6809C26 Class VIII TAPE 3

THE LAWS OF CASE SUPERVISION

And this is the third lecture of the series of the Class VIII Course. Now I give it an English accent because they will be played in England and they don't understand very much in England except English. The rest of the lecture will be in American.

It is the twenty six of September AD 18, and the Class VIII Course marches on.

I am very, very happy tonight, very cheerful, very cheerful indeed. Two of the other Class VIII Course suddenly became auditors. Suddenly. And that is very, very good news. So apparently one becomes a Class VIII auditor suddenly. After a great deal of hard struggle, after reading very carefully, star rating on the basic bulletins and the basic materials, after going over this line, after getting a total, total grip on tech, so if somebody says, "The third law of listing," you say, "Brrrrp!", "The fifth line of the Auditors' Code, "Brrrrzmp!" You don't even think. You know? It's right there. Bong! It's not, "Let me see, according to the laws of listing, I... I wonder if I put down this... See I had a blowdown. What is a blowdown? I better look up in this bulletin over here.' And apparently after about three times through the lines, and got the material cold, and after a terrific amount of study on properly done sessions, now that is the thing which made the difference. And just for the benefit of future students of the Class VIII Course in England, and in America, the two points which make a Class VIII auditor is a total, total grip on basic tech, and a good hard study of well done sessions and proper C/S which led to the well done session, ant a proper grasp of how sessions aren't well done, and the study of the C/S folders on that. And the C/S folders to which I refer are the C/S folders which I did on Flag, on a very long sprint of something on five weeks, over 500 C/S's.

Now. Therefore, a Class VIII auditor has a total grip on tech so that he does not fumble, he does not have to think, he doesn't have any unfamiliarity. And none of the questions which I occasionally get, you don't have any questions on the line. They've just got the tech, pongo! They apply the tech, bango! And they become a Class VIII suddenly, after they've done all this. It's almost lousy sessions on Tuesday, fantastic on Wednesday.

And then, having become an expert Class VIII auditor one has the difficulty then of becoming an expert Class VIII case supervisor. The marvelous invitations which the non-standardly run PC offers to the case supervisor to squirrel are unlimited. There is an infinity of ways to run a case wrong. There are less than four score ways to run it right.

And any time some auditor misses the missed withhold; we just had one. Guy ran, guy had, "You got an ARC break?", you know, asked "You got an ARC break?" It didn't read. But the fellow says, "Well yes. I have about three or four ARC breaks. And these... well I'm having an awful time of them." Natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, natter, paragraph, paragraph, paragraph, natter, natter, natter. "Well do you have another ARC break?" No read on the meter. "Oh yes, I've got a lot of other ARC breaks," and so forth, "They're really doing me in," and so forth. "Aw for the awful way things are running, they're just terrible. And the way you're auditing is awful." And so on. "Yes, I got a bunch of ARC breaks." And the TA goes up and up and up and up. And the TA going up doesn't even alert this auditor.

One of the difficulties I had at Saint Hill was making a bunch of auditors learn that a missed withhold is a missed withhold, and an ARC break is an ARC break. And never the twain shall meet. But the guy can pretend to have an ARC break when he has a missed withhold. And if you try to pull an ARC break that doesn't exist and fail to pull the missed withhold you're in trouble.

So there's a reverse slip to meter reading. Not only does the meter falsely read, but you don't take up things that the meter doesn't read on unless, when you get in suppress it then reads.

You can always put suppress on a rudiment, but of course now this is a wide open invitation to pianola. Put a nickel in the slop of the juke box type auditing. "Do you have an ARC break? That doesn't read. Alright. Has anything been suppressed? Good. Do you have an ARC break? Oh, uh, it doesn't read. Do you have a present time problem? Doesn't read. Has anything been suppressed? Dajata degetee to do gee gee gee, boom" Bull. My disgust.

Somebody who asked me, "How do you ask for an ARC break?" I say, "Well now, listen. The answer to that question is a star rate of every bulletin on the Class VIII Course. The zeros included." Why?

The guy's asking questions like that because he hasn't got a grasp on the tech. Do you follow? Now very often you get asked weird questions that have to do with the persons' case. He's asking you, "Do mice jump through hoops?" Well he hasn't differentiated between the basics of life and the peculiarities which have derived therefrom. Do you understand? So you have to differentiate between what are the basics with which you're dealing, and all of the god awful complex screaming infinity of balderdash and nonsense that can arise from a mis-combination of these. Alright? So we get an unsolvable preclear. You go, "Oh, obviously completely unsolvable. We asked for an ARC break and the TA went up, so obviously he's an unsolvable preclear."

If you get pianola auditing, you drop a nickel in the electric piano. The guy can't think basics! So what he wants you to do is to put a tape recorder in his head. Now if I gave you the proper answer to everything a PC ever said it would take you from now 'till the end of the universe to memorize it all, and I wouldn't be bothered writing it. But anything a PC said is indicative of one of another basics, of which there may only be two or three hundred. Anything. Good, bad or indifferent. Do you get the difference? If you've got your basics, when you've got your basics, and you've got a grip on these basics, so that, and, "I wonder if it's true about the second law of listing." Psst! What are you going to get out of that? You've going to get an infinity of doubt, and questions, and all kinds of complications, and PCs are going to become very complicated and they're going to become very unsolvable.

You get the mystery of, "We asked for the ARC break. And we cleaned up the ARC breaks but he didn't F/N, so there must be something wrong with standard tech, because he didn't clean up."

Actually the situation's completely bonkers. What is the symptom of a missed withhold? A missed withhold is the PC nattering. Bong, bang! Don't think. See? You don't have to say, "Well, let's see. I wonder what bulletin covers that, and blablabla... You know? And this... He did... I remember that in a lecture, and blaaa... did did da."

"Do you have a missed withhold?" "Yes. People have been very mean to me." "Good. What's the missed withhold?" "Well, people have been awfully mean to me." "What's the missed withhold?" "Well, I really don't have any missed withhold." Read, read, read. How do you pull such a missed withhold? Well you gotta know, you gotta know that you've got to pull a missed withhold. Don't go any place else and do anything else, for god's sakes, pull the missed withhold.

Well, how do you pull a missed withhold? Well there's ways of exaggerating missed withholds. There's - I can tell you half a dozen ways of pulling the missed withholds. What you've gotta know is that you must pull a missed withhold.

Now it is either a missed withhold, or it's a false read. If it's a false read you clean it up with false reads. You follow? I mean, you have to know how to play this piano.

Now what would you think of a piano player who say down to the piano and had to have somebody put his finger on each key? And then say, "Press." You've got just about as much change of getting Rachmaninoff's Prelude. He'll never play it, boys He'll... His musical sound, pinks, Pink, Pink, Pink! "That was Yankee Doodle. Pretty good, huh?"

An auditing session is a piano. You play it, boy, and you play it now. And you don't have any time to say, "I wonder

where C is." You hear "Plink" in the PC, and you go "Plunk." Just like that. Bang, bang. "Do you have an ARC break?" No read on the meter. "Yeah, I have lots of ARC breaks. They're awfully mean to me in the engine room. They've been shooting me down lately. And isn't it terrible the way they write up... " "Good. What's the missed withhold?" "Oh! Hm. Ha ha ha ha ha. Ha ha ha. Well, if you come down to that I, the other day poured eight tons of diesel oil into the bunker fuel tank, and haven't told anybody." "Good. Who nearly found out?" "Well, actually the whole ship. The people have been sort of looking at me since." "Good. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Do you have a missed withhold? That's clean. Good. Do you have an ARC break? No, that's good. That's fine. Now. Present time problem? No. Alright, any overts? Well, it reads." "Oh I don't know, I... " "Alright, has anybody ever told you, while they were auditing you, that you had committed overts you hadn't committed?" "Oh yes, as a matter of fact I was doing this sec check and somebody said he turned on a rock slam, and then he found out the meter was disconnected, and so forth, and it was very upsetting. But I'd keep getting this read on overts, and so on." "Good. Alright.
That was a false read at that particular time. Good. Do you have an overt? Well that's clean. Your needle is floating. Thank you. We'll now proceed to rehab... " And you think I've been short handing it, but that's about how long it takes with these difficult cases.

There are no difficult cases with standard tech. There aren't any. Well, this PC was given reviews for two and a half years in Spokane, and the TA three years ago went up to six and a half, and it's been there ever since, and at various places they mislisted the list, and the number of errors found in the auditing summary are 119 auditing flubs. Well is the case hopeless? Case supervision. Do L4A to F/N. Brrrrmp, bong, thump, bang, TA down, bzzt, bong. That's it. And the reason why they don't resolve is because the auditor's sitting there, "Gee, I wonder what chart, what HCOB that was in. Let's see, it was on a tape, I think it was on a tape, and something or other that the high TA shows an incidence of, I think it was, I think it shows a medical background. Let me see, what does a high TA show? Umm... " Has no place at Class VIII. If you have to think in order to know a basic fundamental data you're not VIII, and you're not going to get sessions. They won't fly for you boy. They won't fly! The way you fly a PC, and the way you fly needles, is you know it. NOW! NOW! Somebody'll write me a bunch of balderdash today. I never insult a students' questions. That's perfectly alright. Ask all the questions you please. But I don't guarantee not to bring them up.

All the questions I get are simply divergences from standard tech. The guy hasn't read the bulletins. You know. He hasn't read it. He doesn't understand it. If he did he wouldn't be asking me questions like this. It's all there. There aren't any questions left to ask. He asked me whether or not you list a service facsimile to the first blowdown

or the second blowdown, or to what you do? Oh brothers please! Any listing is covered by the laws of listings. The laws of listing have no variables. There are no variables in the laws of listing. You always list that way.

There isn't any other way to list than the laws of listing. There are no other ways to list.

Period! Full stop!

It just happens accidentally that in 5A you were hitting on the three primary points of a thetans' case, and it just so happens that the first blowdown is invariably the item. It happens on those three questions, because they are questions which are dead on. It so happens that those three questions are dead on. They will inevitably be. What you can't trust when you're case supervising is that the auditor caught the item that it did blow down on, and when Power goes wrong, when 5A goes wrong, it blew down on item one and he marked it as blowing down on item two. So when Power apparently goes wrong, and the guy comes back and so on, you get the list checked. And now it follows the full laws of listing. You may have to add to the list, you may have to suppress it, you may have to look for this and that and the other thing. It just so happens that an expert who doesn't get blowing downs on the wrong item inevitably and invariably finds that the item's the first item that blew down on the list. Because of the three key things about the list, and that is why it's called Power Plus. Those three listing questions, 1B, 1C and ID are just dead center on a case and he doesn't get several blowdowns. He'll only get that one.

I saw a Power 5A list on a student the other day that about fried my hair. He got a blowdown and then went for a whole column. What was he doing? Why? Why? Why did he have to list? He had a blowdown. He wrote it down himself with his own little pencil. So would somebody please tell me, please tell my why anybody under the sun, moon and stars would continue a list beyond the first blowdown when it says in Power Plus in so many words that you... it is the first blowdown. Period! Well who the hell thought there was a whole bunch, a whole bunch of nonsense variables on this particular line?

The number of variables are zero in standard tech. So the invariability of standard tech is an invariable variable. And whenever you think you have a variable on your hands you have done something, or something has been done, which departed from standard tech, which now makes a variable possible.

Now let me show you now, the great invitation. The great invitation. A PC who is different is a complete invitation to the auditor and the case supervisor to do something screwy. And the only mistakes, the only, only, only mistakes you are going to make is accepting the invitation

offered by the different case. And then you're going to make mistakes There aren't any different cases!

You go back down the line, and you look there over former reviews. This very resistant PC.

Oh, very difficult. And there you see the blowdown on missed withhold. Only it was never pulled. And there you see it in another session. Missed withhold. R/S. But nobody ever pulled it. And eventually this keeps up just that long, and you suddenly get a different PC. Doesn't matter much what you run on him, it's always something he doesn't respond. He isn't, he isn't responding to standard tech. Oh oh. And a clever case supervisor goes back and finds out where standard tech was violated and picks the case up at that point.

The formula of case supervision is to go back to find where the case was running well, and come forward of that, looking for violation of standard tech. And if they are too many, to refuse to get in a fire fight correcting the corrections, repairing the repairs; you can do this so - you can actually make up a list of, I've seen a list of two solid type written pages, single spaced, of items wrong from the last time the case was running well. And the case supervisor on this particular instance was advocating correcting every single one of those errors. It would have been a job that would have taken from now 'till Halifax.

I've forgotten exactly what the instructions were. I think it was something like, "Do L4A to F/N, and do the next grade." And they did L4A to an F/N and the person made the next grade and is flying.

Now it doesn't mean then that because a case has been goofed up - it's quite a tribute to Scientology that it has gone forward to the degree of goof that it has been goofed. The violations of standard tech; it's quite marvelous. It's just that you get about 200 times the result with standard tech. Yes, go back over it. So you've only got... you got three sessions. You got three review sessions, something like that, and each one has got a mislisted list in it. We'll correct it. Very easy to do. Three mis-listed lists, go back and find the right item on each list.

Only takes about five minutes. Took something,... I mean per list. Took somebody else two or three hours, or a couple of intensives to make the list wrongly in the first place. But go back.

Correct them. Give him his right items. Give him his right items, come up the line. He's probably only stuck in one of these lists. But you'll catch that one, but, just a little handful of lists, we'll go ahead and correct them.

5A, if somebody falls on his head after 5A it's usually, it's usually that something was very out. And you had a

false auditors' report in that he didn't give the PC the items that really blew down. Another item blew down, or something of this sort. Or the PCs comm was violently cut. You know, something on the order of this trick, somebody is so screamingly anxious about the F/N that he doesn't let the PC finish his cognition. Like say, Oh. Seattle. Yeah." He was going to say, "Seattle, yeah Yeah. Yeah. That's the place. Yeah, yeah, yeah. Christ, what a dumpy you know?" or, "What a wonderful town." something, you know? And the auditor saw that needle fly, and he didn't realize there was a comm lag between the needle, which is just below the level of the PCs reality, and the PCs cognition. So, the needle flew and he says, "That's it! Put down the cans. Good. Thank you. Thank... that's... woah." You know? "Wooh, wooh, we're supposed to do all this very fast."

Now then, you don't see this as the case supervisor very often. You can detect it to some degree, but you don't see it really. It's not there in your view, so the PC falls on his head after the session. Well something happened to his comm. So you just correct that session. Very simple.

Now you can correct the session by asking for this or asking for that, but there's only one thing that can be wrong - two things I mean that can be wrong. It is either cut comm or wrong item. So, your standard case supervisor on something action like this it comes to you as somebody who has just been run on 5A now has a headache. And he's going around the review as for a headache. Or he gets himself an ethics record, or something of that character.

And so he goes around. Case supervisor, he's just had 5A. Now along with your accuracy, along with your accuracy in the field of basics must go a confidence in the gains of tech! And you can't go around saying, "Well it's not working out and it didn't work anyway." And "Yeah, yeb yee, doo. " Explain, explain, reasonable, reasonable, reasonable, "And probably 5A didn't work on this PC, and... " No! 5A would've worked on the PC unless something happened. So the PC, by auditors' report, apparently ran OK, but the PC a few days, couple of weeks later, gets himself a condition of liability from Oprey and Doprey, or some other charge.

It's the business of the case supervisor at that moment to pick up this PC. Something is wrong with Power. Well the proper action is Ruds or green form to F/N. If it didn't F/N on the Ruds you go ahead and run the green form to an F/N. And, rehab Power. So the guy will check it.

Check it. And then when you get to the check of 5A you null the list. You don't just say, "Was that your item?" That's corny. You null a list this time. Because the probability is that the thing that blew down was not the thing he said. So you null a list meticulously.

And if the list now seems to be too short, or something of

that sort, well you add to it, and you repair it just the way you would repair an ordinary normal list. Because there is something wrong with the auditing report. So the guy goes down and he repairs the list and so forth. And it's very unwise to get the auditor who ran the Power to correct the Power. Because you will get some kind of an action like this, you know. "Well I gave him the right item in the first place. Is Mary Jane your item? Yeah, it was, wasn't it? Yeah, oh good. Thank you. I thought it was."

There was just that little bit of criticism, do you see? That's why people, when they fall on their heads, go to Qual, not back to the HGC. So, the list is nulled. And you normally will find out that it was his item but comm was cut, or it's marked as a BD on the wrong item, or for some peculiar reason it didn't BD at all. And the PC was thinking about the listing question or something and got a latent BD and didn't get the thing, even thought he said "Mama, papa, uncle George." He wasn't thinking about that, he was thinking about people I've known.

"God, you know, wow, you know, wow, you know, people I've known." And we had somebody the other day, bless her, who didn't like to put bad people on a list. And the list in actual fact apparently blew down on somebody she thought of, but not the person she put down on the list. She was editing the list as she listed. Tricky, huh? Tricky in that case.

"On this list, has anything... ", you know, you're not get the question reading, items don't read on the list. "On this list, question, bud-up-up-up-ow, has anything been suppressed?" Pow.

What does that pwoon?" And then you get something like, "Well, I don't like to put bad names on a list." You see your variability's of what the PCs response is. You get this real straight.

The variability of what the PCs response is hasn't anything to do with the standardness of the tech. My god they will give you eighteen billion variations for every single, solid piece of standard tech! No, never Q and A with this amount of variation. Do you follow? They act to standard tech directly, but they give you such variable answers.

I'll give you an idea. "Do you have a present time problem? That read." "Yeah, well I, hm, a present time problem?" "Alright, is that a false read? You know, no read there. Anybody insist you had a problem you never had, you know? Hm. Alright. Good. Have you had a problem auditors didn't find?" "Well yes." Reads. "Good." "I was just thinking here, I've never been audited without a problems I've never been audited without a problem. I'll always have a problem. The business I'm in, jiminy-god!" F/N. "Thank you very much."

You don't ask the next rud question of course, because it

F/Ned on Ruds. Now you get down to doing what you're supposed to be doing.

Well that's a variable answer. You're going to get... Look. There can be an infinity of wrongnesses. Absolute infinity. There can be an infinity of sillinesses. There can be an infinity of mistakes. Getting somebody to study mistakes only; he's always gonna run into a new mistake. Just think of the Hottentot repairing the radio. Or the Egyptian repairing the radio.

Now how many mistakes could he make? It's an infinity.

Now let's take, let's take a bunch of green, red and blue chips of various sizes and shapes, and let's throw them down, and just scramble them up and throw them down on a black table. And every time you do this you're going to get a brand new pattern. And some of them are going to be good, and some are going to be bad. And so you say, "Look at the variation in which life is steeped." The hell it is, there's no variation here, you're taking a bunch of chips and throwing them on a black table. And that a bunch of random items thrown down randomly will give you a random answer. That's the law back of that. What's the variability? Crunch. There is no variability. Do you follow?

So there sits the auditor. And he's got to have his tech solid. Proper. No question at all.

Because he's sitting there talking to a PC who's got 18,765,000 variables per square minute.

But they're all varying on his exact basic principles. What you've got to understand is you're sitting there with a stable datum which he's running the locks of. See? You're just watching these locks. Now, if you don't know your tech you think these locks are the stable data.

There's nothing more horrible to happen to an auditor than to run a squirrel process and get a win. It's fatal Because he'll now go down the street and get the next PC, only the next PC didn't resolve on it. And I have actually seen some guy try for years to get another win on the same process.

Now the horrible part of it is, is the guy, in actual fact, probably didn't get a win on the process he continues to try. He got a win on something else. PC all of a sudden cognited, he's saying, he's saying, "How many mother-in-laws are there on the head of a pin?" Or something, some wise process, see? And he says this, how many mother-in-laws are there on a head of a pin?" See? And the PC says, "Oh, gee, that's a good question. It's truly... I feel wonderful. Thank you!" F/N. Now the auditor, not knowing his basics, he thinks, "Christy That's quite a process." Well, that wasn't the process the PC went F/N on. It was somebody who was willing to talk to as degraded a bum as that. Somebody was actually willing to

sit down and ask him a question as though he amounted to something. And he cognited on this, and went F/N.

You get the idea? The auditor goes around with this squirrel process, thinking and so on.

There are five or six brands of processes immediately jumped up and leaped into view around Elizabeth, New Jersey. One or two of them became very, very famous, and so on. They were in actual fact questions which I had asked a particular PC to pursue his particular problem, and were based on the standard datum that a PC makes a mental image picture which then pushes him, pushes his anchor points in. And all I was doing was asking questions what would get the guy to look. And these questions seemed terribly variable. And they seemed so wise, that they became processes. One of them became a whole line of therapy. Well, you think this over.

Well, the guy who was watching me ask the questions of the PC certainly didn't understand what the hell I was doing. If he'd understood what I was doing, why he was; I was trying to get the guy to look at the picture he was stuck in. Any question I asked was simply to get the guy to do that. Do you follow? So the standard action there was simply, well, let's get the guy to look at his pictures, and, and blow a few locks. That was all. That was all.

But they appeared to be very wise, and so forth, you see. They had variables, Guys could actually go out and say, "Golly. You ask the person this marvelous question. This marvelous question," and so forth. Like, "What time was it?" That would add to something. But whoever applied the process thought that I was asking about a clock or something. You know, what time of the day was it at the time that this thing happened, and so forth, and you know, get a big variable on the line, and then that could get all variabled up in some other way.

In other words, these things squirrel up, because the individual does not understand the basic from which the question stems. Do you understand that? He hasn't got the principle from which the whole thing is advancing. He's not running from basic data. So, not running from basic data of course he makes a fantastic number of mistakes. And then, sooner of later, if he squirrels and doesn't do standard tech, he will sooner or later start getting loses on PCs, and then he sort of considers it an overt, and then he is apt to borrow some of their ideas of super-variability, and if he didn't know standard tech in the first place he will for sure depart from what little standard tech he had.

So an auditor auditing standard tech owes himself a hundred percent wins. And he'll get them..

He'll get them. There's no monkey business about it.

Now the state of the PC is not what the auditor says, it's

what the PCs state is. What is wrong with the PC is what is wrong with the PC, not what the auditor evaluates is wrong with the PC. These are all little basic laws. It isn't the auditor's opinion that makes the PC sick. So you read a lot of amateur C/Ses. They really are a howl. You, you; at this stage of the game you've got this ahead of you. But you'll start laughing at yourself after a while at the tremendous opinion that you start forming of this, that and the other thing. And how complex these opinions are. And how much figure you invest into the whole thing. And you read my C/Ses along this line, and they seem to dispose of the most complex things with the simplest actions you ever heard of. So that therefore, because the PC is so complex, and the solution so simple, therefore there must be something you missed. You get the idea? So there must be something more in this folder... .

But what you're looking at is the fact that we have the basic data of life. These are the rules and laws that life lives. And that's all. You apply 'em, and of course any life responds to it. If you could talk to a spider, he'd go OT.

So this, this is what, this is what's required of a Class VIII auditor. He has a grip on tech, the like of which nobody ever heard of. You ought to be able to rattle off the Auditors' Code, bbbrrrrrrr. Boom. But not just rattle it off. PC comes in to session, feels a little dopey, you don't think twice. You say, "Have you had enough sleep?" See? You don't have to think about this, you know that. PC comes in, feels for the chair, and sits down, yawn. And you think immediately of the Auditors' Code, "You had enough sleep? Well good. Go get yourself some sleep and we'll audit you when you're good and rested. Thank you." Not, "Let me see, let me see, this is the... " This is three quarters of the way through the session. "Let me see. I wonder what could be wrong with this PC? He doesn't seem to be able to stay awake in the session. Is this dope-off? Boil off?" Figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure, figure.

Now the alertness to these things is terrific. I noticed, used to notice, that I would catch, when we were doing long intensives and that sort of thing, I could catch an ARC break by the actual clock an hour and forty five minutes before the HGC auditor. That was the lag. Hour and forty five minutes before the auditor noticed the PC was ARC broken. Because the PC would get more and more and more and more ARC broke throughout that hour. But I could pick up the original ARC break. See? And I'd say, "Alright, there's one." And actually have clocked it.

And at that time I had squawk-box systems where I could listen to every session, don't you see? So I had a lot of opportunity to do this. The auditor would miss on his comm cycle, and the PC would say or do something at that moment. That was the beginning of an ARC break that somewhere up the line, in the next hour or two was going to explode in

the auditors' face.

And what always amazed me was, is the auditor would sit there and wait for it to explode in his face. Certainly the PC must have looked strained, certainly the PCs voice must have gotten tighter, certainly the needle must have been not responding properly, the TA vanished out of the session, the skin tone of the PC went bad, the auditor wasn't getting anyplace with the process. Do you get it? It took him a long time to add up all these figures, see? Well, if you're red-hot, you recognize them in the first split half second. See?

Now the way you do it, it isn't that you have to be quick, it's that you have to know what you're doing. Violation of a comm cycle is liable to end up in an ARC break.

Now, rather than go to all the labor of having to recognize it, just don't violate the comm cycle.

That's the best answer to that. Just deliver a flawless session. And a flawless session on communication is communication with the PC. Not a communication with your instructor in TRs. "Do birds fly? Thank you." The TRs are just there to let you get up to a point of where your grip on the TRs are such that you simply apply the TRs, brrrrooooom, boom, boom, boom, boom. You can talk that way, you don't have to think about it, it isn't wooden, it's very natural. And when you've got the TRs down pat, why at that particular time, bang, bang, bang, they just run off pat, that's all.

You can always tell a brand new student. He's trying to do his TR0 and his TR1 at the same time and it all shows up in his tone of voice. And he hasn't got any more auditor presence than a rabbit. You just drill it up to a point of where this comes natural. That's all. Poomp. PC originates, handle the origination. Bong: Nothing to it.

So, when it comes to adding and summating and looking up, what's the difference between a Class VIII auditor and a lower class auditor? Class VIII auditor knows his basics so well that he is never led into a trap by a PC. He never comm lags as to what is going wrong, he knows.

He doesn't have to correct his comm cycle errors, they don't occur. He doesn't have to patch up cases, 'cause they weren't misrun in the first place. He doesn't have to repair the case supervision which he did on Tuesday because it was correct. And he has enough ethics presence when he is case supervising that an auditor who would do something else comes in with a rather pale complexion, if not bright green.

The auditor would be the first one to tell you he had goofed. Ethics presence is sufficient, so he wouldn't try to hide a goof, boy.

So, a Class VIII does it right in the first place, and can repair what other people have done wrong. He himself, in his auditing, invariably does it right in the first place. In his case supervisoring, he does it right in the first place. The cases he has to repair are the cases that have been done wrong by somebody else. Get the difference?

Now I don't want to intimidate you or give you a bad idea of what you've got to do. But the only thing we're demanding is 100% perfection. 100% grip on the data. 100% drill so that it just, bong, lead pipe cinch. 100% result. And that depends on a 100% grasp of the data. And a 100% application of it. And you get 100% results. Just like that. Bong. You can't have a 50% grasp on the data and get 100% results. The percentages would be quite incorrect. Right? Now Class VIII is very fast. It is fast, fast, fast, fast. I received a note here from Joe, a ship captain, and it said, "During last nights' lecture I got the first inclination of what standard tech is. It's the difference between a cold war and a blitzkrieg. It's not just a better way of winning the cold war, it's a calculated assault with calculated victory." You don't go around, when you're first studying and when you're first doing Class VIII type of auditing, you may have some question about what the outcome of the session will be. You might have some question.

But after you've been at it a very short time there's no question.

It'd be a matter of the wildest surprise if something weird happened in the session that made it go adrift, or it didn't come out right at the end. Maybe one session in 75, or something like this might go adrift. Something outside your zone of control suddenly moves in on it in some fashion.

You might find yourself auditing some PC who has a rather miserable auditing career, and it may take you a couple of sessions before you bring it up the line. But your confidence is such that you know it's going to come up the line. Through hell or high water it's going to come right somehow.

To give you an idea, my case supervision was running at about, I suppose about 90 at first, 90%. Little flubs of application and that sort of thing were pushing it astray. And I, myself, in handling it was handling cases that had really been goofed, boy. They'd really been goofed.

And it moved up to about 95, and it moved up to about 99. It's riding along quite handsomely now at 100%, pocketa, pocketa, pocketa, pocketa. Now the only place that it is coming adrift is that there are some student auditors on my lines. And, that doesn't make me not handle the case. What it makes is, I have to case supervise it again, not to change it, but to tell them what to do to correct it so they can finish my C/S. See? That's the reason. They goof,

and then I make them correct it so they can finish my original C/S. And that may happen a time on the case, once or twice or something, and then the C/S is done, it all comes out alright, and bongo.

Your neck is always out when you have an inexperienced auditor auditing for you. In the first place he gives you false reports, and he gives you false reports unknowingly and unwittingly.

He doesn't have a clue what's going on, so he doesn't tell you what's going on.

The case supervisor who believes an auditors' summary is a fool. He's just a fool. That's all.

They have some use. You continue to ask for them. Because it picks up the auditor observation and it can give you the auditors' attitude toward the PC and what the auditor thought happened.

So they have value. But you don't take it up as a case supervisor. There's no action on your part for a case supervisor. Got nothing to do with your case supervision, beyond giving you the auditors attitude toward the PC, and what the auditor thought happened in the session.

You find out what happened in the session by reading the auditors' report. And if there's any variation in that auditors' report from what should have happened, you know very well that the PC didn't come out alright in the end, whether the summary report said that he did or didn't. It had nothing to do with it. And if there's a goof on that line that you as case supervisor can catch as you go through the session, as you read through, the auditors' report saying the PC came out alright has nothing to do with it. The truth of the matter is, you'll find the PC is back in review. Goof in the session, PC winds up in review or in ethics. Case supervisor, you watch your ethics and review file, compared to your cases. Which makes it very rat a tat tat indeed. There's nothing much to it, in other words.

The auditor who ran standard tech produced the standard result, or, the case winds up in review, or winds up in ethics. That's the case supervisors' point of view. Reversely, the case that winds up in review again, and the case that winds up in ethics was not standardly audited.

No matter what the auditors' report said, something is wrong in that auditors' report. The auditor did not report something. Now you've got to do something to find out the data, whether or not it's to send it to the examiner, or so on. You, you, you're gonna find out more data.

Case supervision consists of the complete folder turned in to you with the examiners' note in it.

You don't EVER talk to the auditor, you don't EVER talk to the PC. You never talk to the auditor, you never talk to the PC, you never case supervise without the whole folder in front of you. Laws, boy, those are laws! They're in concrete. Never talk to the auditor. Never talk to the PC. Never case supervise without the whole folder in front of you. Those are the basic laws of case supervision. And the only mistakes I've ever made on it. But boy, I'm talking from history. I've case supervised more damn cases than you can shake a stick at. And the only mistakes I have ever made is when I talked to the auditor, or talked to the PC, or case supervised without the folder in front of me. And those are the only times I've ever made a mistake. Quite marvelous. And so, if you don't disobey those rules you will be a bear cat as a case supervisor. Providing you are a Class VIII and know your data.

So the guy ran in to a hell of a mess in the session. He was trying to do the case supervision and he ran in to a hell of a mess in the session. His proper action is to close the session, how ever gracefully he can. Not have the PC sitting there waiting. Close the session. That's it, and so on, with no continuation of the session mentioned. He just gradually says, "Is there anything you would care to say before we're closing down this session?" And he ends the session. He makes out his report. He takes his folder in, hands it on normal lines. It winds up in the hands of the case supervisor, who in a moment of dispassion reads the auditors' report.

Now the auditor was also expected, when he handed in his folder, to have included a summary report. And then it is administered. And the whole folder is inspected to see what is going on here. And then the action is taken that needs to be taken, written down, that needs to be taken with the case. It is put in writing in a separate sheet. Not scribbled across the corner of some green form. It's on a separate sheet of paper, of which the case supervisor keeps a carbon copy. And, he writes down what's supposed to happen now.

If he doesn't know and he can't figure it out, he sends the folder back with a request that the PC appear before the examiner. And when he gets the folder back then he has at least the comments and condition of the PC, that the PC says. Not just the auditors' side of it. Now he can do something about this. And then what he does about this is so standard that it couldn't be knocked over with an A-bomb. He accepts no invitations to squirrel. The auditor's going to give him some, because you will be supervising auditors who are Level 0 or something. He'll have vast ideas of what he ought to do about this, boy.

Now you write something down, and he doesn't think he can do this, or something like that.

He doesn't change this as he goes in to session, oh no! He just says that is it, he doesn't go near the PC. He has the PC informed that the session is suspended for the moment. And he sends the folder back, and says, "My reputation is at stake. I either can't do, or I don't understand, or I don't agree with this C/S. 'Cause after all, I'm the guy that's going to be hanged. If the PC comes out wrong I'm going to be hanged. Maybe you're going to be hanged, but I'm for sure going to be hanged. So therefore, I can't do it. Doesn't compare to the case."

Now that would be a big invitation for the auditor to have a talk with the case supervisor to...

Violates one of the first principles. 'Cause the auditor's now gotta say, "Why?" If he can't do these processes then he had no business auditing the case, so you simply get another auditor. If he says this isn't the right C/S then he's gotta have some reason why it isn't the right C/S, and maybe he will disclose some new data that he before has not bothered to put down. Such as, the reason he can't run the CCHs is because the person is a complete paralytic, and is there lying on a stretcher. And that is case supervision how she is done. And the end product of all of this is standard tech, standard results, and pocketa, pocketa, pocketa.

Now the way to waste time is to try to save time by speeding up the admin lines. Any time you super-speed the case supervision, auditor, HGC, admin lines, any time you put a crush on these lines it will add to the time spent. Let's get it all done and crush through in the next hour because the PC has to catch a place for Hoboken, and let's get it in, and a big invitation to go in and see the case supervisor to find out exactly what he's supposed to do about the whole thing.

I can assure you, boy, you are now going to waste about session time, money, misery, failures, pfft! No. You save the time in an auditing session. In an auditing session you save your time. It is so damned fast, it happens so quick, the auditing is so swift when it is done right, that you could poke around for weeks with admin time.

Now the only time you would run in on fast administration would be an assist at an injury.

Somebody just got through dropping the body and you're going to tell him to get back in his head and take over control of the body. That's a responsibility of any auditor. Rendering a proper assist, putting a tourniquet on the guy, something like that. See? An assist level action, well, that's not in the realm and remedy of, of auditing, unless it itself is done wrong. Because an assist can fail. I'll have to tell you about assists, because I find out there's very little information on them.

But, your admin time. You don't save time by saving the

admin time. You waste time by saving the admin time. One rapidly done session which is expert and right on the button is worth a hundred hours of old time auditing, any day of the week. Furthermore, the case that is set up, that it's all correct, and you fire him right now, boy he is in session about twenty minutes, zooooomℓ And if you didn't set him up properly he will be in session and then be in review and be back on your lines and then he'll be back over there, and then he'll go to the examiner and then he goes to ethics, and then they've got the hearing, and then there's auditors, and so on, and some condition has to be assigned to him, and then he goes back and then he has to correct the correction now, so therefore the correction has to be, and that is a long, arduous proceeding, and they have to do various things, and, you get it?

So the essence of this is, it's the responsibility of the case supervisor to set the case up, and to set the auditor up, so it goes brrooooooom! Now, if it's only going to take a half an hour, an hour and a half, or something like that to handle this case, what the hell are you trying to do to save twenty minutes on the administrative lines? Matter of fact, if there's any crush on these administrative lines the PCs in an awful rush in order to get fixed up, in order to get swafff, aff, aff, aff, I myself would say, "Well, you tell the PC I've sent a note to the examiner", who is also the case supervisors' relay to the PC is always the examiner, not the auditor. You don't say to the auditor, "Tell the PC... " Auditor's not a relay terminal for the case supervisor in that way. You write a note to the examiner, and you say, "Dear Examiner. We know the PC has to make his plane at 4:00. Tell him to postpone his flight until next week. Signed, Case Supervisor." Got it?

And if anybody is in such a hell of a rush that he's, he has more importance in living than in being correctly audited, I can tell you he ain't going to live long. He who spendeth his time convincing people how important it is will spend a lot of his time in review. Just by the nature of things. "Yes, this fellow really has to be handled because he's entering college in fall, and fall happens to be yesterday and he was due at the college, and so forth, and he's got to get it handled so that he can do his entrance examinations, and so forth... " Anybody saw anything like this on an examiner line. The examiner should write all that down, you understand.

Anytime I saw an examiners' report like that, and "He's got to be audited yesterday... " Who dee dee dee do do do do. Eh, well... let's see. "What organization was this man last audited in?" Let's see, let's get that answered. What organization, there isn't very much folder here.

Alright, good. The answer comes back, "Hudson Bay post 62. Had his Power and 5A." So you say, "Good. Well you tell him, you tell him to make a deposit with the registrar and make an appointment because we've got to get his folder

here, and that comes in by dog team." And the other day, just to give you an example, somebody got in a hell of a hurry. While I was gone on a trip here, these little things happen. Somebody got in an awful hurry. Somebody got in a great hurry and they had to repair this guys' Power. Had to repair his 5A. And the folders were at Saint Hill. And Saint Hill is a considerable distance away. And so, they relisted 5A.

They didn't have the original list. so it was relisted. Not on my say so, god forbid. And I picked this up in this short term when I was absent, and I said, "Well", and I think you may run across the case supervision of it, "Well, we don't know." It says, "This is pretty adventurous to relist 5A or try to correct it in the absence of the folder and the list. Pretty adventurous." Some such thing. And I didn't bother to file it because my certainty on standard tech knew the guy was going to fall on his head within the next week.

Sure enough, here comes in one from the examiner. "PC says he has a bad headache." Naturally. Somebody double-listed 5A. Christ, how dumb can you get? But you see they did this because it would take, maybe, a couple of weeks to get his folder down here. You see? Effort to save time on the admin line then winds up in an adventurous emergency action. Well auditing doesn't run like ambulance chasing.

True enough you can let a case go and go and go, and it'll eventually fall apart. Now I'm at the same time not advocating that you just don't audit anybody for a couple of weeks while you go fishing. But any time you find yourself speeding it all up and having to do it in two seconds, and therefore having to do it not thoroughly, or having to actually call for the auditor to ask him the thing because you've really got to get this thing case supervised because the fellow is Big Joe from someplace, and he's got the be audited tomorrow, and you don't have the data. Bah! You're setting it up to fall on it's head. The essence is, you point him in the right direction, and you fire him and he goes so fast when he is correctly aimed and fired, and he goes so slow, and it is so horrible when he isn't, that any time you save by extraordinary actions on the administrative line is going to be lost by having the folder back, and having it back, and doing it some more, and having it back again, and doing it some more. So the essence of, the essence of standard tech is you know your data cold. You know exactly what you're doing. You make sure that the D of T has got that; D of T trains those auditors so they just go boom, boom, boom. You see? You're going to have to do pianola training. "At this moment you say thin thun." You know?

And you've got that D of P so arranged that that D of P, he is just going to go over that case supervision with the auditor. "Now it's this, an it's this, and it's this. Now you go in, and you get in the rudiments, and mmmwma, and

that's what is says. And then you... " So on and so on. "And this is a very rough PC, and he very often gives auditors a bad time. So you want to go in, friendly, everything, get him set down. Tell him what you want to do, and then give him this and tell him that, and so forth." Now we got it all set. And it's something like setting up a rocket. Don't you see?

And then the auditor goes in, he's got it all set up, he strikes the match on the seat of the pants and lights the fuse. Got it? And the guy goes whhhhooooommmn! See? PC exits laughing.

Now I'll give you the other approach. Case supervisor, he doesn't know, "Uh, this PC has a long history of having been on the police force. Therefore he had a great many overts. Uh, let's see. I think what we had better do is run a Joberg in order to handle this situation. And uh, then, if we get a Joberg done, um, so on. Well, just to make real sure we will run Grade II before we run ARC Straightwire. And that'll, that'll fix it up, because then we'll also catch his overts. Yeah, that's the way we'll do this case. Yes, yes, that's good. Alright." And he sends it in, PC comes into session. The auditor, he's got the case supervision, but the D of P hasn't gone over it with him or anything like that. And the auditor goes into session and goes, "What the hell is this? A Joberg. A Joberg. Let's see. OK, OK, Joberg. I haven't got a form here. Where the hell's the forms here? Joberg. I think I don't know where the... Where's the, where's the... Joberg. What the hell is a Joberg? Oh, I remember what it was. I remember what it was. Uh, yeah. Well I can, I can do that, I can do that right off the cuff, see?" So he gets the PC in session, he says, "Alright. Tell me about your sex life." And PC comes into session already with his tone arm at 4.5, see? "Tell me about your sex life. Alright. Very good. Yeah, you've had a lot of sexual overts, have you? Alright. Now let's check these things out, and so forth. You every stole anything, robbed anybody, and so on? Of course you've robbed somebody. We know that. Now let's see. Alright."

Session comes back, TA 5. "Oh well, I must have goofed that one. This PC must have some; I'm pretty sure this PC must have robbed a bank. Yeah, that's what we'll do. We'll put it down here, "See if the PC has robbed a bank, and then run the CCHs, except specialize in CCHs because he says somebody was a glad hander in the last session." And he sends it back. And the auditor says, "Well, I un, un, un, I... CCH1? To hell. I don't remember what that thing is.

Oh, alright. Um. "TA at 5." And he says, "Well. How does auditing seem to you now? Good. How does it seem to you now? Good. Thank you. How does it seem to you now? Good. How does it seem to you now? Alright. Good. How does it seem to you? Now? Oh let's see, what question was I on. Yes." Pc's TA at 6.5, ran CCH1 without any results.

No kidding, I've actually case supervised almost under those conditions. Where, it didn't matter much what the D of P said the auditor did something else anyhow, but to be agreeable, why, he put it on the report form that he did it, or he'd tell the D of P and then usually the case supervision was tearing into the office and making a couple of sharp comments, and then going off and not doing what the guy said anyhow. Now you wonder what the hell goes on. Well in that much confusion Scientology still increased its' stats, still went up the line, people still did recover from things and miraculous things occurred. Marvelous. Absolutely marvelous attestation.

But those sessions could go on for week after week, year after year, and grind out one way or the other, and get someplace and somehow. Which is alright. Even without bad supervision.

Even with the auditor actually knowing what the processes were. Running the processes too long. Doing this and that and the other thing. Running PCs not set up, session without Ruds and that sort of thing. People still got a hell of a lot of result.

Now, when we find out exactly what are the additives off the line, and you pull those off the line, and you get this new line of think. Case supervisor says, "Brrrmmmnp!" and "ZZZZPDPP and "Zippp". D of T takes it up with the auditor, makes sure that he knows how to do it. PC comes in to session, the PC has had rest, the PC has been fed, the PC is OK, all is alrightf and we got it. And the auditor strikes a match on the seat of his pants and lights the fuse and booms. There was two years of old auditing just went by in those twelve minutes. Got it? And man, a pc'll hold onto those gains just as hard as they are accurately delivered. So you got your hands full of a handful of miracle. It happens so fast people will very often say it looks too simple. Yawn. Say, "That's what Lindberg said," or something like that you know? It's too simple.

Yes, it is terribly simple. And when you have done your Dianetics course, your Academy course, a Class VI and become a Class VII, and then had your Class VIII course a couple of years from now, and so forth, you will be able to do it that simply too.

Funny part of it is you can take an academy auditor and you can teach him to say, "I see a cat." "Sit down at the meter and say "I see a cat" and don't say anything else to the PC. And then when you've said "I see a cat", then when the PC answers that question, you watch this and you're watching for that needle to go woof. If the needle didn't do that, you close the session, you make your auditors' report, and you send it back to me. And if you say another god damn word, boy, hm hm hm ha. Right now I want to stay in ARC with you. Let's have this all on a beautiful, even plane of ARC so I don't have to bust your teeth in to shut

you up in a session... Now I trust you completely, that's why we have this squawk box. Your auditing room is bugged. Your sessions are patrolled. We have utter trust. Complete trust. Say anything you please in a session as long as you say exactly what I tell you to say and not another damn thing."

And you will be able to do it actually, with Level 0's. What you would do actually is clear one rudiment at a time. One rudiment per session. It isn't worth while to do anything else. Now a Class VIII, you turn him loose with a whole session, see? We'll put the rudiments in this morning, and then, if the needle is still flying this afternoon you can go to the body of the session, but you'll have to send me the case supervisor folder first.

This PC could very often be in the org for two weeks, having received three sessions. Or having received five sessions, each one of which was only five minutes long. And the funny part of it is he would fly like a bird. Do you see?

Now the length of the case supervision then, is proportional to the class of the auditor who is doing the auditing. So I can say to a Sea Org Class VIII now, "Do the usual rundown for OT Section 4. LRH." And he goes and does it. A hell of a complex damn thing. It's, "Fly the needle on Ruds or go to a green form and fly the needle on it. When you got that done get earlier, rehabs, practices, whatever you got to do. Get that cleaned up, make sure that rehabs.

Rehab ARC Straightwire, secondaries, engrams, Now, zero, one, two, three, four. Rehab or run. If they don't rehab you do something with them to set them up. Skip Power. You never rehab Power in a clear. Rehab R6EW, rehab OT1, rehab Clearing Course and OT1, OT2. Prepsheck 3. Do a valence shifter and run confront." And that is Section 4 OT. Complete.

Done by a Class VIII. And the total lapsed time that it takes to do that is variable. I haven't been reading the Section times. I don't know. Hour or two at the absolute outside.

But if all of a sudden he can't do one of these items, or one of these actions doesn't work, or so forth, even so he would be expected to pack the session up at that moment. Pack it up.

Close it off and send it back for additional C/S. He has hit a bug.

He doesn't try to sit there and solve this bug. He's running standard tech and there's something in the road of it. Now, the guy tried to rehab ARC straightwire and it wasn't about to rehab.

And he checked over to see if it had been run and it apparently has been run. If it's been run it won't rehab

and the TA rose on it. He could assume maybe it was too many times rehabbed, or something, or something. But he for sure had better send it back to the case supervisor.

Something went adrift. And the case supervisor'll look it over, look over his session, and find probably the bug that he didn't see.

Or we may be dealing with a spook. And before this time we have had somebody who was an OT2 who hadn't ever been audited on ARC Straightwire. That hadn't ever been audited on engrams. Secondaries, engrams. OT1, 2, 3, 4, never had his service fac run. He'd been run on some version or another of Power. And somehow or another had fumble bumbled and false attested his way at R6EW, and fumble bumbled and attested his way falsely at this, and had told people that he was in actual fact a Class VI auditor when he'd never seen the inside of an Academy. How would you like that sitting in front of you as a hell of a withhold? It isn't likely anything would either run or rehab. But it'd certainly measure as a withhold. But something like that, so we could do an assessment on the thing, and we'd see all of a sudden the PC has never been clean on withholds. There was a read there of some kind or another, but it wasn't picked up. Something must be suppressed. So the case supervisor would recheck. And it'd all fall out in the wash.

Where the case doesn't run standard, where the case doesn't run standard, there's a lie.

Because the totality of OT is the totality of truth. And the number of lies which a person has on the line is a direct index of his case state. So you'll get the lower level cases, they lie like hell all the time anyhow. So something has got out of line and we have to find what it is.

Anyway, regardless of that, I'm just giving you some of the limitations, some of the actions, and the exact precision with which you do case supervision. And you're going to think that you figure, figure, figure a lot on case supervision. You don't figure, figure, figure a lot on case supervision. You just know your standard tech better than any auditor you have auditing for you, even though they're Class VIIIs. And you always know your tech perfectly. And you never get invited into the cul-de-sac of running some unusual squirrel action, because the auditors' report seems to indicate that the case is different than all other cases. There are no different cases.

Now, when you can do it as a case supervisor you're not even looking at the PC. You're that remote. And the invitations are terrific, because the auditing is being done and recorded and reported to you out of your sight.

So there, in all other places you've got to hold the grip on standard tech. But to do it at all you've got to know your tech cold! Cold as ice. This is standard tech. This is

VIII. VIII in its' auditing is one thing, in its case supervision is another. When you're a good auditor, you can case supervise. When you can't audit you can't case supervise. That's for sure.

OK? I trust a few of these succinct remarks will be of some value to you in future days. Thank you very much.

****