

6809C28 Class VIII TAPE 5

THE STANDARD GREEN FORM AND RUDIMENTS

And this is what date? The twenty eighth of September 1968. Lecture number what? (Five) Glad you can still count. Thank you very much. Lecture number five of the standard tech Class VIII auditors' course.

The situation with regard to standard tech at this time is we have had a few mice. And I imagine down through the years there will be a few other mice. A bulletin gets altered, a tape gets pulled off the line, some vital action is shifted. Somebody comes tearing in with a brand new idea that seems to be absolutely vitally essential, and the first thing you know, why we have trouble of one kind or another. And tech fails. And it suddenly ceases to give the results which it should attain.

At that time morale goes down. "No, Scientology doesn't work." These are the danger points of the past and of the future. It is not unbeknownst to me to get proposals such as this through the mail line. It's a proposed HCO Bulletin. There are forty or fifty of these things which have been written and issued. And it does seem that a person, before he is permitted to have a Grade, should go to the examiner to find out if it was an ARC broken needle or if it was actually a release on the Grade he was supposed to be released on, and not an F/N on something else.

Now I'll tell you, what does this stem from? Why? Why? Why would such a proposal come up? Standard tech is already out. It's already out with enthusiasm. What's out? The TRs are; would have to be so bonkers that the auditor was not able to attract the attention of the PC for the next Grade or action, and the PC chortling merrily, merrily to himself would be getting an F/N from a former action. You see what could happen here?

Alright, we've just released this fellow on zero, and he says, "Ooh, gosh, you know, boy that was really some cognition." You know, needle's swinging. "Uh, it's really going great." And the auditor sits there and says, "Aw yaya, uh number one, it went away and it went by and ububuzub." And the PC thinking to himself, "Boy, that's really great, that communication process. Really great." And the auditor says, "Uh, why, that's a release. Uuuuwuwuw." And the pc'saying, "Boy, that, really. I can communicate, you know?" And the auditor says, Kenya you know, nyee," canned command, no TRs, no command, no impingement on the PC, can't operate his E-meter anyhow, doesn't even notice the PC isn't looking at him. "Uh, well it's raring' too', and so forth, and the needle's going on a swing and the PCs saying, "Gee, well what do you know about that? I really can talk to people, you know?"

The only other condition this could occur on is if it was a busted E-meter. Now in the first place, if it's an ARC broke needle, you're getting the PC sitting here like this. "Duh." And the auditor says, says, "Catfish, gollawong." And the PC says, "Awawang. Yeah. Oogh. Nya, oog, Log." And the auditor says, "Well I'm glad that's a floating needle", and so forth. The PC never would answer on any of his questions.

It could also occur on one of these kooky stage four needles. It goes up and does a little hitch and goes down. You ever heard of a stage four needle? I saw somebody just go "Uh!" What's a stage four needle? A stage four needle is a stage beyond three, which is dead. (Laughs) You can get a meter, you can get a meter on a PC and he sits down in session and goes up and hitches and falls, and it's doing about a two inch sweep. And it goes up and it goes, it hiccups at the top, and it goes down, and you say, "Have you ever been shot?" And it does the same thing, and "What's your name?" And it'll do the same thing. And you kick him in the shins and it'll do the same thing. And there's absolutely no meter change of any kind whatsoever. It isn't hardly connected to anybody. Which is really the truth. It isn't connected to anybody. And it goes on and it does this weird dance. Well if a person doesn't know what one of those needles is as far as an ARC broke needle is, you can get a swinging needle. It isn't connected to anybody either. And the questions which you ask don't change it. In ordinary auditing an F/N broadens,-narrows, responds just to that degree. You start overrunning it you'll see your F/N is going narrower and narrower and narrower and narrower and it packs up.

PC, you get an F/N and then the PC has the cognition, he actually states the cognition on which he gets an F/N, and you see the F/N widen up. In other words, an auditor'd have to be a complete dolt to need such an arbitrary on his lines.

Now this is based on the fact that somebody has trained some auditor in an academy on the TRs, something on this basis. "What is TR0?" "It's the TR in the book you... and I think I heard about it." "Good, fine. You passed. Now, what's TR1?" "That's the number of the other TR." "Good. What are the rest of the TRs?" "Oh, I know all them." And that would all... he could possibly know about TRs to require such a regulation.

One of the conditions of auditing is that you have the PC in session. He has to be aware of the auditor, and in communication, and answer up, and so forth. Well, if he wasn't doing any of these things, naturally you would have to send him to the examiner to find out if it was a real F/N. But the situation would be so peculiar. But to stop everybody, everywhere from ever progressing in a session just because some supervisor hasn't been able to teach an auditor to audit, and just because there's been one PC last May who went all the way through the lines with a stage

four needle and nobody ever noticed that he didn't know he had ever been audited, and didn't know he'd ever been in session, just to introduce that sort of an arbitrary would, of course, be completely nuts. Inspection before the fact is the standard line. If you're not having trouble on some line don't do anything about it. If you are having trouble on some line, do something about it. And it follows in auditing too. You're having trouble with the PC, well, you do something about it.

Now when I berate and start tearing you apart for wanting a nickel in the slot-type approach to auditing it is because you are asking for something which will make you a rotten auditor. If you don't know what you're doing, and if you don't know what the standard action would be for that, you ought to go back and study your TRs and a few other things.

It wouldn't be an occasion then to put a regulation in after the fact of not having trained somebody. Do you see? Now there are rote commands which are the standard processes. But you receive an order, something like, "Rehab former lifetime releases" Now what the hell do you want? What now; how could anybody under god's green Earth write down all the words that would have to fit in the ensuing action. They couldn't. It couldn't be done because it wouldn't fit all the cases. Because there are many different types of former lifetime releases or this lifetime releases, and, you see, what you're doing is rehabbing former releases. So you say "Rehab former releases." Well how would you go about finding these things? Auditor - that is your problem. And if you can't solve that with the PC sitting in front of you, you ought to quit. Do you see what you're doing? You have to know what you're doing. And then do it with great economy. And then if the session is running like an express train, what're you going to do? Inspect after the fact every couple seconds?

Now, I'll give you an idea, you know? "Do you have an ARC break? That reads." "Uh, oh, yeah. Uh, yeah, I was feeling pretty bad yesterday. I got a letter; very bad." "OK. Was it a break in A, R, C, U? U? That reads." "Yeah. I couldn't understand any part of it." "Good. C, D, E, I," using the words to somebody who isn't educated. "Curious." "Curious about what it was" "Curious about the understanding of it?" "Yeah, that's right. Hey yeah, that's, you know what? I thought it was the stuff in the letter, it wasn't in the letter. I never could dig it. I, I didn't dig it. Wow!" Skin tone looks good, good indicators, everything is fine, and the needle goes whum-whum. F/N.

Now you're going to say, "Do you have an ARC break? Did that floating needle float on the ARC break cognition which you had?" Mm-mm. You're not going to say anything about it at all. You're going to say, "You're needle's floated. That's it. Thank you."

Now. Your F/N is now in on the rudiments, which are simply setting the PC up, then you simply swing into the session. Now because there're this many variables you would now have to say, "It didn't clean. See? So do you have an earlier ARC break of a similar nature?" Or, "Do you have an earlier, similar ARC break?" "Did you have one like that before?" Man, we're talking about communication. We're not talking about words. You have to know what you're after. You're after the ARC break similar to this which occurred before.

Now, it doesn't matter what language you say it in as long as it communicates to the PC, and you know what you want. Otherwise you're liable to get something kooky. You want similar, earlier ARC break. You got it?

Now supposing you're auditing some guy. Supposing you're busy auditing some guy. And he doesn't know what the word ARC break is. Or, suppose he's got a complete mis-definition of the thing. He thinks an ARC break is an overt, or something he busted when he was a kid.

You're going to have to know what you are asking for, so that you can communicate it as an auditor. As an auditor you are trying to communicate a thought or sense. Now why should anybody try to escape his responsibility on the whole subject to the degree of wanting a canned word by which to ask a perfectly ordinary routine question? If you know your business you don't have to have those.

Now on the Grade processes, yes, you had better know those words exact, exact, exact, because they're very carefully worked out. But again you can't administer a Grade process if you don't know what you're asking for.

It's your job as an auditor to, to, to deliver it to the PC. To receive the answer and know what the hell to do with it. And there isn't anybody under god's green Earth can give you a whole bunch of canned balderdash that does your job for you. Now I'll point something out to you. I have already done quite enough without also writing all the words you use. Now that is not a wide open invitation that every time you get yourself into a corner you suddenly shift processes. Now recognize the difference between a process and a question. There's a fantastic width between a process and a question.

I'm going to give you a kooky one I read in a folder. You can have an infinity of wrongnesses, but some of them are funnier than others. You say that this auditor said to the preclear, "Do you have a present time problem?" And the preclear said, "Oh, yes." "Good. What postulate created that problem? Good. Now what counter postulate met that problem? Good. Now what postulate created that problem? "And the funny part of it is, that the TA sort of, went up, and the session all went to pieces, because I think the problem was that his chair was tippy, and it didn't have

anything whatsoever to do with any problem. It had to do with the auditor didn't clear the environment in the first place. See, he's actually asking the; he had some canned idea.

He got this from someplace, I don't know where, that you clear up problems by what postulate did you make, what counter postulate did you make. Now he of course is taking the definition of problem is a postulate, counter postulate. He tried to audit this by definition. But note that is was also in the wrong part of the session. He didn't notice that the PC was sitting there almost falling out of his chair, because one leg was busted. Now this is one hell of an awful, lousy level of awareness, if you want to even dignify it by calling it a level of awareness.

So the auditor's supposed to be there, he's supposed to be on the ball, and he's supposed to do what he's supposed to do in order to come down on a certain, exact line and keep the PC herded on to that line. So we know that it would be the most fatal to audit over an ARC break.

You audit over an ARC break, it's an absolute law, it's nobody's opinion I assure you, you audit a PC over an ARC break he'll go eventually into the sad effect. Yet, at Saint Hill one time I saw a PC who had been walking around for three months with an ARC break that people had audited in every session over the top of. She was in grief, she was in a complete sad effect, she was an absolute text book case of sad effect. And there wasn't one single person there ever asked her if she had an ARC break of long duration. Until I noticed this character walking around, and I got an auditor by the scruff of the neck, and I said, "Pull the ARC break of long duration, would you please?" And he did so, and the case cheered up and everything was great.

You see, there're certain things that are meaningful. Like, an ARC break, audited over the top of, puts the PC into a sad effect. And there aren't any exceptions. And it is a rule. And it is a law. And any time the law is disobeyed, you cut your throat as an auditor, and the PCs throat.

So you always pick up your ARC break as the first thing in the session. 'Cause it's completely fatal to audit somebody over the top of.

Now, the person who has the ARC break who says he doesn't have an ARC break has had somebody tell him he did have an ARC break when he didn't. He protested, and since that time ARC broke has read. And, an educated auditor asks him immediately for, "Did anybody ever tell you you had an ARC break when you didn't?" Cleans up the false read.

Or, this reverse thing can happen, more rarely. More rarely, but it can happen. He said, "Do you have an ARC break?" Doesn't read, the auditor says, "That's clean." And the PC says, "The hell it is." So the auditor says, "On ARC

breaks, has anything been suppressed?" And you get the suppress off. Now you say, "Do you have an ARC break?" And the PC says, "Yeah, that was my ARC break. People never taking up my ARC breaks." So, it now doesn't read, but the PC is cheerful about it. So it can be positive or negative. But your educated auditor, your educated auditor takes this up. This is something he takes up. He doesn't sit there like a damn bump on the log waiting for the next piece of telex tape to pass through his skull.

Auditing is something that is understood. You only get into fire fights over PCs if you don't know what you're doing. So we don't ever audit over an ARC break. And we never leave a false read on. And we never leave a false no-read on. We handle it.

Now, the next thing we take up is a present time problem. And a present time problem means present time problem, the problem the PC has now, a problem which he does have. You never get into any trouble about this or a definition. It comes up or it doesn't come up. And the reason we take up a present time problem is very elementary indeed, as you will not ever change a case that is audited over the top of a present time problem. You won't do him any harm, but you're never going to get any change. He doesn't change. And that is proved by graph after graph after graph after graph after graph, dozens, dozens, dozens, dozens, dozens, hundred of PCs. I finally traced it back and isolated exactly what it was that gave an unchanging graph. The presence of a present time problem. Work was done in '55, '56, Washington. No change.

So you going to audit this guy over a present time problem? Well then you're going to audit him to no change. Where you going to get an F/N? You're not. Where're you going to get the TA doing anything? You're not. What you trying to do? Cut your throat?

Alright. Similarly, you asked him if he has a present time problem, and he says; you say that reads. And he says, "Oh, no, not again! God damn. Every time I get into session and I try to get auditing done, why that reads, and so on. I suppose I have got a present time problem." And you say, "Alright. Has anybody ever said that you had a present time problem when you didn't have one?" "Oh my god, yes! Bda-bda-da-da-bab-bda-bda-da-dabab. Bdee-dee, bdee-dee, bda-da, and so on and so on and so on, and I never can get into the body of the session because they all say there's a present time problem with the Ruds, and so forth, and all dba-ba-ba- pow-pow. Pow-pow-pow-pow-pow. Pow. F/N. You say, "The needle floated. We're going to take up whatever we're going to take up."

Now the reverse can be true, more rarely, that you say, "Do you have a present time problem? That doesn't read." Funny, you see him look a little puzzled. Just but very often won't say, puzzled, it didn't read. Look a little bit

baffled. And you could say, "Well, should it have read?"
"Oh, yeah, gee, you know? I just have been served with a writ for federal income tax from the Eskimos", and so on.
"And boy, it's a problem, because I don't know any Eskimos." Anyway, you say, "Alright. On the present time problem has anything been suppressed?" "Yeah, yeah I have to suppress it. If I don't suppress it I'll never get anything done." It doesn't clean up. "Is there an earlier time you suppressed a problem? Anything you care to say at this particular time? Do you want to tell me more about the Eskimos, or any damn thing you care to say?" It's itsa or earlier. Green form rule is invariable. It is itsa or earlier, or a listing process.

That's all you ever do on a green form. Itsa, earlier, or a listing process. And there're certain things on the green form which you list. Says environment. Alright. If there's something wrong with the environment do a remedy B. If he's connected to a suppressive person or a suppressive group, anything in that department that comes up on the green form, you do an S and D. Continuous present time overts comes up, you do the prevent process. You say, "What about all black? Doesn't that require some special process?" No, not necessarily. I don't care if the PC goes on being all black. If he wants to be all black that's alright with me. Do you follow?

But the PC is; you didn't follow. The PC is worrying about his Grades. He's worrying about his field. He's worried about this or he's worried about that. So it'll clean up on itsa and earlier. "Yeah, yeah, everything I see is black. I don't ever see anything. I close my eyes and it's all black." And so on. "Did you ever notice this earlier?" "Yes. Yeah." "Alright, when was that?" "Oh, I don't know. Spokane." "What was going on then?" "Oh that's right. We ran this engram and everything went black. Huh. What do you know?" Needle goes voomp. F/N.

What the hell are you doing something complicated for? It's itsa or earlier. That is the law of the green form. On certain points of the green form you do a list. So. Itsa or earlier. If it doesn't clean on itsa, it cleans on earlier.

Now I can see you putting together a beautiful, rote process. Knock it off! What you have to know is, itsa or earlier.

Now, how do you ask for itsa? Knock it off. "Do you have a present time problem?" "Oh yeah, my god. I'm about to lose my job and oh, wow, and so on, and then how will I meet my alimony payments because, oh, my god, you know, woo. Wow.~
"OR. Do you have a present time problem?" Read. "Is there an earlier, similar problem?" Didn't clean on itsa. So you gotta go earlier. And you can run it back, back, back, back, and all of a sudden you've got it. You got it back to basic. Then you have to know your mechanics, don't you? You have to know the composition of the mind. You have to know

that you have to reach the basic point where the chain started in order to get total freedom on the total chain. You have to know that. You don't just know itsa or earlier, you have to know why. How come you run it earlier? Well, if it doesn't free late on the chain you; there's an earlier on the chain to make it free. If it does free late on the chain it hasn't got any basic under it. Or, it's a simply tripped off and released at that particular point. You've made him think the right thought that moved him off the mass.

Simple. Too simple. It is so simple that it is the most easily misunderstood thing anybody can think of. In the first place you're trying to teach somebody something about something they very well may have. A reactive bank. Now, when you say present time problem there are so many people that say, "Oh yes, I've got a present time problem," and they miss the rest of the sentence. And you're trying to teach them this, you restimulate 'em. A problem.

I brought up one here in yesterdays' lecture, and I said the incredible can hang up a track, and two students only learned this about it. That it applied to them. And I didn't tell them because it applied to them. And I couldn't care less that it applied to them. Do you understand? I taught them that because it applies to other cases. And I am talking to an auditor, not a case.

There is a rule about this. A very broad rule about this, that in later years has been violated.

Auditors and students do not have cases. When we first found out they had cases and thought they had cases was about thirteen years ago. And it became illegal, while being a student and while being an auditor it is very, violently illegal to have a case. You don't have one at that time. That's it. Do you understand? Those are the facts of life.

We had a gag here happen the other day. Somebody says, "You're late. Why did you arrive?" And the person said, "I need a review because I've got an ARC break." How can anybody get up to Class VI and not know that a student doesn't have a case? Students don't have cases.

So, when I'm trying to communicate to you I'm not talking about your bank. To hell with your bank. I am not talking out of my bank as philosophers and experts in this line have only done for the last four or five quadrillion years. So you can pay me the compliment of not listening through yours. It's very remarkable to have principles which came up way the hell and gone back on the track of Dianetics and Scientology, principles of the early years. They still hold good. They hold so good that they function at OT8. Fantastic The stuff which is being taught to the lowest grade auditor is valid all the way through to OT8. Fantastic! So when you're learning a simplicity of this character you are learning a simplicity of this character.

Nobody's trying to solve your case. Nobody's even trying to give you a cognition. I'm just telling you what the hot dope is.

Those three things, those three things that are absolutely, completely impossible to audit over the top of, include the withhold. So you've got ARC break, PTP and withhold. You will never get away with it. And neither will the PC. Nothing.

How many ways can you pull a withhold? You can pull them the easy way, you can pull them the hard way. I have pulled withholds by moving my chair over in front of the door and said, "It's perfectly OK. I can sit here the rest of the night. I am going to hear it." But that was after I checked it over to make sure that it was a real withhold. That it wasn't a false read. That the symptoms and manifestations of the withhold were very, very present. And the PC wasn't going to tell me his withhold. Well I knew damn well there was no reason to proceed beyond that point. I would just be wasting my time, so I would just simply say, "Well, I can sit here the rest of the night until you tell me. There's another system which is highly workable.

Alright. Good. We will sort this out on the meter. You're not going to give me the withhold, we'll sort this out on the meter. Have you murdered somebody? Good. Where did you bury the body? Have you robbed a bank? Do you strangle children? Are you a rapist by prof... " "Oh no, god, nothing like that." "Alright, what is it like?" "Oh, well, I just so and so and so and so."

Huh. "I'm short twenty five dollars today in my cashiers' till and can't find it. And I didn't want to tell anybody." In other words, you exaggerate the withhold. But that's after you've made sure that it is a withhold. There's no false read in connection of it. Connection with it. It is a withhold. It does read.

Now there is a slight danger about rock slams which turn on on withholds, occasionally, is you can get them off with invalidate while they're still hot. Now you can turn off a rock slam by putting in the button invalidate on it. It doesn't mean the person's innocent, you've just cooled off the rock slam. Now the person may be innocent, but when you put in invalidate then you also have to put in suppress. You can't just put in invalidate and have it cool off, without then also putting in suppress to find out was it just smush out.

A rock slam is basically an invalidation. Therefore, if you invalidate somebody hard enough on some subject he can turn on a rock slam. An invalidative question, asked with sufficient ferocity can itself turn on a rock slam. It can be done. But that isn't all the rock slams there are.

We had a criminal, I use the word advisedly because it wasn't a very big criminal, but nevertheless a criminal,

just the other day, that had a rock slam. We cooled it off with invalidate. And then it didn't read. And she was supposed to have stolen a hundred dracma. It didn't read. It exonerated her. She even had two hundred dracma on her. And then, a few weeks later, a thousand dracma disappeared, and she had it. Too many coincidences. The rock slam, actually, was perfectly accurate. The person was a thief. But it did cool off with invalidate. So remember, if you cool a rock slam off with invalidate, you've also got to put suppress and not-is and a few other things in, and make sure that you don't turn it back on again. Your job as an auditor is not to turn off rock slams or turn them on, it is to discover the truth.

There's any gods' quantity of ways you can approach the whole subject of withhold. There have been many bulletins concerning it. An auditor, if he understands what a withhold is all about, is all about, he can handle withholds. Now a missed withhold is what is in the rudiments. So you have to not only detect that it exists, but you have to find where and when it was missed. And I see folder after folder where it says, "Do you have a missed withhold?", the auditor says. "Yeah, yep. I stole a pin from HASI." "Good. That cleans the question. We will now go to the body of the session." PC doesn't think anything, matters, ble-blop-bloop-jep.

Doesn't even repeat the question, doesn't ask who nearly found out, nothing. Just missing. Do you follow?

So, this is, is kooky, kooky-Ruds. See? Now you wonder why you haven't, if you haven't flown the needle by the time you've got to missed withhold, and you wonder why it doesn't fly on missed withhold, it's just that the where and when, by whom it was missed has been omitted. You have to know the theory of a rudiment. It is not enough to know a rote.

Now we go down into other matters but frankly, from there on you're on safe ground. You're on safe ground. Nobody's gonna do anything very weird. Now the only violations of this is taking up the obvious ARC break. The guy was given a wrong item. He's ARC broken about it in the last session. PC is ARC broken after the session, the session consisted of listing for an item. He obviously has a wrong item. The longer you spend asking if he has an ARC break, the more of a fool you are. Obviously he's got an ARC break, because that is what, a wrong item causes an ARC break. You look in the folder, there are eighteen items reading on the list, and he's given an item that he didn't list, and the auditor gave him the item. Do you know that was the first trouble on lists? We always have trouble on lists. First trouble on lists was the auditor suggesting items to the PC. We've come further than that now. We've only come as far as it doesn't matter whether he's given a wrong item or not.

But this is important. The lads got an obvious ARC break,

because you're repairing the last session which had a wrong item. You're repairing 5A and you find the third BD item was the one he was given. If you get a hold of this guy, wrrrrr. Now you're going to put in Ruds to correct the item. Aw, don't be an ass. See, if you know your business, and you know you know your business, you know that a wrong item off a list is going to have produced an ARC broken PC. And if you ask for the ARC break he is seldom sufficiently technically oriented to know that that is the source of the ARC break. So of course you can't pull it. So you can box around for an hour and a half, auditing across the known ARC break, just busting him to pieces. So of course you handle the known ARC break. If it wasn't an ARC break, alright. So the PC comes into session, "Alright. In the last session we see we had a list here, it runs 118 pages. Oh, yeah, yes. We have this list, and how'd you feel about that?" "Oh god almighty, oooh." "Well, I wish to indicate to you the list was over listed. Alright. We're going to check this list now. Was it the first item?" Bong! "Alright, that's good. That was the first item on the list. Your item is free fall. Thank you very much." OK. Good indicators come in. You now say, Rudiments."

Do you follow?

I saw a session, there is a session in the case folders there that is in a complete howl. The PC was sent in by C/S to have a wrong item corrected, and the auditor asked for an ARC break.

And it goes on for column after column, because the PC is insufficiently educated to know he's ARC broken because he's got a wrong item. It goes on and on. Well, they pull more ARC breaks without getting anywhere, because pulling ARC breaks over the existence of the ARC break can also be painful. It goes on for pages. Wound the PC right up in the rag bag.

So the rudiments, Now that doesn't in any way violate the rudiments. The guy walks into session saying, "Oh my god, what am I going to do? Oh my god, what am I going to do?" He sits down in the chair, "Oh my god, what am I going to do?" Picks up the cans, "My god, what am I going to do?" You would be a very, very foolish auditor if you didn't say, "Do you have a present time problem". Elementary.

You don't Q and A on other things then the rudiments, however. PC comes into session and says, "Well, I suppose you think you're going to do something with me. Heheheh. Myanyayaya. You think you're an auditor do you?", and so forth. My response to that is, "There you go, there are the cans. Do you have a missed withhold?" Pongl Booml "Something wrong?" "Oh, no, I'm sweetness and light. As a matter of fact I did have a little withhold. I stole a pin once from HASI." "Good. Thank you very much. Do you have a withhold?" "Yeah, I ate your lunch." You know, something like that. Well, it'll be obvious. And having

handled that one, naturally then you go back through your actions.

Now this is an auditor who knows his business. There is a folder that runs like this. "Do you have an ARC break?" "Yeah, they're doing us all in. Everybody's caving us in lately. We're sure getting shot down in flames," and so on. "I'm really ARC broken about it. Boy, what they're doing to us." And the auditor, like a god damned fool sat there for the next I don't know how long, continuing to ask for ARC breaks, and finally finished up the session asking for ARC breaks because he couldn't clean ARC breaks. Well it was very remarkable. He couldn't clean up ARC breaks because the PC didn't have one. The PC had a missed withhold, and was calling it an ARC break. And he'll notice in the old bulletins and so forth, says very often it occurs that when you have an ARC break it is really a missed withhold. The one thing I had a hard time teaching Class VI students way back when, was that they don't accept everything the PC says in violation of tech.

He says, "Oh, they're doing me in, and all that last auditor, he cut my throat from ear to ear. And that is all bad. Yes, I have a terrible ARC break, because everything... they're doing me in, you see. And they're really pretty nasty to me. And that's off pmfodf fddouf, gobbldy, gobbldy, gobbldy, gob." Critical, missed withhold. Pcs, inevitably because it's more socially acceptable, will call a missed withhold an ARC break.

So, if the ARC break doesn't clean he's got a missed withhold. Very simple. But it isn't something you wreck the PC with. All of this is... We're traveling now in auditing, and a couple of thousand miles an hour at least. We're not traveling with that old fan job, Piper Cub fan job, anymore. Don't you see? If you know your business, it's, "Nya, nya, nya." "Now good. Do you have a missed withhold?" Zoom. "Thank you very much. Now, do you have, that's clean, do you have a missed withhold? That's clean. Good. Do you have an ARC break? No, that's good. PTP? That's fine. Alright." Didn't F/N? Green form.

Now you've just asked these four questions, so are you a live being or a fool? Are you now going to ask those same questions again on the green form? All you're going to ask about is environment, you having trouble in your environment. And then you're going to bring it down to overts and motivators. Because you just got through covering them. Do you understand? And you get down the line and you suddenly find out that this PC has had an overrun. And you straighten up the overrun. And the needle flies. Good. Now you can get on with what you were supposed to do in the first place. That's the way it goes. With speed. It isn't any fumble-bumble stumble-bumble. "I wonder whatts wrong with this PC?" If you ever think that thought as a case supervisor you're an ass. I can tell you what's wrong with a PC - he's humanoid.

That question's answered, don't ever worry about it again.

On diagnosis, if you want to use such a word, the PC is as he is because he hasn't made the next Grade. Now let's set him up and correct any earlier errors, so that he can make his next Grade. We don't go into a figure-figure because he's got a pain in his side.

PC comes in, he says, "I have this awful pain in my side, oh terrible pain," so on. He's just a walking invitation, boy, for you to go kooky. He's issuing an engraved invitations to the examiner, and everybody else connected with it.

The two things that can be wrong with him are, the auditing he's had needs correcting, or he should be on the next Grade. And that sure requires a hell of a lot of you as a case supervisor, doesn't it?

Honest. Papa'll spank you if he ever catches you pulling this line. "Well he's got this awful pain in his side. I wonder what it is." I can tell you what it is. It's either the living he's had or the auditing he's had isn't sitting well on his reactive brisket. Which can be corrected... He should be doing the next grade. It's always the next grade. That's all the think you do. You can know more doggone things about PCs.

You can run a complete intelligence service on PCs, you know? They are this and that, and a woffa-woffa-woffle. Well it does you some good. Don't think that it doesn't. It does you some good. Because it tells you what you just solved. You don't have to know what you're trying to solve before you solve it.

This fellow was a hop head, bank robber. Spent the first five years of his life in a cast. His uh,... Do you see? Was a premedical school student and was expelled, uh so forth and etcetera, and etcetera. And for twenty two years studied yogi. See? And you've got this list, see. And you say, "Wow." See? And by the time you get him up to Grade IV he's flying, and you say, "Boy, look what I did." That's actually most of the use of it.

You can get this kind of a situation, where you know that the PC is Lithuanian and doesn't speak English, and has been audited by a Dane who didn't speak Lithuanian. Your problem as an auditor is to find, is to find a Lithuanian auditor. Your problem as C/S is to find a Lithuanian auditor.

I've had that here the other day, had that here the other day. Managed it too. We were embarrassed one time, along side of a dock somebody'd been handing out hand outs, talking about Scientology. And some guy showed up and he wanted to be audited on his Grade processes. And he only spoke one language. Actually, I think we did get him some

auditing on his Grade processes. He just showed up out of the blue demanding his auditing. Couldn't speak English, nothing.

Recently, recently you talk about standard tech and the quality of auditors, and so on. We had an auditor who was absolutely the world's most experienced killer. This auditor was a Class VI, but had never audited anybody with any great degree of success, and had in the main neglected one certain an especial PC. And this PC had been especially, he wasn't a PC even.

He had never been audited. He was the one who had given over all the money for all of her training, her Grades, everything. But she had never paid it back with a single Grade. So she was asking some favor of me, and I said, "Yes." And at that moment she was balled and chained on the whole subject, some of you are liable to take that literally, it was actually only forbidden to leave. And I said, "You, for the first time are going to really learn what a Grade process is. And you're going to run every single one of those processes, and you're going to run them perfectly, and you're going to produce results. Because as of this minute you have no certs and awards of any kind whatsoever, and you get 'em back just as fast as you put that PC together. Each Grade he makes you get your cert back on that Grade." Took him all the way through to Power, the guy was absolutely flying, you couldn't recognize him at all. It was almost over her dead body that she'd do this. She didn't like him, I think.

But all of a sudden he made it all the way. She made it all the way. All came out right in the end. She wasn't auditing on her own determinism. (Laughs) That's how exact and good standard tech can be. It was quite remarkable. It was a remarkable feat. It's much more than I tell you in just this little thing. It was a win of years' duration. Years' duration. It's great.

Now what did she have to do? She had to do exactly nothing but exactly what I told her to do, and if she so much as wiggled her little finger, god help her. And even though she was unwilling to audit him, even though she didn't even like the guy, even though so on and so on, it all came right on up the line.

Therefore, the processes which you're using can easily, easily, easily bypass mere objection.

You see, you're not dealing with 'Let us assume the ibis position'. You are not dealing with 'If you take a vitamin a day the dogs will go away.' You're not dealing with a bunch of old wives' tales. You're dealing with something that is as hot as a ninety foot circumference buzz saw. You got to learn how to run this buzz saw, 'cause it'll go right straight up the line. You don't monkey with this buzz saw. You do exactly what the buzz saw says. And if somebody under

your direction doesn't do what the buzz, what you say, and does something else, well you just turn the buzz saw in to hLm a little bit sideways. You make it go. You make it go right. And it will go.

You can make it go right in the most impossible situations you ever heard of, as long as you keep the guy right on the main highway. You've got channels and edges on that road. He can't go into the ditch. You mustn't let him go into the ditch. There is an infinity of ditch to go into.

There is only one road.

So therefore, the approaches to a session are simply the approaches I've been giving you.

There aren't other approaches to the session. You really can't audit covertly.

Wawafafaawagaaw. I can give you an infinity of other circumstances. These are the things which you handle with a session. And you don't go anyplace with a session unless you've got those things handled.

Now the Grade processes you go up the line through have just about as much choice in wording as though they were branded four feet deep on a concrete wall. There is no variation.

Not the faintest variation. Clearing the command, the exact command, the exact administration of the process, the exact end phenomena. It is a drill of tremendous precision. And that is what you're leading up to when you get those rudiments in, and so forth. You're leading to this moment, where the next Grade is to be done.

And then you've got him all set up, and you do just exactly that. You tell him what it is, you clear the command, you get; make sure that he knows the command, and polly-volly. And he goes on through. He doesn't miss.

And you fumble-bumble, "I wonder where the, where is the trim knob? Where's the directions for the E-meter? It's HCOB, let's see, the Grade Chart. What are the commands for Level 1?" and so on. "This meter's terribly... new meter... just take me a... I've seen it on the... " He won't go up the highway. Any fumble-bumble at all, any slightest, any slightest wiggle-wobble and indecision and have to think to get the datum, and, and so forth, it... There is goes.

You haven't got it. I mean they're... Not it, you haven't got the session. You haven't got the preclear. He didn't go anyplace. You got it?

It's like a marksman. Marksman, he's trying to find the trigger on the rifle. "Where is the trigger? Where's the trigger?" You think he's ever going to hit any bulls eyes? No.

So, here you have the variability of the rudiments. The variabilities involved in setting up a case. The variabilities by which you can run a green form, or run an L4A, or an L1. And in each of those you just get the thing done, somehow. And the rule is uniformly, it sets itself right by itsa or it goes earlier.

You can, on such a thing as L1, indicate the BPC. Reads. You can indicate the BPC. But you would be a very foolish person indeed to be indicating the BPC on something you didn't know what the PC had just read on, 'cause it might be a false read. You always have to find out what it is, which is itsa. Now you could indicate the BPC in the matter. Now that, that would take it out of the line.

You can indicate the BPC very complexly. There's an old bulletin there that tells you how to indicate BPC, oh my god. It's perfectly OK to do it that way. But that's that body of auditing.

Now those are the body of auditing of repair. Now you also have to know what the process was to know what you are repairing. See? Now that is working with the PC to set it right. And that is usually a backwards look, and you don't do review actions to get case gains. Only one thing to the contrary, and that's OT4. It is now a review action. Because the whole rundown, it can get so damn many gains for the guy, that there have to be done at OT4 before he starts OT5 that it's just a review action now. Only it's really not a review action, it's sort of a tech action.

But you start sending people to review, it's because they can't get on the next process. "All my life I've had this heavy feeling in my stomach." Well you send the guy to review. Why? Is anything wrong with his auditing? No. There's nothing wrong with his auditing. What's wrong with him is his stomach. Well does that mean Scientology won't handle things like this? Yes, Scientology'll handle things like this. It'll handle on the next Grade or two. Sometimes it handles on the next Grade, and then, then drifts sort of back, and then two or three Grades later, or sections later, all of a sudden he runs into it head on, and it does solve then. For god's sakes. See?

But you're not auditing the significances and peculiarities of individuals. These are infinite in number. You have the main road. Why are you running up and down these little side paths? Any of the Grades will handle anything, so to hell with it. I mean, walking up the Grade line will eventually handle anything. But anything. You don't have to have a process that handles this, and a process that handles that. Don't get yourself associated with a little doctor that has a little pill case. There are pink pills, green pills, orange pills and blue pills. Now if the individual has a toothache you give him a green pill, and so forth, waffa, waffa, waffa. Well you're not in that

business. You're not in that business.

Well there are undoubtedly processes which might do him this and that and the other thing, you could straighten this and that and the other thing out. But the truth of the matter is, on your main line of auditing, on your main line of auditing, it's always a Grade action that handles the PC.

Now there are certain actions that run through the entirety. One, secondary running, engram running, and ARC breaks, also missed withholds and also PTPs, run all the way from a hundred lifetimes ago to OT8. Those processes still remain valid. Still remain valid. Well the faults I find with Scientologists is they very often will see somebody fall on his head, get run over by a truck, and do some kind of a light touch assist and say "That's that." And then wonder why the guy is limping. And then they sort of say, "Scientology doesn't work." Man, I've got a word for you. That auditor is afraid of work. Do you see?

An engram could be run at any time, but then, this isn't a review action, it comes under the heading of an assist. It's engram running as an assist.

Now you say, "Well god. If engram running can be done as an assist what couldn't you do?" Oh, yes, that's right. You can always run an engram, you can always run a secondary. I don't care where the grade is, but I got news for you. Know how to run it. Know how to run engrams.

The funniest thing, engrams don't run if you don't know how to run engrams. I get so disgusted looking at somebody who allegedly knows how to run engrams. Or, know how to run secondaries. This is an actual one. And he says, "Recall a moment of loss. Recall of moment of loss." And I looked at the thing and I said, "What the hell were you doing, what were you doing in this session? What were you doing? What, what the hell was going on? What, what, what, what is this? What's this?" "It was running a secondary." Suffering Godfrey, if that's gotten into the line up. Holy Christ. Now you see, the truth of the matter is that you can take a thing like a secondary, which is in present time, near present time, the individual's got all of his restimulators for it, and you can key it out to F/N (snap), just like that. And then the person walks around the corner and meets Joe, who is associated with it, and it keys back in, just like that. And then you can, as an auditor, give the guy a slight recall of it and it keys out to F/N, (snap) just like that. And he can go around another corner and he runs into a restimulator of it and it thump, back in, just like that. And you can just keep this up.

Eventually it'll wear out. But I call to your attention that it is about the slowest possible method I know of, of running a secondary.

Now I have had to pick up two cases. Two cases who in

actual fact were severely, severely bogged on an assist level of secondary and engram running, that auditors had stood right in front of them, sat down in the auditing chair, asked them what it was all about, and the individual is all boggled up. It comes under the heading of secondary can make somebody so depressed that they feel physically ill. They feel old. It's a peculiarity. - They feel energy-less and old, and used up and so on. And you're in to audit this, see, you're trying to audit this.

And you're trying to audit this. Oh, nothing flies, there isn't any reason to run anything on the thing. Why? Well the guy... she just lost her husband. He isn't even cold in the ground. And some damn fool auditor will say, "Do you recall your moment of loss", and so forth. "Yes, I guess I do." "Oh good, that F/N'd." "Oh yes, I feel much better. Yes, I feel much better." She'll feel that much better for the next ten or fifteen minutes. Don't you see? What you have to know is the mechanism of release. And an auditor that does this sort of thing's a damn fool.

Now a good auditor would say, "Now wait a minute. This character's, was doing all right, really fell on her head," you understand I'm talking to you about an exception from grade auditing. These are the things that can go the whole line, see? But what's messed up? Life's gotta be corrected. See? Some; it's gone this way in life. See? There's been a life intervention of magnitude that has driven this person off. And you can get the idea that if the cannon ball came along and blew off your PC's head, he wouldn't be able to make the next grade. He wouldn't be there to hold the cans. Well, I'd say at that exaggerated level it's the same thing.

When a person was an innocent bystander, and all of a sudden, why they had this big secondary occur. Bombo. Big loss of some kind or another. And I've had a good auditor, a good auditor, if he was on the ball and he knew his business and so forth, he wouldn't ask questions about this, or something like that, he, he would know this and the C/S would be informed she just lost her husband. And the C/S would say, "Alright. Get in your Ruds and run the secondary of death." Only please, that would be "run the secondary of death." Run it.

Run its "The first moment he enters the incident, What is the duration of the incident?", and so forth, "When did you first hear in the news of the subject?" You know? Bong. "What is the duration of the incident? Alright. Move through the incident... " And so on. Just like it says in the handbook. And you go through it and through it and through it and through it and through it, and you spill a few gallons and quarts of tears, and misemotion comes up. There's such a thing as a fear secondary. "I was terrified." the guy was terrified. He's been in a state of shock, he's dead white ever since. He can run a terror secondary. Perfectly easy to do this. But life has knocked him sideways, you can put him back on the line.

Alright, he didn't get up high enough to get his grades fast enough in order to keep life from knocking him in the head. And to this degree you can give him an assist, and straighten him out.

Another person was given an S and D, and I don't know what all, to straighten out a severe illness. I got a hold of the PC, found the pc'd been ill, asked the PC what's she been doing, told me at once. Ran him to the first moment of the incident, ran him through it, zoom, zoom, zoom, zoom. That was the end of the illness. And one of the, one of the lazy part of this problem, however, is do you know it can take nine hours to run a secondary? It can take ten or twelve hours to run a real engram? You only run it to F/N, of course. But running it, it doesn't just key out. It erases. You are now dealing with the category of clearing. You're erasing the engram. You're erasing the secondary. That's different.

Alright, I'll give you the circumstances. This is an assist-type action. The individual was doin' all right, they were gain' on up the line, and they stepped under a truck. Now you've got to get him back on the main line again. How do you do that? Well, you can give them a contact assist, taking him to that place. If it is necessary, to where the accident happened and make him touch that place, and so forth, with the part of the body that was hurt, touch the object that hurt them, and work on it on a contact assist, just directly, one right after the other. Always the best type of assist is that contact assist, and the somatic runs out. You wait for the somatic to run out, and so on. It runs out when it runs out, and bang, that is it.

If you can't get him to that place, and so on, you run a touch assist. And the touch assist is run with "Feel that finger" and so on. And if the injury was very severe indeed, after you've done the touch assist a little bit later you come along and you run the engram. And that is a complete assist.

Now how come we're knocking off all of a sudden, this business of running the engram?

'Cause the person might, it might go past an F/N? Now let me assure you, you'd have to be completely ignorant of the phenomena of an F/N. An F/N occurs when the person disconnects from the masses connected with something. He ceases to make them and ceases to be there, and he disconnects from them. Alright, so he gets an F/N.

Now you can disconnect a person from his whole bank. Which is greats Which is great. And that is what is called a release. It's a release of this type, and a release of that type, and the central things you have to disconnect to bring him up the lines are the grade processes right to

five. So find out what you're doing You're just making him disconnect. That's all. The only grades that that is not true on are secondaries and engrams. You're erasing something there.

Now, he's gain' on up the line, and only when he gets to clear do you find the final mechanism as far as he is concerned, and why he's doing it. What he's doing. That isn't the end of it. But his bank at that moment, or what he knows of in his bank, goes brrrrrooom! Erased, gone! Now it's the difference between this ashtray ceasing to exist, gone completely, and the ashtray simply being put off. A release is the ashtray being put away. A gone ashtray is an erased ashtray. A gone secondary is an erased secondary. So you can actually do this. You can key out a secondary, no longer thinks that kind of thing, you key out a secondary, and you can say, "Well. To key it out again would be an overrun." Oh, that's so true. To key it out before it had keyed in again would be an overrun. And to go on keying out something that has been keyed out would be an overrun. But do you know that you can key it out, turn right around and plunge him right straight into it again, and run it? Without the slightest consequences. The TA doesn't go up, nothing. The proof of the pudding of this whole thing is, what's the behavior of the meter.

Now this is the only time you can go by an F/N. That is two different processes. One, you're releasing, and the other's going to clear it. So you could get a release on this engram and then erase it. Now it'd be much to your horror if you found out, actually at the moment of release he had also sort of blown it. He had done both actions at once, then you might be a little embarrassed. But I've never seen it happen. So you could get a release on a secondary.

Alright, her husband's dead. Alright, good. Husband's dead. Now what are we gonna to do? We're gonna "recall a moment of loss. Good. Floating needle." She's saying, "Oh, thank heaven. I feel so much better." And she goes home, and she opens up her drawer to get out her powder puff, and there's his watch. Gaa! Well, your release did her some good, but she could come right back to you in session, and you could do the exact same thing as before, and get her to recall finding his watch, and it'd key out. And you go floating needle again. And then she could go home and open the closet and find his hat. And this could just keep up ad nauseas.

She could keep keying it in and you could keep keying it out.

Do you see then, such things about, the fellow has had a wreck in this car, and he drives to work in it every morning. It's repaired and he goes on driving to work in it every morning.

And the next thing you know he develops this horrible neuralgia on the side of his head. Well it's restimulated

all the time. Now if he drove it long enough, and restimulated it hard enough, and was in it often enough, and went past the place frequently enough where he had the accident, it would run the engram. It wouldn't just key it out, it would actually - Well, the familiarity, and so on, and would just sort of run it out.

He is, he's running through it every time he goes about anything. So gone, you know, ooh.

And then he sees a little picture go by. And then that kind of... He'll keep doing this. Do you see? Well, so you have to choose whether or not this is an assist action which is necessary by reason of the restimulators of the environment. So a person can only be released; now when he's released on communications he doesn't release from one engram. Let's look at this. He doesn't release from one secondary. He doesn't release from one specific action. He actually may very well be releasing from hundreds of trillions of years of such actions. All in an own little flicker of an eye.

Now the length of time it would take to key that back in, because he's not on those planets anymore, he's not even in that space and time. He's not even in that era anymore. So, it's a very valid release indeed. It'll take a, quite a while to key that one back in. Do you see? So, he's having difficulties with problems, and all of a sudden he has a cognition that just roars on the whole track. It isn't even that he can think on the subject of the whole track, but, he suddenly has a change of mind, concerning the subject of problems. Christ, how long is it going to take to key that back in again? Man, you'd really have to bail this guy under to do that.

Do you see? Now you see why the releases are valid, but why releasing a guy from a specific instance in an engram that has to do with injury and unconsciousness, or a secondary that has to do with loss, you see how these things differ? They differ. They differ considerably.

Now as a C/S, you are going to have this sort of situation. This individual has had something happen to him in life, is driven off the line, and you're going to have to order that the engram of it be found and erased. And you would only err if the auditor erred. Now, one of the little bits and pieces that's missing off the line is that if a secondary on the second run through becomes more solid you have to send the PC with the same procedure to the earlier secondary.

To an earlier secondary. And if that secondary, by the second pass through it, running the PC through it becomes more solid and begins to become more solid, you have to send him to an earlier secondary. The test is that it becomes more solid. And if you don't do that, and if you don't know that, you can wrap a PC around a telegraph pole. But I notice that it is missing from the rundown on engram running by chains in this Dianetic auditors' course book at

this time, and it is being reinserted into the book, and is the subject of, at this moment is the subject of HCOB 28 September 68, Class VIII. I'm carefully inspecting back bulletins to find out what's been missed. What's disappeared out on the line up. And that, for some reason or other's disappeared.

On the second pass through, if it gets more solid, you go to the earlier incident. Now that doesn't mean you go from a secondary to an earlier engram. It means you go from a secondary to an earlier secondary to an earlier secondary to an earlier secondary. On the engram line you go from an engram to an earlier engram to an earlier engram, and I've got news for you, this isn't just, this isn't just for, only for your little guy who's doing an assist. This is the only way you're going to solve some section threes. And section three is going to have to be audited just that way. So you better get hotter than pistols running engrams.

A "none on three" is a this lifetime injury which has impacted all the body-thetans into one chunk. And is handled by running that engram. Loosens them all up and away they go. Now you can run three. There is no case, there is no case, there never has been a case that has none on three, that had one on three, that had two on three, that had five on three. No such cases.

There isn't any case that suddenly read the instructions and all of a sudden, whee, they all went away. And he didn't have to do anything after that. Bullshit.

So you have to know engram running. And you have to be a damn good engram runner.

Because that engram is gonna run like a bitch. You're really gonna have to have session control to handle it. 'Cause all the time pc'll be telling you, "Well I don't know why you're doing this. It's just evaluation on the whole thing, because that really has nothing to do with me." He's just talking out of the basic incident all the way. He isn't protesting the auditor, he's talking out of the basic incident. And you roll it right on down the line and smasho, bingo, thud. There is an exact rundown which you will have. Oh, looks to me like you better get very familiar with this 'ole process known as running engrams.

As far as running secondaries is concerned, you can have somebody around, and this ARC break is so thoroughly encysted in grief, and so forth, that you can key it out, and it keys in.

You key it out and it keys in. You get tired of it after a while. Run the secondary. Where is it? What is it? A person comes into session every time with a howling ARC break, in grief, and all upset. Cleaned up, and got a review three days from now. Gonna do the same thing. Clean it all up. Goes F/N. She feels great. A few days later, feels terrible, is all very

sad. You look for a ARC break of long duration, you're liable to find yourself sitting there holding onto a secondary. Roll up your sleeves and audit. Why be lazy? Run it. Establish what it is. Because it won't, it'll just keep releasing and coming back and releasing and coming back, and this becomes one of these weird cases that you really can't quite do anything with or for. Don't you see? Rockety-bockety. It's one of... it's one of the types that are very difficult to do anything for. They keep getting caught up in this present time situation. But if it were out of this lifetime I wouldn't bother with it. I'd leave that for seven, eight, way up the line, see? When they can handle such things.

But you find out, two years ago she was doing all right, the case was doing all right, and then all of a sudden she vwaff, waff, waff. And there's a period there, and that has been handled before, and it's handled before, and it's somebody ran it before, and so forth. So you just roll up your sleeves and you run it. And that is the only real criticism I have of a modern auditor.

You're perfectly willing to learn. I'm willing to take responsibility for the fact that some guys hooked things out of the line up, and so on. But the one thing I can't understand why you would omit from your repertoire, would be secondary and engram running for good. Good, solid, nothing but secondary and engram running. Running 'em to free needle of course, stopping them when you get the free needle. They're gone, they're erased, naturally. You run 'em through, you get the free needle, only that time that needle, damn it, will stay free. After you've freed up the needle four or five times on the same subject I should think you'd get the word. Run it! The person's gonna keep falling on their head.

The reason why you shouldn't, shouldn't drop it out of your repertoire, if you want advertising pieces. It's pieces on whom you have run a secondary or an engram that is close to PT. Because their before and after is extreme. And he's going around looking like he was an old lady about ninety years old, and creeping about, and so forth, and he's been digged in this way ever since the house burned down and she lost her all. And people know how this character looks like.

Alright, you take this person, just run the secondary. If that one goes solid there's an earlier one with a loss. You have to run the earlier one. If that goes solid you run the earlier one.

Follow the same rules, but you just go to that secondary, get the moment of it, get the duration of it, follow it through. Broom, broom, broom. Grind away, grind away, grind away, through and through and through, and spill and spill and tears and sorrow and shame, blame, regret, apathy. Through it, and through it, and... Some of

these cases you wouldn't believe your eyes. You're sitting there; you're sitting there looking at somebody who looks like they're only about twenty years old.

I've seen in a person running an engram, I've seen a person running an engram. A goiter, at least six inches in diameter, recede and completely vanish with all signs thereof, within a half an hour after the engram was finished. It isn't a for every time action. But there are miracles to be found on it. There are rather wonderful things that can happen.

So you start omitting this from your repertoire, you've got rocks in your head. So a Class VIII should know how to run an engram, because there are going to be some cases you run into that won't, just won't go anyplace unless you run an engram. And there's the other little interesting thing, is you won't be able to shove anybody up through the later OT sections unless you can run an engram. They're just gonna hang right there unless you're sharper than a pistol on running engrams. But running engrams is a lot of fun. When you have a good meter, and you have the technology of engram running as it was finally developed, it's a gas. Nothing to it.

It's a ball. And it doesn't take as long as you'd think, but don't, don't be suddenly upset if it, the session, is twelve hours long.

You can break one of those sessions, but when you break the session you've got to get in all the Ruds, fly the needle again, before you start him back into it. See? You don't have breaks which go back to the same action. Every time you have this trouble with breaks, every time you have a break, every time you have a new session, you've got to fly the, you've got to fly the Ruds.

So, you have to know this sort of thing. Now, to show you how far out it can get, and so on, I don't think people today really know how to do a touch assist. I don't know what happened to the touch assist, but I was fascinated to have a whole group of Scientologists not very long ago, absolutely amazed watching me with the most intense fascination. Watching me do a touch assist. Correct and by the book. They knew that you touch assist left and right, but they didn't know any of the fars or nears. They didn't know that you followed the nerve channels. It was quite interesting. Quite interesting. A touch assist is a highly complex action. It isn't just jabbing the guy in the ribs, saying something or other. And the action is elementary, actually.

The area, the area that you're doing a touch assist from you approach on a gradient and recede from on a gradient. And if you have, for instance, an elbow injury or something like that, you would for sure go further from the head than the elbow eventually, but if you wanted to practically kill

the guy, why you'd go immediately and directly to an area further down the arm than the elbow as the first touch.

Now a contact assist also has its' gradients. And you do it equally on both sides of the body, and it's just a feel my finger and so forth, but you have to also go down the nerve channels, 'cause there's where the current is locked up. And there are twelve nerves in the spine. And any injury that is severe in the body has to have the whole spine released on the subject. And it's far and near, gradient approaches, coming back, going forward.

So what, what, if we can forget an assist, or it can evaporate, a lot of things can evaporate on the lines. But your job is to hold standard. That's why I'm telling you these things. Your job is to hold it standard. Now I haven't told you all there is to know about a touch assist. But I will.

I haven't told you all there is to know about engram running. But it is down, except for the one data I gave you. And as far as I'm concerned, the technology has stayed together pretty well.

Pretty well. There aren't many pieces of it missing. Enough of it's missing to make some of you curious, and people have not held the standard well enough in its' application to put it where it should go. And now, assembling it all, putting it together, making a straight line proposition that is right down the middle of a highway with a wide open throttle, with everything we know about it, we're in a position to make it win. But it will keep winning just as long as you continue, as you continue to hold the standard. Thank you very much.
