fight. You've ordered the guy to a moment of pain and unconsciousness, but he didn't have any place to go. What is out there is he had never, under gods green earth, ever realized that anybody ever made any pictures, including himself, he doesn't know what the hell these pictures are. He has never associated it, that's completely foreign to him. And you will also find out the guy doesn't have any past either. He has some intellectual concept of the fact that he might have been here yesterday, but he couldn't swear to it.

When you get one of these basics out in the field of auditing, recognize that you do not need a tremendous number of complications to explain why the case won't live. If these fundamentals of auditing, these grade processes done on a case bring him up toward a native state, a much more desirable, more potential level, then recognize that any one of the elements connected with those levels, if out, any one of those elements bars the way.

Now I'm trying to get you to look at very basic basics. How can you run an auditing command. This is this tribe of Indians that as up there, up in New York, up the Hudson River, and so on. They had a tremendous number of sayings before the advent of the white man. Like, "The way to cross the river is cross the river." See? "The way to cook ducks is to cook ducks." You know? They had a lot of these things. Well, this is sort of the game line of country, except it now makes very good sense. The way to get a case to F/N on a recall process is to get him to recall. The way to get a case to F/N on an engram process is to get him to go through the engram, or to earlier similar incidents, until you get an erasure, and then you'll get an F/N. But what do you have to do to do that?

Well it's usually the business of the auditor, and when the auditor doesn't take care of it it backs right up into the lap of the case supervisor. And you will, you're going to be in the position where you'll be saying, "Run Dukes on recall an auditor." The thing winds up in a mess. PC gets all massy, TA goes up, you decide there must be something horrible on the

track. You might immediately leap to a complex conclusion that some horrible auditing had been done, which when it was disclosed, and pofwa flea fwa fwa, and waffle waffle waffle, whereas the matter of fact, the guy does not know how to recall anything. So therefore, clearing auditing commands is part of the basics of standard tech. And this class right here, I had to teach you how to clear the rudiments. And I don't think it had ever occurred to anybody before that the reason the case wasn't in session was because the rudiments were out, and the rudiments were out was because the rudiments had never been cleared. Nobody was really insisting on an answer to his question. "Do you have an ARC break?" The guy gives you a PTP. Nobody was insisting on an answer to his question. He bought that, he bought that. I wouldn't have bought it. Without invalidating and pushing in the pcs' anchor points I wouldn't have bought that. For that session, yes.

Next session, "Now we're going to clear the auditing command for you, 'Do you have a present time problem?' What does present mean?" And this girl says, "Oh, a mink coat, so on." And you say, "Well let's get the dictionary and look it up. See what present means." "It's like I said, a mink coat, so forth. Yeah, I got problems about mink coats." You don't know what goes on in peoples' minds. Don't make up your mind that you do, because you start going into that never-never land, and boy you are going to go into an infinity of variables. You know exactly what you mean.

But you have to know, as a case supervisor or as an auditor exactly what these things mean. A present time problem is one which occurs in the now-ness of things. It is a problem in the now-ness of things. The basis of a problem is a postulate, counter-postulate. Mass, counter-mass. Intention, counter-intention. It is two forces interlocked, or threatening to, and occurring in now. And it has to be in action now to get in the road of auditing. So if the PC doesn't know what present means, and thinks it's mink coats or something, you're always going to get a problem, because there've been an infinity of them on the track. You'll also get eventually an ARC broken PC, because she never can clean up problems.

She answers problems in this wise. "Uh, let's see, problems, problems, problems, problems, have I ever had a problem?" You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" The PC says, "Have I ever had a problem? Let me see. Yes, I think back in 1722, now my recall's opening up a little bit, I had a problem. Now Christ, I wish we would get off of this process because I always seem to have problems, yap yap yap." Don't you see? Well the PC actually, you can clear it false reads, you can do this and that with it. But any time you have to clear a rudiment with a false read, some auditor the person's had in the past, or that PC sitting right in front of you, or that is being audited on your case supervision, does not know the definition of it. So if you see false read on present time problems coming up and is having to be user, then you order the "Clear present time problem cleared. I handled that by making everybody in this class do the rudiments in clay. I cleared it all at one fell swoop. I'm not berating you, I'm just showing you how this is gonna get in your hair. Because if I had to clear some of these things up with you guys, wow! What are you going to do with raw public, and things? Huh"

So you say to this fellow, I've seen idiocies happen on this little three year old kid walks in for a session, and the auditor says, "Do you have an ARC break?" Wow. And the kid tries to give him some answer. Here in the Sea Org. why, they auditor's very often fooled. He asks a six or seven year old kid if he has an ARC break, and the kid answers him very glibly indeed. Tells him where all the spots are, 'cause these kids know their business. Don't expect somebody walking in from the public would.

Do you see what fundamentals are? How fundamental is a fundamental? When you're walking on the sidewalk it is the sidewalk. It isn't, it isn't a composition which may or may not have come into being and which may or may not be made of infinite mind. I can tell you that OT 8 you're in for some shocks of simplicity. The great mystery of the physical universe is no mystery. But it is too simple. So therefore it gives problems. Do you follow?

So you have problems occurring every time somebody has avoided the basic. You have difficulties and complexities and errors arising when the basic is out. Now the way you put the

basic in, is to get it clarified as to that is the basic. In auditing itself, that's all you are doing, is clarifying the basic. So if you start to clarify the basic with a misunderstood auditing question you're never going to get down to the basic in the first place. Do you see how idiotic this... It's simple! It's too simple. It's, it's actually simple, you know, to a point where, ham. Well you can get very baffled trying to put it across sometimes. You tell this fellow, "Turn on your E-meter." And that's a very simple action to you. But he, for some reason or another, has read a whole series of directions about the electronic potential of sweat and the hyper sensitive neurons, and how the capsulized long fronts go wobble wobble Wobble wobble, and the business of turning on an E-meter to him is a production like setting up the electric light plants and light lines of a city, even back to mining the coal. You will see some characters in the lower, lower, lower areas of training, you say, if you put your E-meter in front of them and you say, "Turn on the E-meter." The guy doesn't reach over here for the sensitivity knob. What he does is he... "Just a minute I'll get it, yeah, yeah, heh heh..." If I ever saw anybody do that I'd put him back on E-meter drills for forty eight hours nonstop. "You're supposed to have checked out an E-meter, huh? Good. Turn it on for me." I might even do that if an auditor's giving me a lot of trouble in sessions. I'd say, "Turn on your E-meter." If he goes... "Just a minute, I'll get it. Ah, yea." Boy, he'd sure be back studying E-meters.

How the hell can he operate an E-meter when he can't even turn it on? You see what I mean? Now if this is the thing which you look for in the case, if this is the thing which you look for in the student, if this is the type of basic you are trying to put in, you will win all the way!

Wherever you see an appearance of unworking tech, it's this sort of thing that is out. And it is frankly, too idiotic for you to easily grasp. You'll laugh like hell over these things sometimes when you finally find out what is out. Wow! It's unbelievable! It is always some piece of damn foolishness. It is never anything complex. So therefore, you get asked for answers to conditions that don't even exist. You say "This PC has had a great deal of fwa fwa, and he's done a great deal of study. And back in llama time, and so on, he seems to have a tremendous amount of ability, and therefore he should actually be audited on some easier process, or such higher level process, because he says these processes are too easy for him." I've seen one like that. "Ding a ling." Good. Find out if he's ever been run on ARC Straightwire." "I did. He hasn't." "Then how do you know the processes are too easy for him?" "Oh, I get what you mean." "Run ARC Straightwire on him." If they do this guy comes up shining.

But you're presented with problems which don't exist. The appearance of unworking tech includes with it the appearance of difficulties which don't exist in the first place. And the way you surmount all this, and the ease with which you surmount all this, is one hundred percent. Just look for the out-basics, to hell with what they're chattering about. Actually assume the attitude that monkeys chatter endlessly but they don't necessarily make any sense. They say that fifty million monkeys writing for fifty billion years would write all the works of Shakespeare. But I don't think any publisher would wait around that long.

Now you're going to get, "Well, fwa fwa fwa." Now there's an old policy. It's the person who takes conclusion from juniors is going to fall on his head. You can trace back your more serious administrative errors to taking a conclusion of a junior without getting the facts. You have had... The junior has told you some conclusion, and you'll find out they normally will tell you conclusions, because they haven't got any facts. "And I think we ought to discontinue processing this PC for the excellent reason that he has not yet made any gains." That's a conclusion. You say, "What is the data on this PC?" "Well I think we ought to discontinue the..." He didn't give you any data, did he? He gave a conclusion. "What is the data on this PC?" "Well, he's very hard to audit." That's a conclusion. It's no data. What you're going to have to do is train up and regiment people on the straight forward basis of, "Look, son, when I asked you for data I wanted data. What you think about it is completely unimportant to me." "Has the PC been run on...?" You say, "Check the grades of the PC up to two. Where the person's supposed to be." "Check the grades." You get it back from the auditor without even asking the PC anything, and say, "He hasn't been audited very much." You've had it. But you gave it to a guy who didn't know how to check the grades up to two. So he chickened, and gave you a conclusion instead of fact. So your main action to overcome all of this, get in

basics, is you just tell them to be gotten in, and tell them to be gotten in, and tell them to be gotten in, and tell them to be gotten in, and the next thing you know they go in. When you want somebody to check the grades of this PC up to two, you want somebody to sit there, put him on the meter, and ask him if these grades have been run. And then give you the behavior of the meter as you ask him, and you can even describe what the grade is as long as you don't run it. When you've got that, you know where you are. You know where you are exactly. The processes were described and the TA went up. Now it can either be rehabbed, or it was never run. See? It was either overrun or it was never run.

So you've got now, you've narrowed it down, to grade zero, communication, was either overrun or never run. The rest of them apparently OK. But grade zero was either overrun or never run, so you have the auditor ask them, was it run? Did you go release at that point?" And it doesn't F/N, and you now know it was never run. So you can describe to him step by step exactly what you want. Those are the basic things. You do your nut. Because it's unbelievable to you that anybody could believe some of the things they believe, or the outnesses on why a case doesn't run.

The one I told you about with the recall? You know what his advertised OT section is? 3. This person has had trouble the whole way, has given people around him trouble, he's in difficulty perpetually, he runs horribly, he runs very badly indeed. Supposing he were to leave session with an F/N? Then he'd try to remember something and he'd put himself back through an engram that wasn't ready to run. So you see what you've got to be alert for? Somebody comes along and asks you for something wonderful. Yes! What magic thing is it going to be that makes this auditor an auditor? You could tell him at once. You could simply write down a list of the things an auditor has to know, you could assess those things. The one that he doesn't understand and that sort of thing, will read. People gonna look at you and say, "Well we could have done that." Here's the joke. They couldn't have.

You have to be very brilliant to be able to think simply and act and use the simple solution. And the basis of all of this is, that all power is total simplicity. The basic lesson a thetan eventually learns. But when you can get it to no effort of any kind whatsoever, it is total power. You could tear this planet in half if you could think of doing it without any, any force.

So that actual power depends upon total simplicity. And after you do it, it looks so simple to some people. They wonder why they didn't think about it. Or why they didn't do it. Or why they didn't conceive of it. Well you can point out, alright, perfectly good. I mean, more cheers to you if you conceived it. We got the thing on the road now, alright. We assessed how this auditor never got trained. We figured it out. They don't have any E-meters in the academy. My god that's right. See? But these things are usually of that, of that category. And then what arises on all of this is this fantastic over burden of complexity Oh, many Complex, complex, here, there, everywhere! Towers and towers and towers of pure balderdash. You get the apparence of tech unworking? The basis of it is that it isn't applied.

Now the worst cases you're going to have this is that it hasn't been applied. Now somebody's going to say, "Oh yes. I understand that. He was audited by somebody who really didn't have his TRs in." No, no that isn't what I'm saying. You know, he just wasn't audited at all. Then it starts to dawn on somebody. What's that? I mean, you know? "Well how could he have gotten there?" Yeah, well look. I've got news for you. He didn't get there.

Now when you can master that level of think you have mastered a near total power in standard tech. Both in training it, in case supervising it and in auditing it. And you've seen yourself doing that, and you've seen yourself doing that on this course, I'm sure. And you've seen it stripping down, stripping down, become easier and more simple, more direct. It's more action. And the less difficult it seemed the simpler you did it, the more F/Ns were arriving at the examiner. Now F/Ns weren't just arriving at the examiner, F/Ns have started coming into session. So at the beginning of session you no longer are getting in Ruds, because you're sitting there looking at an F/N. Which you have to wreck to do any process. See? And what you're doing now is you're just in the business of widening F/Ns. Do you see?

Well that's in direct proportion. If I can teach you this, I have taught you all. It's in direct proportion to the effortlessness with which you regard the action.

Total power is total effortlessness.

And when you've got that you know how to mock up a planet.

Now, any action is based on certain simplicities. Those simplicities are stable, they are standard, they'll become obscured and complicated more and more. That is, the individual gets "weaker and weaker". He gets more and more complex. The basic is more and more lost.

Let's take this bird. He doesn't know what an ARC break is. He doesn't know what a PTP is. And he doesn't know what a missed withhold. A missed withhold is defined as something he keeps from himself. Alright, it's something he keeps from himself. A PTP is something somebody worries about, but he knows that it's wrong to worry, so he never worries. An ARC break, an ARC break is, in actual fact, a problem of some kind. Now you start auditing this guy. And it's very hard to push it through. Very hard. Now as case supervisor you start handling his case on a via. But it's very hard to push through. Just can't seem to get any place, and it's very difficult, and the folders get thicker and they're already very thick indeed. And the guy spent eight hundred hours on 3, and he can't seem to get anywhere. You can run into these problems, you see? They're big. And the farther they have departed from simplicity, the bigger the problem seems, until it is practically a gigantic problem that nobody could possibly ever solve, and nobody could ever see around. This problem is so huge, and it's presented to you normally in this light.

You start going through the thing, and you'll find the answers to his PTPs are worries of sole kind that caused him to be upset. Some weird definition, and they don't seem to be anything in the present, and a missed withhold, he doesn't ever have one of those because he never finds out what he is doing, he says. And you'll find something out. Well you know immediately the guy's audited with his Ruds out, because he can't define 'em. So now with your sword you cut the gordian knot. And you say, "Clear each rudiment."

Now you're liable to run into this trouble. The auditor goes into the session, clears each rudiment, and he didn't know what they were either. So therefore, you had better keep up a liaison with some training entity. And we'll say before you start handing this out, you had better have your auditors clarifying what each rudiment means, before they start hanging up a false one with that. And all of a sudden auditing moves that has never moved before. God, that's awful simple, isn't it?

Now another one is, is an E-meter trim check should be tested before the session, and the meter should be turned on and given a test check. But if it acts kooky sometime during the session, the meter could have been discharged. Also, you can have trouble with the line that's connected with the cans. So you want to bounce the line around, bounce your meter connection around a little bit, and these things screw in, these plugs. And you know, you can have a pin unscrewed? On some of your meter connections it gives you a permanent rock slam.

Now a guy should know enough about what goes wrong with his E-meter not to run into a hell of a lot of trouble. We had one here the other day, unfortunately. Somebody was busy having a hell of a time with the pcs' tone arm, and come to find out the trim check at the end of session was 2 equals 1.75. So all through the session the auditor thought that he was auditing somebody with a very low TA when he wasn't. Didn't start, didn't put his meter into some kind of condition.

Now in solo auditing, every now and then a solo auditor wraps himself around a telegraph pole by not paying any attention to his meter. I know one guy ran a lot of sessions, he ran a hell of a lot of sessions. But he got all messed up on the thing. The meter was discharged. I don't know how he made it read at all. But he was in deep grief finally. 'Cause he knew he hadn't made the

section, and he couldn't get any TA action. And then somebody checked the meter and suddenly found out that it was discharged. It's too kooky, see?

Well, how do you get these in? How do you get all these points in? How do you get them in in training? How do you get them in in auditing? Well you make each one defined. You get the guy to define each one. You'll find your outness fast enough. That's all. That's all the secret there is to it. Let's find out how complicated he is or how simple he is. Let's clear the auditing commands for ARC breaks, PTPs and missed withholds. Big folder. Big folder.

Guy is so very upset and nervous that he can't seem to get anyplace. Well there is a way you can go about this. You can actually assess things in connection with auditing, do it on a list 1, the result on a list 1, and then fly each rud. Now you've taken away the obvious ARC break stuff on the list 1, so he won't blow up in your face, and now you're going to fly each rud. Well with any PC with a very thick folder you had better clear the command of every rudiment before you think you can fly it. PC's liable to have a hell of a cognition. Because where his definition of the rudiment is out, the rudiment's always been out. In other words, the rudiment is so out he can't even define it. And you pull off these miraculous wins, see? Hooray! God almighty! People think you're looking over their shoulder and adjusting their brains for them. And you say, "Clear the rudiments." Folder's this thick, case supervisor, you start going through it, and you find the kookiest damn rudiments you ever saw in your life. And you say, "Nuts." Clear the rud.

You look at the answer to recall processes and look how long it takes to run a recall process. Something like this. It'll tell you at once what the state of the PCs basics are. You know what's got to be done with the case. You've got to get the rudiments in on the case. And you've got to get these various things straightened out about the case, certainly in the field of auditing. And it's all in the direction of getting the charge off, but a case is never going to make any progress with their rudiments out.

If his missed withholds are out, why he's going to get mad at the auditor. And it doesn't matter if he's defining missed withholds to himself as something he doesn't know about. What's a missed withhold? It's something I don't know about. Well if he's got missed withhold defined it doesn't keep him from being mad at the auditor when he has real missed withholds. So you straighten it up. All of a sudden he starts getting these actual withholds off that are missed.

Alright, PTP. He doesn't know what the hell a PTP is. His mother walked all over the place. I had somebody one time that had a problem defined as something you did in arithmetic. And knew then that you couldn't solve any problems, because the teacher always said they were wrong. Now that is an outness in a rudiment. Do you see?

Now we take an ARC break, define an ARC break. Actually it's quite a discovery in itself. It isn't remarkable that people don't know this. So if people don't know this they're not to blame. Just by clearing the rudiments you're liable to straighten up all kinds of damn things.

This is how you bring about miracles. By bringing in simplicity where only complexity has existed before. That's actually the whole secret of how you get the show on the road. The cycle of action is, is you say, "Now listen. Over in the academy if you fellows would just start teaching the TRs, we'd be a lot better off." And they say, "Good. Oh yeah, well we do all that." You're defeated there. Actually your auditors, you know damn well because they chatter and yak and so forth, you know damn well they've never done their TRs. You know this. So, take a walk over and say, "Let's see a couple of students do confront." Yeah, this one student who is the coach bouncing around in his chair, and the other's doing this, that and the other guy up, and the other guy's shaking his head, and yes, well there you are, and back and forth they go. And they look like a couple of god damned bobbing sticks! And you say, "When do you do confront?" "That's confront." Just say, "My contempt. Let's see you sit for two hours, both of you, without moving an eyelash. And let's set up a couple of photographic timers. And somebody else looking in on this, every time they see anything happen at all, have them hit the

timer to get the two hours started all over again. And all of a sudden you'll suddenly start getting your TRs in, getting some auditing done.

Also it works on this basis. They're trying to give you problems, be sure you give them some. Never let giving of problems be a one way flow.

I hope that clarifies to some degree, clarifies to some degree how standard it is, or what you are trying to standardize. Because that is what you're trying to standardize. It's what you've trying to make there, the basic you're trying to get in. They are not very esoteric basics. And as I say again, the test of true brilliance is the ability to conceive total simplicity.

Thank you very much.