6810C08 Class VIII TAPE 12

MORE ON BASICS

The assessment's supposed to catch a little bit of doubt on it, because you couldn't quite read what he thought about it, and the other one was a C/S, which was for the birds. Which wasn't actually germane to the auditing session. And so, it may be brutal, it may be horrible, but you are moving right up the line with greater speed than I have ever seen a group move up before, so I thank you. (Thank you.)

Now, you will find that when an individual has been trained and trained and trained, and trained by various instructors, instructors, not supervisors, but he has been instructed in academies and on the Class VI course and ACCs or any other kind of course, he's had, he's had a cycle that he goes through. He begins, he looks at his basics, and he says, "Yeah, that's right. OK. I'll do it." And then somebody comes along and says, "Well that isn't quite right.", and he gives him something else, and steers him sideways. And so he doesn't quite know whether that was right or not, but he goes on and does it. And he sort of gets away with it, and he's not sure. And then he goes along a little bit further, and he runs into a contradictory datum or a datum that somebody else says is contradictory. I'll give you an example. Somebody all of a sudden said, "All the laws of assessment really apply to the laws of listing and nulling", and at that moment, why every auditor has had it. And then somebody came along and said, "Well assessment, that's old hat. We don't do that anymore." You want to watch this we don't do that anymore". And so this noosed up the laws of listing and nulling, and then somebody says, "Well the tape on that is lost or something. We don't have that today. But you just do it like an assessment", and then it's ssss... It doesn't come out right. And an auditor wonders what is going on, but he somehow or other perseveres, and he again doubts his own grip on basics.

So when we get to the level of Class VIII, and we handle this. And Class VIII is probably a simpler course than an academy course. Probably simpler. The data which is delivered, including C/S now, is so straightforward and so simple, that it's almost unbelievable. It's incredible that somebody wouldn't have picked up this data along the track to begin with, because it was all there. Actually this current activity is being taught against a great deal of in tech, out tech activities. But we can't suppose that just because Class VIII has moved into view that in tech, out tech, contradictory tech, you were not quite right even when you did standard tech, will disappear forever from the planet.

But let me assure you that as the organization gets bigger,

and it does consistently and continuously, that you will get more and more areas, and the very multiplicity of it, the numbers of areas which exist, give you that many more opportunities for things to go wrong.

And I have noticed consistently, consistently that we seem to run the same time track - The same things happen. An org starts up in Keokuk. And there is a town called Keokuk. I hope some day there is an org there, and if there is, why I'm sorry, because it simply up to date has been used as a hypothetical area. An imaginary area. Anyway, this org starts up in Keokuk, and it's going to probably go through the same convulsions of the Dianetic Foundation, go through the same errors of the fifties, go through the same difficulties of the sixties, probably get in fire fights with the local council, you know this. It'll have, undoubtedly, a somewhat similar time track to the subject as a whole. Except it will have it in a small bit. You'll get somebody, an auditor went to Keokuk and started up something. Audited quite a few pcs, and moved out and left them flat on their faces, never finished up. A tour got to Keokuk and it picked up the cases that were there, but it generated some more interest, and then some more PCs were audited, and some of those fell on their faces, but there was no org there to really take care of it. Finally somebody puts a franchise center into the area, it goes squirrely, somebody comes in and begins to give colonics at the same time their giving intensives, and it folds up. And then finally, why, a good, steady franchise man gets in there, it builds up to an organizational status, it begins to hold on, it starts taking responsibility for the cases in the area. But this is this planet.

And this is the planet Teegeack. And this planet had a very sorry history. And to get anything started at all on the planet is quite miraculous. Quite miraculous. It's a great tribute to the tenacity and stick-to-ivity and carry forwardness of Scientologists that's it's going forward.

And it is, right now. There's some little, tiny pipsqueak two bit town right at this moment that is trying to pass a local ordinance or something against Scientology, saying it is so evil, it is causing fantastic quantities of distress, and the birds who are trying to pass the law, of course kill four or five patients a week in the local sanitarium, by various methods of butchery. And nobody pays any attention to that. So the planet gives you many contradictions. It's an incredible, it's an incredible scene, where you find the cowboy in the black hat is in charge, and where the bishop has nothing but choir boys in mind, and he is looked up to as a pillar of the community. And they wonder why they seem to be eaten all the time by termites. They're certainly carving into that pillar. But he is his own termite man. And these things happen. You see, we wouldn't be at work at all if the planet were in perfect condition.

Now the hard way to start out a straighten up of the old galactic confederation would be to start it on the planet Teegeack. And the people who went through that one could start it up anyplace, because this was the one which was hit the hardest. This was the place where they were brought. So to get it going here is fantastic. And that, however, doesn't excuse us for tolerating less than perfection, of pushing forward, of keeping it going, and so on. It's a lot of work - And the vagaries and wobbles of auditors and the public, and that sort of thing, no don't think they're going to stop wobbling. It wouldn't matter if we were in charge of the whole planet - You'd still find a file clerk, or a Mr. Bonkers someplace or another would have started up an "I will arise", which has as its' sole goal a slaughter of Scientologists, or something. You know, I mean, it's that kind of a planet.

Alright, so it is a tribute to Scientologists that they carry on and they do get their job done. But along the line of training, you get into, you get into areas where people are leaning on this training. They're reevaluating it. They're doing this with it, they're doing that with it. And when you get to level eight, when you get to level eight, it's instead of falling on your head and feeling that you are now guilty for practice of out tech from here, there and every place, you probably are making progress on the realization that you had your basics in the first place, and that those basics were the basics, and that they were right there and available, and you now probably, because you've been through it all, probably couldn't be improperly trained against the results and precision which you are learning at Class VIII.

I can imagine one of you right this minute. Somebody rushes in and he says, "Oh, well, we don't do that anymore." I can imagine the lip curl he would get in response. He'd probably get examined very carefully.

But you see that a subject goes as far as it works. And it has been necessary to develop the technology, to develop it along a certain research line, and to make sure that it worked here, there and every place amongst the Hottentots and the Mohicans, amongst the Park Avenue and Mayfair, as well as down along the London docks. And it had to work. And it had to work on each, all and every, and that meant that you had to have nothing but the common denominators.

So, but there is this difference. There are the common denominators to all persons. And then there are a lot of peculiarities that each person has which are peculiarly his. The C/S pays no attention to the peculiarities. The more attention he pays to peculiarities, the less success he's going to have. It's a Q and A. It's a Q and A with a difference. The road out is one road.

The oddities that happen in cases are very often fascinating. There's many a good laugh along the line,

that's for sure. We get laughs along technical examiner lines. We got one the other day that just, marvelous. The PC, the PC walked up to the examiner and says, "I feel great." And the examiner's report is, "I feel great. R/S." (Laughs) Magnificent. A whole model must be contained in just that one little sheet.

And so you will find that what is out, and what is being shoved out of line are basics. They're just basic things. Now there's certain basic data which have arisen since the beginning of the research line of course, naturally, because the search was for the common denominator of all cases. This was pretty well wrapped up in 1966 and became very standardized about that time.

But the standardization of it wasn't too possible to one and all, because there were certain people who insisted on being contradictive. They, you know, "He wrote that wrong, well... Waaaa." And they were either operating out of their own banks or against some unfortunate win.

There is this thing, you know, about the unfortunate win. The auditor goes in and he takes a look at the PC, and he says, "What's the trouble with this PC? He thinks he has a head, and he's so fixed on the idea that he has a head. So I'm going to run, 'Do you have a head? Do you have a head? Do you have a head?'" And this one case out of a thousand, this guy all of a sudden goes, feel, touch, mmmm. "My god, I have a head. My god, I'm in a head. Wows" And he blows off and becomes exterior.

Now this poor auditor. This poor auditor will go through years trying to find another person on whom that process works. Now unfortunately it is a trait that he will do more selling than he will do research and applying. And he will start selling the idea that this was a great process.

That it is a great process. That it ought to be done. That all other processes are wrong. We've been through all of this in the fifties. And it simply worked on one, two, three people, and it didn't work on anybody else.

Now there is such a thing as some processes being so pistol hot that they're hardly trustworthy. R2-12 is one of these things. You can overrun R2-12 with just, while you're turning over the bulletin. It's, it's one of those things. And people insist that it seems to produce a great deal of result for a very long period of time. So we have somebody who ran R2-12 fifteen hundred hours. Oh, wow! And it did, it practically ran him into the ground. He actually, probably, went release on it in the first three or four minutes of auditing. And that was practically that. Don't you see? But the auditor, who was green, would be adjusting his E-meter in those few minutes. He would be trying to settle into the session. So R2-12 becomes dangerous in the hands of a relatively untrained auditor. It becomes dangerous, because he hasn't really got his session going

yet, and he hasn't got himself tuned in and the meter down, and he hasn't got his paper, you know, and he's still sort of looking at the PC, and he's still trying to straighten this out. And the damn thing has gone release. He's setting down, and you, you know, settling down for a long haul. And it all happened already. Only he didn't notice it.

It was too quick. Do you follow?

Now that is one of the dangers you're going to run into with Class VIII techniques. Trying to get somebody to do them. Now what's out with the individual is his basics. It isn't any airyfairy nonsense. Any time you hear of this course being taught on the basis of "It is all very airy-fairy, and you have to be in wawawawa, 'cause it is old... And really the basic theory that this is sort of a feel, you see. Class VIII auditing is really an art. It really takes a certain type personality." Any, any, any variety of this, why give the guy the bird, would you please? Because what is inevitably and invariably out is basics.

Now basics can go out on a long trained auditor by being misunderstood or being contradicted.

And when he comes back to his basic data and looks at it again, now he has no choice but to get off his misunderstoods and the contradictions. And he gets his data back. Now there are a few data that he won't have heard of, perhaps. And the subject is an advancing subject, and sometimes you have a little breakthrough of some kind or another. But that would inevitably just be put in a bulletin form. You discover all of a sudden that the... There've been a couple of them while I've been teaching this course. A discovery of the actual liabilities of a one hand electrode. And it's a liability, because a lot of solo auditors have thought, "Oh my god, my TA is out of sight. I don't know what is wrong with my case." And then they get into some weird one, because they go down into session, in reviews you see, and review says, "Your TA is 2.25." And they say, "What?" "Well, I don't know. Something must have happened between here and there. I wonder what that was.' No, their TA was 2.25 all the time.

Now if the one hand electrode was a constant, you could throw the trim check knob of the E-meter over, so that the one hand electrode would read what the two hand electrode should read.

But unfortunately there weren't any meters built at this time which you could trim check to that degree. They don't trim check one and one half division of TA. That's too wide a trim check.

But there are solutions to this sort of thing. You can even do it with a one hand electrode, providing you had two electrodes standing by. And whenever you take your, your

TA, grab the two cans and plug them in, to find out what the one hand electrode is telling you wrong.

But the trouble with the one hand electrode is it usually misses a float.

You see it isn't sweat that activates an E-meter. It isn't sweat that activates one. It's current.

And it is actually being activated by a thetan. And the thetan is not in one's palm. So all you're doing is getting a distant reaction from the thetan himself, and it's liable to miss. And the number of floats which you get on a one hand electrode, and in fact I don't think I've ever seen one. Not a real, wide float. And yet you swap over to two electrodes, my god. You're sitting there looking at a dial wide float. So something like this can come up, or a bug like this can show up. But it's usually a mechanical bug.

Now that, right at this moment, is in the process of solution as to what type of electrode is then usable. And there are three or four of them been suggested, and we, we'll strap it up. So this...

Now that, it was a very big bug, but it never really came forward as blocking the line.

The other thing is, I'm teaching this course against the development of 7 and 8. 7 is all done, OT 7 is all finished. It hasn't been written up at the time I'm giving these lectures. There is nothing peculiar, and I might as well make a remark on this. There's nothing peculiar in either 7 or 8 that violates standard auditing. Nothing in either one of them violates standard auditing.

Not a thing. It's the very standard tech you're using right this moment. Carries you right straight through 7 and 8. There's the difference being the targets of the auditing shift, but they're handled, handled exactly the same way that you handle any other grade or level. Do you follow? There's no difference. It's just what different basic. What different combination. What different thing are you looking for. It's that easy. You do, perhaps another little assessment sheet. Do you see? And then you get that, and you run that, the same processes, same everything. It's a different, it's a different target area. Then you also get to more and more deal with the being.

And you are; I will give you this word of caution. It already exists in a bulletin. And it should be in your pack. As an individual comes up the line he has more and more effect on a meter. So the further he comes up the line the more likely you are to get a read on anything he says. Or anything he thinks.

So that you ask him, "Do you have a PTP?" And you get a long read. And then he says, you say, "That reads." He

says, "I wa... ' That's why you have to know false read. Because what he thought was, "I don't think so." And that fact that he thought this thought of course act...

He's an electric eel, you see, anything he thinks causes an impulse. And that is why particularly auditing people who are on the upper levels, you have to know this definition of a read. And it's a precise definition. A read is what the meter says. What it applies to must be established. It may be reading on the auditor's question, which it usually, fortunately, is, or it may be reading simply on a reaction to the question, which gets you into trouble rather consistently, or it is some other influence has entered in to the scene.

So when a meter reads you have to find out what read. And if anything, even faintly, seems to be out about it, then you have to find out what it is. Not to actually identify what the exact read is, but you say to the fellow, it's very simple. You say to the fellow, "Do you have a present time problem?' Fall. You say, "Alright, what was that?" It's a cautious question, see? "Oh", he said, "Did that read?" And you say, "Yes. That was a read." "Well I don't know. I can't think of any." Read. "Well, were you thinking something about the question?" "Well yes." Bong.

Your auditing an electric eel. See? He, he can punch reads into this meter. And the higher up the line he goes, why the more obvious this becomes.

You don't have this trouble with wogs. You don't have this trouble with grade fours. You seldom get it on Power. You begin to get it in the area of R6EW, and you sure as hell get it in the field of clears. So you no longer can take a meter for granted. You ask if there's a PTP, you get a read. You can even say, "Do you have one?" He says, "No, I don't think I do." You say, "Good. Has anything been suppressed?" And you get another read, and he says, "Yeah, well I don't think I have a present time problem." You see the same read. You say, "Good." Why bug him? Why bug him to death? It's obvious that he's reading on "No I don't have a present time problem", because every time he says this it reads the same way.

So there is the thing of establishing what is a meter pattern of read. Now you're getting into a pretty skilled area. Did you... It consists of knowing the read you just got. Knowing what read you just got, and then comparing the next read to it. We're straining at it here, because it isn't really this important. It's just one of those things that goes by. For instance, an invalidate will get the same read as the item would get. A suppress will get the same read as an item that is suppressed. You'll say, "Has anything been suppressed on this item?" See? "On this item has anything been suppressed?" And you'll get a read. Now if you; the guy said, "Yeah. So and so." Now if you say the item you'll get exactly the same read that you got when you

said suppressed. It's almost curiosa. It'll be the same length and the same characteristic of read.

This is not very usable in things, but it's just that all the auditor knows is that the meter read.

And I impress upon you that you're not going to have this problem in academies. You get it with can fiddles, but anybody can see a can fiddle. You're not going to get this problem down in humanoid levels.

As you move on up the line your guy, your PC that you're auditing in review, you have to then have some idea of what grade or section of PC you are auditing. And you expect this thing to really fly.

Now you can get a person who is in the upper sections in less trouble than you can get a person who is in the lower grades. A person who is in the lower grades has to be, if anything, more precisely and delicately audited. He's in a more delicate condition. But then the meter work is very, is much more precise also. So, you fly the Ruds. "Good. Do you have a present time problem?" See? "Do you have a present time problem?" "Woah, yooo. Well you're very quick on the draw, you know your metering very well, and it's, "Do you have..." Woah. It read.

See? It didn't give an instant end of the line read. "Do you have a present time... " Woom.

"Good." Alright, you're auditing somebody clear or above.

If he immediately tells you he has a present time problem, why good. That was a read on present time problem. But if he starts saying, "Well let me see. Uhhh... " You say, "Alright. Was that a false read?" Or, "What did that read on?" "Oh what did that read on? As a matter of fact I was watching that fly over on the window." That cleans the read. You say, "Do you have a present time problem?" It's now null. Do you get the idea? So that it's just that little more complex. You're auditing somebody more at cause. And you can make somebody very unhappy if you start calling a bunch of reads that didn't occur. Have you got it? You must not vary on that. And, but this liability starts to occur from clear up, particularly. So I make that point.

Now those are niceties of auditing. They're niceties. The probability is you'd work it out anyhow. But you've got a basic. The basic datum on a meter is, is that the auditor knows the meter read. The probability is that it read on his question. The probability is that it read on his question. You don't pay any attention to any oddity unless an oddity occurred. Now what's an oddity? An oddity is, "Hmm. Present time problem. Hmm." And you say, "Well what are you thinking about when I ask you the question?" A very smooth way to approach it. "Oh, oh yes. I think, 'Christ, I wish we'd get on with it.' Yes."

You ask somebody, "Do you have a present time problem?" And you get this read. And with it comes, "Oh, that again." Now a well drilled auditor just flies right into the, right into the old slot. And he says, "Anybody ever said that you had a problem when you didn't have?" "Oh, yes, yes, yes. It's a wow wow wow, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa." "Anybody else ever said that?" Or, "Has anybody ever said that to you before?" You get another read. "Anything earlier?" "Oh, yeah, wow wow wow wow, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa, itsa." See? "Alright, anybody else ever said you had a problem when you didn't?" "Wow." See, "Alright. Anything earlier? Earlier similar incident? Similar time, similar time?" "Oh yeah, well hell, it's my mother. Aw, it's my mother. She's always telling me, 'Why do you have, you have so many problems.' I didn't have any problems." Foom. F/N. GIs.

Well a very skilled auditor, who's very well trained, he goes into this drill just as zzzzzt. See? Very smooth. Now if he had a lot of patter, this is the way it'd sound. "Do you have a present time problem? That reads." PC, "I, I don't, I don't, I don't, I don't think I do have a present time problem." "Good. Is that a false read? Good. That was a false read. Do you have a present time problem? That reads. You get the idea? You could get a lot of stupid patter out of this, so that's why some times when guys ask me for patter, you know, I get a little bit cross. I say, "What the hell's the matter with your own patter? You can talk English."

The only time I get cross with somebody on patter is when he can't distinguish a process from patter. So he starts asking processing questions. He isn't trying to clarify a read, or run anything similar, he asks some dumb question which is a process. "Well, was there anything incomplete about that present time problem?" Oh. Oh no. Now what's he done? The PC inevitably is now going to come up with an ARC break which is probably a session ARC break, but in actual sober fact incomplete is one of the species of ARC breaks. An incomplete action brings about an ARC break, so he introduces this stupid question. He should have said, "Is there an earlier, similar problem?" Instead of that he says, "Well is there... " He's trying to solve this problem. The PCs on this problem and it isn't surrendering. I don't know what he thinks he's running, see? Is he running a grade process or something? And oh, he's gotta solve this problem. You know?

The pc's saying, "Oh I, yes, I had this horrible problem. I have this horrible problem. Nobody will give me any candy sticks, you know? And so on. And it's terrible. They've done me in. And etcetera and so on. And yup, rok, rok, rok, rok." Well instead of doing what he supposed to do, "Is there an earlier, similar incident?" See? That's your itsa line. He says, "Is there anything incomplete about that problem?" Oh, my gods He instantly is into the zones and areas of

liability. Immediately! He's trying to run a process! Second he tries to run a process god knows where he'll shoot the PC all over the track.

If he asks this question, like, "Is there anything incomplete about the problem?", he really doesn't understand that a chain of incidents doesn't tear up until you approach its' basic. That principle he doesn't understand. He doesn't understand the mechanics of erasure. What are the mechanics of erasure? He doesn't dig 'em, so he asks some weird question. You got it? So that the lack of a basic understanding brings him around into a squirrely action, which then gets him into a mess. He thinks it's a terribly important problem. This kid's standing there, the kid is crying, the kid has got a present time problem, so his, I don't know. His helpfulness or his something or other, see, just flips his control. And he comes out with something stupid like, Was there any time anybody almost never gave you any candy?" Well that, he says let's see.

I'm supposed to find an earlier incident. Yeah, that would be earlier. Yeah. "Has candy been delivered to you incompletely? Think of a problem of comparable candy." I know I'm supposed to do something here. Christ. Let me see, what is it?

You get the idea? He, what's his basic? There are only a few of these. It's the mechanics of the chain. It's one of the wildest discoveries anybody ever made. But you have to, on resistive incidents, you have to approach the basic on the chain in order to blow the chain. It's a wild discovery, man. It's first time counts. Now it works even that way in an engram. You get the earliest point of the engram and the rest rolls up like a tent. Very often what you think is a resistive engram is simply because you didn't get to the beginning of the engram. But it'll blow up if you get the earlier on the chain. So you can make the mistake. But it is a mistake. He didn't get to the beginning of the incident. Do you see?

You try to run a secondary. There the guy is, at the moment they burned down the house, or whatever it is. See? And you try to run this. And you try to run this. And you try to run this.

And you try to run this. And it apparently was erasable, but it just kind of stuck up. And it's difficult to run. Now an auditor who doesn't know that it's the earliest, see? He hasn't got this datum, bang, right there at his fingertips as a senior datum. It's the earliest. It's the earlier. It's the earliest. See? Works that way on a secondary. The earlier point in time. The earlier incident.

He doesn't know that, see? So he just lets the PC grind his guts out. You're trying to erase this thing, "Yes, well tell me again." "Well I went up and they were burning down the house. And, god, let me see, I felt very griefy, let's

see. I feel very griefy. I felt, I don't know. Uh, um, it's getting very confused. I don't know whether I'm there or here, wohamjm." And the auditor just sits there like a bump on the log. He doesn't either ask for an earlier part of the incident, or ask for anything earlier on the chain. Well what the basic is out there, is he doesn't realize why things erase. And if an auditor, and particularly a Class VII, doesn't know the mechanics of erasure, he's had it.

Now he has to know the difference between a release and an erasure. Now how is it? You're actually scolded, scolded, scolded, for going past F/Ns. You can get shot for going past an F/N. And then all of a sudden you get a process, it is "Recall bumbershoots", it goes to F/N, run an engram on bumbershoots. Oh you went past an F/N on bumbershoots, right? Now anybody who'd be confused about that is gonna be confused about a hell of a lot of things.

We released bumbershoots so that we could take some charge off of bumbershoots, because he couldn't get near bumbershoots unless we took charge off of bumbershoots. So we disconnect bumbershoots, he floats free. Oh great! What was he running? Locks, locks, locks, locks, locks. He discharges the locks, don't you see? Now this is less charge in the incident on bumbershoots. So, bum, bum, bum, plunge F/N. Great three cheers!

You'd be very mystified if you didn't know about this, 'cause four days later he's all worried about bumbershoots. You'd say, "I released him on bumbershoots. Four days ago, and here he is coming here and telling me all about bumbershoots... " You get awfully mystified, and you could say, "Well gee. This auditing, I guess, doesn't work, or something. It, it, it... I did all this recall of bumbershoots, and god damn, here he is in here again, yip, yap, yak, yak, about bumbershoots. Huh." So you say, "Well alright. The process wasn't flat. I get it. It was an ARC broke needle. Good! We'll run it again. 'Recall bumbershoots. Recall bumbershoots. Recall bumbershoots.' TA starts up. "Recall bumbershoots." TA higher. 'Bumbershoots. Recall bumbershoots.' TA's higher, higher. Recall bumbershoots.' TA 4.25 now. His next basic is out. He doesn't know that overrun causes a high TA. He thinks high TAs are caused by toe nails growing too fast, or something. So he doesn't knock it off. He isn't immediately signalled "overrun", bong!

TA starts up, zooooooom. "Has this process been overrun?" "Yes it has!" Booooom, F/N. You get what I mean by knowing a basic? Now that's a big basic. What is it that causes a rising TA? It's a terrific discovery. You might at least have the courtesy to remember it. And yet in two cases in just the last few days the auditor has just sat there, as nice as you please, and run the TA right up through the roof. And it just never occurred to him for a minute. One auditor took a C/S, he took a C/S, he rehabbed sec checks and rehabbed all drugs, and then for reasons best know to

the man or beast didn't audit the PC again for two days, picked up the C/S, didn't himself remember he had done it, didn't review his former session, didn't turn the folder into C/S. It didn't happen in this group. And ran it all over again. Rehab sec checks and rehab drugs. And the TA started up, woooooo! And he just kept at it. He just kept at it. Man, that session's about half an inch thick. He just kept at it. He just kept at it. Trying to rehab the same thing. Trying to do the same thing. And, watching the TA go right up, up, up, up, up, up, up, up, up, and didn't do a damn thing about it. Didn't even occur to him, oooh. I finally belatedly got the folder. And I blew my stack. 'Cause I couldn't find out what the hell. I couldn't find out why is the TA going up on a rehab? And then I found the earlier session, and then I managed to read through the squiggle, squiggle writing, and I managed to find out... Oh my god. He did the same C/S twice.

So he overran a rehab of overruns. Oh no. And never, for one split second woke up to the fact that he was overrunning something. Well where the hell were his basics? Damned important basic. A TA goes up because of overrun. There is no other reason.

I've seen somebody on Power going by this datum, which was extant at one time or another, that they had to ask one command at least. The thing blew up on just clearing the subject of PrPr4. Bong! The meter blew up. F/N, GIs, so forth. And the auditor asked one command.

That is, he started to clear the command, not only cleared the command, but he ran it for an hour and a half. And the TA was going up and up and up and up and up. And he finally came to the conclusion about an hour later, that there must be something wrong. Well the C/S on it was elementary. It was an unnecessary C/S. It was simply to "Tell the guy it's been overrun and rehab it." Did it, fwmp, bong! Down it goes. Bang! Floating needle. Starts on 5, then there's no trouble.

Now what was missing there? It's a grasp of data. The datum being that a high TA is caused by overrun.

Now I'll give you another one. A low TA, and I won't use all the key buttons and association, is caused by invalidation. And a low TA is inevitably and invariably caused by some species of invalidation. That is not the button, and that is not how you get about it. But that is the close enough to it, so as not to key everybody in in sight.

The guy's been hit too hard. He's been punched too hard. And that's a low TA. And that's all a low TA is. And a low TA isn't anything else. I can show you a session where a guy was having rudiments put in, and he runs ARC breaks with three suppressives in a row. He was in a somewhat suppressive area. And, as he clears the ARC break the TA goes from 2, down to 1.7, and it F/Ns at 2 again. And on

the next guy, now he's F/Ning at 2, now here's the next bird that he's taking up. And he tries to, he was taking this up on a different process, prep check, you see, and TA, he gets onto the next suppressive. And oooohhh. TA down to 1.7. To cognite, to F/N at 2 with GIs. And then he gets on the next suppressive with another process, and it goes, aaahhh , down to 1.7 And then he runs it out, and pongo. Back up to 2, GIs.

Anybody who is running a TA at 1.5 and getting an F/N at 1.5, ought to have his little britches spanked. Because his auditing is suppressive. In some fashion or another he's over whumping and running into the PC too hard. All he'd have to do to bring the thing up would just be to fish around. Is it a subject that we're trying to, that's got you going, or is it something that we've done in the session? Oh. See, he can't get it up. The process he's running, it's trying to F/N at 1.5. Christ. What do you do about this? Well, it could be an ARC broke needle, it could be this, it could be that, the other thing. No. It's just something has run into him with a truck, that's all.

If you want to get the TA up, why, you could ask as crude a question as, "What ran into you like a truck?" "What have you just been run into with?" You know? Or, "What did that guy bop you with, or bop you with?" Crude, see? You know your basic. You know your basic, see? The TA'd come up, (whistle). Come up into normal range.

And then some sad sack who is just perpetually down, low TA, and feels sad about the whole thing all the time, and he F/Ns with bad indicators. Boy, that's a missed nomenclature if I ever heard one. He F/Ns with bad indicators. That's horrible, see? You don't F/N with bad indicators. You go ARC broke needle. Yeah, but if you keep running the process that you're running, the process itself is probably not solving what the guy should be run on, or you've forced an item or process on him. Some action is being too forcefully done, or he's being shoved into a zone or area which doesn't have anything to do with his case, don't you see? And, or he gets on some subject which makes him very sad indeed, and then it's not cleared up and the TA goes down you'd get an F/N at 1.5. Now a guy who is run this way gives a very interesting aspect. He now begins to believe, after a while, that when an F/N occurs he feels bad. So therefore, an F/N is a bad thing to have. Actually computes it out this way. And the remedy of it is just to prep check floating needles, of course. You advise him of the fact that he's been low TA enough times to prep check floating needle. And then all of a sudden it reverts. And something else happens. But it's a standard remedy. Prep check floating needle.

So this, this; you can get anything out of the road by prep checking it. If you don't know what else to do with it prep check it. You don't want to run it on L-1 forever. You don't want to run L4A forever. And after just so many green

forms, why you'll have to rehab green forms someday. And so, you've got this situation here. You've got this situation here, that you have to handle something that you don't know how else to handle it, prepcheck it. Prepcheck it.

Fascinating, you see? Well it's the old, old, you say, "Well that's not done anymore." I'm sure that somebody has said within the last year or so, before this lecture, certainly. I'm sure somebody has said, "We don't do that anymore," about prepchecks. In fact I ran into somebody the other day who didn't know what one was. It's the handiest, jim dandiest little piece of stuff you ever had anything to do with. If you don't know what the hell to do with it, prepcheck it. That's just the rule, see?

Now you can endlessly prep check. There's two actions you can always do, when you don't know what the hell else to do. You've run into somebody who's weird, off beat, god help us.

Nobody ever heard of it before. Some, some auditor has audited this fellow in a tub of hot water on the theory that the TA is too high when it is cold. And therefore... You're gonna run into all kinds of goofinesses, don't you see? And you say, "Oh my god. What do I do about this?" Obviously to wrap a PC around a telegraph... What are we going to do about this? There's always something you can do about it. You can prep check it.

"On the incident of being run in the tub of water, has anything been suppressed?" The other thing you can do, you can always make up a list. And there's where your imagination can play around. And the only rule about a list is keep it dimly in the same subject area. Don't have a list that has dental operations and roller skating on it. Don't write up a disassociated list. Your items on the list must be associated. And you get your clues for these lists, by the way, you don't have to pick them out of thin air. You look back through folders and find the PCs comments about this, that and the other thing. And you all of a sudden find out, they always seem to have a little nyik, nyak, nyak, nyak, nyak on the subject of, of banks, or something.

You all of a sudden find this guy is a clerk in a bank and he's ...; you look over this, and you read some of the data out of the line, and he seems to have PTPs about being broke - And so on, and this guy just always seems to have this problem - And as CSS you get tired of this problem.

There's something about, he can't pay for anything, and the reason he waaa... You say, "To hell with this." I'll just give you a wild example, see? When you write up a list for assessment.

Don't get the PC to list it, because you're doing an S and D type thing, and so forth. The hell with that. Do an

assessment.

And you, you say to yourself, "Banks, banking, bank managers, bank bosses, bank organizations, money, cash, checks, coin, silver, gold, copper, paper, checks, customers, clients," see? And you make a little list, see? That's as much as you want to embrace in the matter, because all you have to do is get a corner of it. That's what you don't know about these lists. See? You only have to come in on the edge of the corner of it, and the pc'll take it the rest of the way.

And so you write this up as a little list and you assess it. Perfectly. Bark bark bark, bark bark bark bark bark. And you get it down to that. There it is. It's checks. Checks. There it is.

Alright. And you just unwind that. Now order a prep check on checks. And the god damndest things happen you ever heard of. You move in sideways on this thing, don't you see? Actually it wasn't really checks, it's ledgers. And he'll eventually tell you that in the process, without disputing checks. Actually he's been entering checks backwards into the ledgers so as to make them come out some other way, and he's been balancing his books so that he won't get scolded, not to... not. He's got this hellish withhold on money all the way up the line, only you softened it up. And you're getting rid of his withholds.

Now the hard way to get a withhold is, "Have you ever shot your grandmother?", you know? Direct sec check question. Pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow, pow. See? Pound, pound, pound. Easy way to get it, is find the subject or area of the withhold and prep check it. You get the withhold very nicely and smoothly. That's just a use. Use of an assessment list, use of a sec check. This has infinite variability.

What are the basics then? The basics, is how do you dream up a list? How do you assess a list? And what do you use on the list? Now there's something else you could use on the same list, but you wouldn't go past its' F/N by using this other thing too. You do one thing or another.

See? So you'd say, on L-1 you'd say, "On checks, you know, has a withhold been missed?" You know? You could run the L-1. But I assure you that the case has to be in pretty good shape to run an L-1. He has to be able to pinpoint things. And on somebody who's muggy-fuggy on something you are much better off prep checking it. You got it? It isn't it's for a lower level case, it's a more generalized subject always requires a prep check. Specific, particular things; the guy just went through Saint Hill. Something like that. Alright, you've got particular little items that you can pick off. Do you follow? Lets get a zone or area.

Now Saint Hill doesn't go back several lifetimes. You got it? Doesn't go back several lifetimes.

It just goes back for a short period. So therefore it's L-1 date. But checks, holy suffering Christy Lord knows where it's gonna go. Do you see? So the more generalized subject or the more generalized or lower grade the case also, that isn't similar, your prep check's best.

Now you can add certain buttons to a prepcheck. Eval, inval. Now if you were to try to do a Joberg, or pull missed withholds on somebody who had a low TA, I can assure you his TA'd go out the bottom because you're overwhelming him. And you also would probably turn on an R/S and then spend a long time trying to pull this R/S on some imagined crime. An R/S does mean a crime, or it can mean an invalidation. It could mean one of two things. Also, dangerously, you can clean the R/S off a case and leave the crime sitting there and not now R/Sing. There is two or three instances of this having actually occurred. It's very hard to find an actual live, thief, criminal-type crime, don't you see? You know, somebody who actually took the loot. And then you find out later he did take the loot, and somebody had cleaned, cleaned the R/S off the case with invalidate. But having cleaned the R/S off the case with invalidate, then the case, this person went around and stole a thousand, where before they'd only stolen two hundred, and the money is found on them both times, so there wasn't much excuse. You see, you can clean it off with invalidate and find out it was a crime too.

So somewhere on down the track, to make an R/S, why there is some kind of a crime. It doesn't have to be against the subject or area that you think. But nevertheless, nevertheless, if you start to heavily hammer somebody, and heavily hammer somebody around, you wouldn't be a bit surprised if he had a low TA. Now you, as Class VIII, should simply say, "Low TA? Self invalidation. Low TA? This case is being invalidated. TA sank in the session? PC was invalidated in the session." Got it? "TA was at 2.5 at he session beginning, and sank to 1.2.

Shoot the auditor." You don't need to know what anybody said. You don't need to know a thing. Session wound up at 1.2. What happened? You see, your basics. Your basics. TA sinking is the guy being overwhumped. See? Or, left in the middle of an unfinished cycle of being overwhumDed. Something like that. Don't you see? Which would also be an auditor crime. But let's say they weren't running anything very vital, and they start out at the beginning of the session, TA 2.25. You wind up the session, TA 1.5. Well you don't even have to think.

Your C/S on that; you don't even have to think about it. It is... Write it out. Prep check the last session. Give it to another auditor, have the auditor retrained. You don't even have to think.

Boom. The guy was either invalidated with bad TRs, or he

was run halfway into something, and not run through it. The session is a false report. An ARC break needle, the idea of GIs being in on it is preposterous. The guy must have been at least propitiative. This is the kind of a grip you've got to have on data. You see the needle going up, see the TA going up, needle goes up, TA goes up, needle goes up, TA goes up, needle goes up, TA goes up. Did you ever notice that the needle goes up before the TA goes up? In the opposite direction? Buuuup. Buuup.

Buuuuup. Zuuup. Zuuun. Zuuup. And the auditor keeps on doing this, boy. Hang him. He doesn't know this datum. He won't believe it. He thinks there's some other reason for it. TA going up is overrun. TA going down is invalidation. (Got it) Make and break, open and short, simple, succinct, sweet. There are no differences. There are no variables to these things.

You can appear to have a variable, because you can run an incident which drives the TA down, but the auditor would have had to have goofed like screaming crazy with his TRs not to have let it run out and come back up to normal range. So he had to find an incident where the TA was down, where the TA would go down, and then only partially handle this, goof it up in some fashion or another, and then falsify his report to leave the TA down. See, it had to be a combination of things would happen. But you say, "Well, alright." Because this excuse will be given to you. "Oh, I don't know." Yeah, well yeah. "You see, we were running an incident on his mother. And whenever we mentioned his mother his TA goes down." "Well that may be so", would be a response. "But why aren't your TRs adequate to run the incident all the way through, instead of leaving it parked halfway through? Why didn't you ask for an earlier, similar mother?" (laughter)

In any event, it's a hell of a flunk. End of session, TA 1.85, PC laughing, GIs in. It's either a false auditing report or the TRs were madly out, or the pcs anchor points were being pushed in two feet back of his head. Do you understand?

Now when you get the next session you can do a lot with the session. You can put in the Ruds in or during or before that session, you can prepcheck that session, you can do an L-1 on that session, you can do a lot of things with it. Those are the principle things you would do, just the ones I gave you. And in the next session it will emerge what did happen. You don't have to worry about what happened, you just know something wild happened. And now if you're interested, if you're that interested in grooving in an auditor, you can look at the next session, which is run by another auditor, and find out what the hell happened to that auditor, and what should he have straightened out. Because he certainly needs something straightened out. So that all non-standard results are departures from basics. All non-standard results are the departures from basics.

And that is the moral of my little story.

Now either the guy had his basics, the auditor had his basics, he studied his basics, somebody moved in on him sideways, contradicted the basic, he found some other data, and so forth.

Now he at that moment got a departure from standard results. And that departure stemmed immediately from having been moved off his basics. Right?

So, then all non-standard results stem from contradiction or misunderstoods or messed up basics. And it never, never, never, stems from the individual not having been super airy-fairy in the seventh gallery. "You see he really didn't have the talent for auditing. You see, his father was a clergyman, and his basic training was the challenge. And that is why we have not been able to make an auditor out of him." If I had a academy D of T telling me that I would take out a little imaginary violin I carry in my pocket, tuck it under my chin, take the little bow, and I would play the little song, "It may be so, we do not know, your story sounds so queer. We hate like hell to doubt your word," and finish it off yourself. He isn't teaching his students basics. He hasn't said to George Aloicious Gulch, "Your TR 1 is just about the most stinking TR 1 I have ever seen, and I want you to improve it." No, he's told him, "You see the expression which you use is very important. And when you are sitting down looking at the PC, be very careful of your expression during TR 1, because the expression is very important." That isn't what's important about TR 1. And TR 1 doesn't take anything in it about expression.

TR 1 says TR 1, doesn't it? And that's all it says, and that's all he's supposed to do. And how he does it is his business. You got the basic. You got the basic of TR 1, you got the basic of TR 1. That's what's your supposed to do with TR 1. Alright, you can do TR1 or you can't do TR 1. Period.

Now somebody comes in sideways and says, "The color of your eyes have a great deal to do...

I knew a hypnotist one time that says, "I always handle my patients... " I bet they were, too. "I always handle my patients on the basis of, I say there is something you do not like about me, what is it?" Can you imagine the fellows' social approach, going around in the neighborhood.

Anybody he meets he looks at them, shakes them by the hand, and says, "There is something you don't like about me. What is it?" Well you know, sooner or later that might become TR 1.

That's how far a basic can go out. Do you see?

I one time... The best TRs I ever turned out in a group of

auditors was every time an auditor asked a question about a TR he was read the TR. Now that might have cut his comm, and it might have ARC broken him, or it might have this, or it might have that, but you know they all wound up with terrific TRs. Every time he said, "Well now, in TR 1 does one hold one's little pinky up, or,... ", so forth. And all the supervisor was permitted to do was to pick up the sheet of TR 1 and read it. Now he could also have said, more delicately, "Is there anything you don't understand about this, bud? Something you don't dig about this. What was it?"

"Well, yeah. Why do they have that date at the top?" You know, something like that. Clear it up. See? But what is it he doesn't understand about it? Not clarifying evaluating on it. Do you understand? It's that level of simplicity the basic is out. It isn't because this fellow doesn't know a hundred and fifty thousand processes. It's because he hasn't got enough sense not to ask a process when he should be letting the PC itsa.

The simplicity you are finding right at this line, right at this time, the simplicity is fantastic. I'm sure that you are getting your hands on. Some of you still perhaps a little nervous, the finger shakes a little bit. The pencil I noticed quivers slightly on the page here and there. But these are the things which have been out in this particular unit. It isn't what would be out in another unit.

But they'd be things comparable to this. These are the things which have been out. There aren't any airyfairy things. Your comprehension of this, that and the other thing is great. Assessing.

You should have learned that in the academy. You've got your cast iron nerves not knowing how to assess. It's EM 24 of the E-meter book. It hasn't changed for years. How to run an engram. R3R wrapped up engram running for all time. There hasn't been any shift of any kind in R3R. Engram running, engram running by chains, there hasn't been any shift in it, no change in it for years and years and years. Anybody whose been through a Dianetic course and has gotten himself a piece of data that is cock-eyed or upside down, or somebody told him, "We don't do that anymore." If somebody said we don't do that anymore he would fix it up so that you really couldn't shoot anybody up through OT8. That's for sure. He would be stopped.

So. Guy's got... I don't know how the hell you'd ever heal anybody. How would you ever make anybody well if you couldn't run an engram by chains? I don't know how you have.

Alright, so therefore I can tell you positively that not knowing this cold, then this is what's happened. You've cleaned up Filches lumbosis on Tuesday, and he's had it back again on Thursday. And you have been damn puzzled. Well if you go on keying out this lumbosis it's just a key out. Lumbosis is just sitting there. All you've done is

shift his attention. You have improved it to some degree. It might never come back again. It might come back again while he's walking to the examiner. But all you've done with this lumbosis is to key it out.

So what's a key out? You have to know what that is. Any time you just key something out you pays your money and you takes your chance, boy. It's liable to be back in the next minute, it's liable not to be back for a hundred years. But it'll be back. Why? Because the basic impulse to manufacture the picture is still there. And at the least whiff, this guy's gonna make the picture all over again. Because you haven't hit it. It's something he won't confront. He hasn't owned it. He got rid of it. And you're sort of parking dirty laundry over in the corner to be picked up some day. And some day he's gonna run something and all the dirty laundry will disappear, as he goes up through the OT chains. See? But, nevertheless, this guy comes in with lumbosis, you say, "Good. Who in your family had lumbosis?" "Well, you see, that's an interesting question. Who the hell did have it? Oh my god, my uncle Timothy." "Do you remember a time with your uncle Timothy complaining about lumbosis?" "Ha ha. Yep. Oop. What the hell? My lumbosis disappeared." You say, "Good. That's it." But hold your breath, boy. If you were to say just one more sentence, or send them to an examiner who is a complete, knuckle-headed idiot. And the examiner knows the guy's an idiot. And he comes up, and the examiner says to him, "Ha ha ha ha ha, how are you, Zilch? Ha ha ha ha, how are you? How's your Lumbosis, Zilch? Ha ha ha ha. God almighty, Jesus Christ!".

That's why you've got to shoot examiners who do anything but shell out a piece of paper. As a matter of fact, it's probably the safest system, is to have a booth with nobody in it. Examiners can evaluate with a look, you know? "You again." You know, that sort of a "What the hell is wrong with you?", sort of a look. You know? Maybe the guy's just got a headache or something, "Aaiuh?" Guy says, "What the hell. I must look like him." You got it? Alright. Now that's a very slippery straight wire wing bing, wow wow technique that I just gave you there. It's as old as 1950, and it works like a bomb on an awful lot of cases. I have seen, I have seen an entire scaled face, completely scaled and scabbed, go completely clean and clear in some two or three minutes. It's impossible! Yet it happens. Key out. Bong. Gone. But when is it going to come back?

Now, we run engrams by chains. Rat tat tat ta bow, ta boo bow, de de dee... Actually, if any guy's chronically ill, any engram chain you find, or any, really any secondary chain you'll find on a girl, or something like that, has got the illness on it. You don't have to say, "Let's see. What engram chain would I find to find a leg injury? I think we had better run a leg injury chain." Bull! You're liable to get him into the wrong chain. You just run the most available chain of engrams, and of course he is stuck

in the most available chain of engrams. And if you know your basics, the engram he is stuck in is the engram he is in, which is the engram which is giving him the trouble he's having, naturally. So if you look any place for the engram, than the available engram that he's in, you're gonna run out something else. And now he's got lumbosis and trumbosis, and pneumonia into the bargain. So it's always the most available secondary, the most available engram. This guy has a tough time in life, you're gonna run secondaries. This guy is angry a lot of the time, you're gonna run secondaries. That's the most available thing. But, you just run the engram chain.

Now he can walk up to the examiner ... ... "What the hell happened?", he says. "It all disappeared. It blew. Something, pft. It blew. Hey. Pain in my back's gone. Hey what do you know? Where the hell's my arthritis? Yeah, gone. Hey!" Wowing See?

Now he walks out to the examiner, and the examiner says, "Oh yeah, Joe. Ha ha had your lumbosis! ", and so forth. And he says, "How's yours? Ha ha ha." and walks out.

Now you've erased the impulse to make the chain of lumbosis, by erasing the engram that the impulse was making. And it ain't never gonna come back no more. He can get sick from something else. Do you follow? So I can tell you very definitely. The PC whose mannerisms do not change has never had an engram chain run on him. Well his mannerisms come from the engram chain he's sitting in.

So I watch these PCs that always go ck, ck, ck. And I see them four years later, they've been audited eighteen thousand hours in some place or another, and they go ck, ck, ck. And it made a big mystery for me. I wondered what in the name of god is this all about? And then I find out that people have been saying for some years, "Oh, engram by chains? Ha ha. A person who does that is sort of squirrely. We don't do that anymore."

You get the difference between a release? Release is, he's not going to do it now. It's out. But the basic guts of the thing is what you erase, man. And an erasure is an erasure. Somebody the other day in this unit, obviously didn't know what the hell it is I'm talking about right now, even though it was on an earlier lecture, because he said after he erased the damndest series of engrams in the PC, then he wrote on his report, "He sure looked keyed out." Oh. That's pathetic. You might not get the joke. But if he'd erased the engrams he couldn't be keyed out, because there was nothing left to key out. And there's nothing left to key in, so why would you say he looked keyed out? Do you follow?

And of course, the understanding of the mechanism of clearing and other such mechanisms, must be very, very poor. The mechanism of clearing is simply that when you've erased the basic the guy realizes he's mocking it all up,

then he doesn't mock up any more of those things which he knew he was mocking up. It's a horrible shock to him to find out a little bit later that he's got some pieces of him parked over there that he didn't know, and he'd disowned, and he didn't have anything to do with anymore, ha ha. He blows 'em awful fast, but that's what you clean up as you go up from there.

Now a guy at clear, he feels wonderful. Why does he key in? He's still got body thetans, he's still got this and that. So, you take it apart, take it apart, take it apart, take it apart. And, just today in research I was punching around to find out exactly how you restore total recall on the total track, and so forth, which is one of the functions of 8. And found out how you did it, on somebody who didn't know how to do it. Somebody who didn't have it.

"What did you have for breakfast in 1325 B.C.?" Whole track recall, whole track recall. The same reality level as you recall this lifetime. Well, opened the door to that one.

Anyway, now the rest I'd like to tell you here is basics such as how to run an E-meter. People having E-meter trouble. What, anybody's got nerve, having E-meter trouble, not in this line of country, but somebody must have moved it in sideways and invalidated metering, pushed metering around, got to worrying about metering, what's metering, this way and that way. Got to doing' something wrong with a meter, and then didn't, couldn't put it right again. And there was some misunderstood about it. Something like that. But of all things, how to list and null.

That is a killer. Absolute killer if you don't know that. You'd knock a PC flatter 'n a flounder if you don't know how to list and null exactly right. It's an exact precision drill. You could make mistakes in assessments, or from prepared list, in prepchecks; you can make all kinds of mistakes. Don't you ever dare make a mistake in listing and nulling. And therefore you don't often order them.

I look through a few folders, it's pathetic. S and D. S and D. S and D. Remedy B. remedy B. Have an S and D an S and D and an S and D. Have a W. S and U-type S and D. Ah, bull. It's a risky action. And you only do it when you've really got it set up straight and right.

I was horrified the other day. I had not; I had ordered specifically itsa on the green form. A whole itsa on the green form. Only itsa, similar itsa on the green form. Guy got to environment and did S and D. He did a remedy B. rather. He did an environmental remedy B. If I'd wanted an environmental remedy B at that point I would have said so as C/S, pow. And you know why I didn't say so? It was because that damnea review folder was about a half foot thick with them. We didn't need any more lists on this case, thank you. So it was itsa, earlier similar itsa.

I ought to give you a drill some time. It's a drill you can give somebody. "Run this whole damn case with a list 1 itsa, similar itsa, with no subject. Run the whole case with a list 1, itsa, similar itsa, earlier itsa, with no subject, to F/N." This is an elementary drill. That'd make a citizen out of him.

Now you want to know how to run a green form? How do you run a green form? How do you phrase the phrases of the Preen form? Oh, bull. I'm not trying to make a player piano out of you. The green form contains a whole lot of subject matter. And you could do it all with itsa, earlier similar itsa. The whole green form.

Your TRs, somebody had disturbed your TRs one way or the other to a point where you were contradicted and upset about them, and so forth. And how to really get in Ruds. That, nobody had ever learned. Nor the consequences of auditing with Ruds out. And I find with horror that you've been doing solo auditing with your Ruds out. I don't know how the hell you ever made it.

And oddly enough, what the mind consists of. Exactly what is in the mind. What is this thing called the mind? It's such an elementary gimmick that not to understand it is something like, "Explain to me the sidewalk." It' s very elementary. There isn't very much in the mind. But a guy is thinking about the mind with a mind, and as he can make many complexities on the subject. And man has managed to, for all the trillenia. And the reason he has made these mistakes the whole trillenia is simply that a mind is a mind, and people have made a lot of business out of mucking up minds. And it seems to be the one thing that you can muck up.

And they apparently could get further for their own purposes mucking up minds, they thought, until somebody got around to mucking up their mind. They're not good at straightening up minds, and nobody ever issued anybody an instruction manual with the mind. And nobody ever issued an instruction manual with a body, so that one is prone to make mistakes. But these things were not understood.

And just to give you, just a little rundown of the various things. How to run engrams and secondaries, how to run an E-meter, how to do assessment, how to list and null, TRs, how to really get in the Ruds, and what the mind consists of. Those are the outnesses in this unit. Now there isn't a single damned, airy-fairy anything anywhere there, is there? So you had to know that you had once known it, and had to get it cleaned up, and had to get your misunderstood and contradiction straightened out, so that you could get it in and play it on the piano. And you obviously are playing it on the piano, and this lecture you'll probably all be thumbs again.

The main trouble with C/Sing so far has been C/Sing from stuck opinions, and wishing off one's own case on somebody else. "Well I think this PC must have a lot of trouble with train accidents." You look back in the guy's folder and he has trouble with train accidents, not the PC.

Now one thing I wish that you would get used to doing, get used to doing, is this is an administrative action, which can be done by a C/S, or it can be done by an auditor, or it can be done in a Qual or in a tech division. But whoever does it, it should be done. And if it isn't done somebody damn well should do it. And that is, keep a tally of all of the C/S actions taken and executed in the beginning of a folder over on the left hand sheet, so that you know everything that's been done. Now this can get pretty damn corny. C/S is in order; "Fly each rud to F/N." Somebody did it the other day, took a break for supper, and came back and flew his rud to F/N, and it shot the TA up to 4.25. So it can be forgotten within half an hour. Well think of what happens if it's left for six months. Somebody's had a valence shifter. Well it should be over there. He's had that. You try to give him another one and you've had it. He's had his S and Ds. He's had an S and D-U, he's had an S and D this. You can look it over and you can see what S and D he hasn't had. You could give him that one. Do you follow? So it's a highly precise action.

If you don't want to overrun cases, why you don't run things on them again that have been run, so some kind of a tally of what has been run on a case should be placed in the folder, very visible, and should be kept up to date as fast as it is run. Shouldn't be left behind. And that way it'll keep him from making mistakes.

See there were two instances, two cases smashed up, not here, but two cases were smashed up very badly, because when the session was finished the auditor didn't note down anything on he completed those actions on review tallies. And he came right back to session and did them again. Complete idiot. Wrecked the cases. Smashed 'em, boy.

Alright. So, the general point which I've been trying to drive home, which I think anyone whose been at this any length of time at all is getting wise to, is he doesn't have to know a hundred thousand combinations of something. He only has to know what he knows very well, and the basic elements with which he is dealing must be tightly grasped and used. And there aren't a whole bunch of variables that run in from the side.

There is no... This game has narrowed down to where you all of a sudden don't get a new rule for the game every time you try to play it. You're playing cards, the fellow says, "Oh, red cards. They're not valid now." You've just gotten yourself fifteen red cards. It's not that kind of a game you're playing. These things are stable, and if you don't believe they are stable, why look around at the results you

are getting, look around at the results being gotten on your own case and on the cases of others.

And I think you will agree that standard tech is highly workable tech, and it is as workable as it is standard and kept standard. And that is the secret of it. The standardness of its' administration, and so on. And it's getting there. It's going like a bomb. And I'm sure that you agree that it is.

Thank you very much.

****