

STANDARD TECH DEFINED

Class VIII #04 - 6809C27: Transcript of Taped Lecture by L. Ron Hubbard.

[*applause*] Thank you. [*applause*]

And this, the last time I looked, was the twenty seventh ...

Thank you very much. Thank you.

Very polite of you - The last time I looked this was the twenty seventh of September, AD eighteen, and this is lecture what number? (*Four.*) What do you know? Lecture four. The reason I'm numbering these is so that nobody can come along and cut them all out.

Probably the ... expect it some years from now, that somebody will have figured it all out. It would be much better if we had the lectures on case supervision taken out, because if auditors are allowed insufficient latitude for their own imagination. It cramps self determinism, ruins cases, but it cramps self-determinism. And you can expect sometime in the future that the thing is not, well it actually isn't a good thing. The case supervisor, he actually has to have latitude when we're getting, you see, and the auditor should have tremendous latitude, because it'll give him too many case gains, and stuff like that, you know? Qual income is down. Ever since we started this Standard Tech, Qual income has gone out the bottom. [*laughter*] So, the best thing to do is to subtract lecture three, seven and nine, don't you see, from the lectures. You know. Many ways of subtracting them, such as simply tearing them up. But somebody would at least know something was missing.

Now we have something of that order coming up on your bulletins. The truth of the matter is, is I'm going over bulletins at this particular time, so that all bulletins as you see them, as of this moment, are in actual fact being edited down into a Standard Tech package. But that doesn't change anything. And if anything is in any way changed it will be to the basis of bringing it to an earlier standardization. And it will simply be a correction of some out line.

We apparently have forty or fifty bulletins in the line up which have been written by other people than myself, and these occasionally contain errors. The bulletins which you've got are not in this category, I am sure.

But to give you some sort of an idea of it, we in actual fact had ... There have been two changes in the standard processes, both changes to the original. I didn't drop – they'd been changed. One of those are the commands of ARC Straightwire, which are being issued to you directly and immediately, and the original commands of ARC Straightwire are those commands which crack neurotic cases. And somebody, some ... with some enthusiasm, along the line someplace, cut off the last half of the command in each case. But that's a real case cracker the way it is originally.

"Recall something that is really real to you" is the proper command, and it's never been otherwise. But people with enthusiasms edit this material, and every time it has been edited, the material and workability has to a marked degree been lost. All of the listing tapes, although there were lots of tapes called listing tapes, on the Saint Hill Course all of the key listing tapes and the key listing bulletins were removed from the Saint Hill Course during the last two or three years. And that's why you guys don't know nothing about

listing. You come to me here. I wouldn't give you a penny for what you know about listing. That's a fact. If you can't *ratta tat tat*, *ratta tat tat* off the laws of listing, *poppety poppety* pop, and know that those are the laws. Those are the laws. There aren't any other laws. There are no exceptions to these laws. These are the laws of listing. Those are the laws of listing. That is how it is done. It isn't done any other way. There are no exceptions of any kind whatsoever. Any list is listed that way. Do I make my point? So don't ask me any more questions about listing or I'll bite your heads off.

Anyhow, asking me whether or not the lists of four are done in this way. Now. There is a thing which isn't a list, which is actually a repetitive process. It's "What's been overrun?". It doesn't go to an item. You're asking, in actual fact the pc, what has been overrun. And you rehab each read you get. It's a repetitive process. You write it down so you know what you're rehabbing.

But as far as listing and nulling is concerned it's a non-nulled item. As far as listing and nulling is concerned there are no variables. And it's the one thing that the bulk of you who are studying this course don't know. You don't know that you're dealing with an invariable science. It has no variabilities. It is absolutely *clank*. You have to begin by finding this out. If you don't find this out you will never make a Class VIII auditor. It's a marvelous discovery.

You are in the process of discovering Scientology. That's right. Now let's take it up from the beginning. What does the word Scientology mean? If there seems to be a little bitterness in that ... *Scio* is the word for truth. And *scio* turns in to *scien*, in that form, which means truth. And *ology* is the study of. Truth, study of. Now if you're studying truth, how the hell can there be a variable? Truth, by definition, is what is. There is a direct relationship to the amount of variable in a person's life, and complications which are untruths and his state of case.

A wog lies by the words and music. Lying is a way of life. "How are you today?" "I feel fine." "You look great Mabel." "What a pretty hat you have, I've always liked it." You listen to some of these birds, they're so bad off because they've just been done in. But they aren't, haven't been done in, they have been doing something in. Don't you see, that is a level of truth. So that an OT comes up the line toward a truth. And the more truth there is in him, the higher his case level. By direct proportion.

So a fellow comes in, he's lying in his teeth. Lie, lie, lie, alter, alter, alter, vary, vary, vary, quibble, quibble, quibble, *nya nya nya*, *booboo dee dee*, *boo boo*. You have a direct, immediate index of his case level. He's nuts. And this goes down and expresses itself as delusion. The delusion of insanity. The delusion of a hop head. The delusion of a Callagan. Or a Robinson. "Oh my god the Scientologists are all after me!" *Pffff*. My contempt.

These characters, we weren't after them. They practically had to take taxi cabs, airbuses, helicopters, walk through mud, struggle through storm, anything else, to get on our track. We didn't even hear of them. We didn't even know anything about them. We couldn't have cared less if we had. We aren't in any line of country they have anything to do with.

The guy who is stuck on the track someplace, the Martians are after him. Fighting shadows. Fighting things that haven't anything to do with him. Wars, world wars, whereby the Germans says the English are horrible, and the English say the Germans are horrible. And the Germans say the English are trying to conquer the world. And the English say the Germans are trying to conquer the world. And Germans say the English are slaughtering

babies, and the English say the Germans are slaughtering babies. The amount of truth there is in connection with any war man has ever fought is undiscoverable with the world's most powerful microscope.

So in the gravest insanities you get the greatest untruth. So the road is a road of truth. At VII there is a step known as the *incredibles*. As you go up the line you discover the *incredibles*. Things that happened to the individual which are true, but not believable. The *incredibles*. That is one of the points of auditing. Stripping out the *incredibles* off the time track.

Now you know how much you'd be believed if you walked into the barber shop and says, "Well, I put ten cents down on Sky Rover in the third race, and he paid off two million to one, and I made a couple of hundred thousand dollars, and my wife thought of the idea in a dream, and so that's why I did it. You know? Only it happens to be true. But you can't believe it because the odds are too great against it, see?

I had trouble with this when I was a kid. I was everywhere and anywhere and into anything, and all over the planet at the time, when people were not traveling all over the planet. [laughter] And I eventually got to a point where I couldn't talk about my adventures. I actually hit a level of untruth of minimizing what I had done and been. That's the reduction of incredibles. There are various ways by which something can be, or seem, untrue. Various ways.

So anyway, Scientology is well named. It is the road to truth. It is a study of the truth. And total truth is total power. And when the guy hasn't got any lies left in him he's OT. And all the mechanics of OT work out too. So the subject is very, very well named.

And that's what Scientology means. It's the study of truth, to which could be added the technology of achieving truth. And I have a list here, whereby several students don't know what Standard Tech is. Don't know what the word "standard" means. Haven't any idea. Now if somebody doesn't know that there is a subject called Scientology, which is a main line subject, which has a certain number of hair line processes which make up a direct route, he needs an academy course. He shouldn't be here. Those are brutal words.

A science is a body of truths. A technology is a body of truths. Now somebody who can't confront action, or something like that, thinks a truth would be a datum of some kind or another. Well a truth can also be an action. And the road through all of the untruths of a person, from all the way south to all the way north has been mapped. It exists. It has been on a chart for years. There have been bulletins which announced its processes. The doingness of those processes are exact, precise. There aren't two ways to do them. There is one way to do them. And that is what you are here learning. And if you can't learn that basic fundamental you might as well quit now.

You are not learning this wide subject of philosophy. You're not learning "every student's got a chance to think his own opinion" right now. You're not learning that right now. You're learning the technical application of exactly how it is done, exactly to whom it is done, exactly and precisely the steps and actions taken to an exact, precise result. And that's what you're learning. And you haven't anything to do with how many needles sit on the head of an angel.

Now case supervision, you were given some folders to case supervise. Then doing a case supervision of them, you decided what was wrong with the pc. Which is a direct violation of the Auditor's Code. Evaluative case supervision will be your downfall. It comes to this: He couldn't or didn't make this grade. Your job is to make sure he made the grade.

Now what's wrong with the pc is he hasn't made that grade. The major gains of the pc are always the next grade. You won't ever get any gains on a pc compared to making the grade. All your job is to start the pc in at the beginning of the assembly line and make sure that he's correctly run to the end of the assembly line. And that's your whole job. And when you do a case supervisor, don't ever let me hear you say again to the end of your career an evaluative statement about a pc. Because you don't know.

You do certain, basic, standard actions. Basic action. Standard action. And the case falls apart. You have to know your stable data, boy, you have to know your stable data so you can mutter it in your sleep. You look into one of these folders. If you know your business you instantly will look at a list. The list was complete. The pc was given his item. The question read to begin with. Didn't dead horse. You have to know data like this. Dead horse question didn't read to begin with.

Don't list a question unless it reads. Question didn't read, don't list it. Question read, no item found on the list. *Pfff!* It's either incomplete or it needs to be extended. It needs to be extended or the item's been suppressed. You find there's a little list, four things, which you do with a list. Very standard. Elementary. Elementary.

Now let's go into the definition of the word standard. I want to put you in a good frame of mind now. I'm not mad at you at all. There's no animosity.

Standard. The word standard as taken from Rodell's synonym finder. The word standard. And it says here it is "Universal, accepted, common, normal. Of recognized excellence or authority. Final, definitive, authoritative, conclusive, reliable, preferred, classic, timeless, accepted, orthodox, staple, official, cathedral, doctrinal, ultimate, canonical and authentic." That's what the word ... the synonyms of the word standard.

And now we have the Oxford Illustrated dictionary. And we will read here the definition of the word standard. I want to call to your attention that my messenger looked these up for me. *[laughter]* The word standard.

Standard ...

- It's a distinctive flag.
- It's a banner with royal arms.
- It's a flag of cavalry regiment.
- It's a rallying principle.

One of the meanings of standard is carrying a banner forward.

Now ...

- It's a weight or measure to which others conform or by which the accuracy of others is judged.
- It's a legal proportion of weight, as in fine metal and alloy in gold and silver coin.
- It's a degree of excellence, *which is the meaning which we have*, required for a particular purpose.

The word *standard*, the "degree of excellence required for a particular purpose".

- It's a thing recognized as model for imitation.
- Recognized as possessing the merit of authority.
- Degrees of proficiency.
- Class studying to reach this.

Let's take another dictionary. And this is the Universal English Dictionary. We're getting up in weight here. My messenger had a hard time lifting these off to look them up for you. Actually, our Sea Org messengers are very proud of themselves. They're moving up toward a ten thousand word vocabulary, which is exactly twenty times that of the average college student. Do you know the average college student knows five hundred words? *[laughter]* It's true.

Once more, it's a banner, standard, a banner. Bearing a royal or national arms. Flown only by the sovereign. Flag of the cavalry regiment. Etcetera, etcetera of gold. Style, mode, type, accepted, recognized by convention, within a community, at a given time, as a criterion of what is best in speech, behavior, conduct, action, face, morality, to which we add technology. What is the best.

And now we will pick up a bigger dictionary. This is Webster's Third International dictionary. It is a couple of volumes, because they couldn't get all the words into one. And it's in India paper in microscopic print. And my messenger has very good eyesight to find it at all. *[laughter]*

Standard. It's a rallying place, a flag to mark a rallying place, a pole or a spear bearing some conspicuous object,... Man, we haven't even gotten down to anything else. A definite level or degree of quality that is proper and adequate for a specific purpose. The word standard. The word standard. It means "*a definite level or degree of quality that is proper and adequate for a specific purpose*". And that one you can star rate. Got it?

And now we will look up the word "*technology*". I don't want anybody with any misunderstandings here. I haven't looked these up, my messenger looked these up for me.

Technology is a scientific study of practical arts. It's practical arts collectively, terminology of a particular art or subject. Technique is manner of execution or performance. Manner of execution or performance.

And we'll get this big dictionary up here. And it says here, *technique* is a systematic and special method employed in carrying out some particular operation. Skill in, practical acquaintance with the methods of some particular art, specialized procedure, operation and the like. That's a technique.

Now. *Technology*: Science of the mechanical industrial arts, contrasted with the fine arts.

Technologist as student, is one who is versed in technology.

And, let's get this big one back here. I don't know whether I can find it on this page or not, it's so microscopic. There is technique, techno. *Technology*: Is the terminology of a particular subject, it's the technical language. It's the science of application of knowledge to practical purpose. Applied science. The science of the application of knowledge to a practical purpose. Applied science. Have you got it?

Now, there's no animosity connected with this at all. This is perfectly friendly. But Scientology has a very definite body of technical application, which is the only body of technical application in all of the data of Scientology. There are not two ways to do anything in Scientology.

In 1966 this was totally summated. And it is time that auditors ceased to be airy-fairy about it. Going up the line right now we have the fact that Scientology, applied as you are being trained to apply it, produces 100% result. And applied with the airy-fairy, "I don't know what we're doing. *duh duh duh duh*, I have lots of opinions on this subject. I think I'd better case supervise; I think this guy must have missed withholds." After they got five items reading on the list, and it was four pages long, he threw the cans at the auditor. Obviously he has missed withholds.

Scientology, mis-applied, applied contrary to Standard Tech, produces back-fires, that are not the pc's fault. Standard tech is entirely under the control of the case supervisor and the auditor. The preclear, the pre-OT, is entirely under the control of the case supervisor and the auditor.

Just so you know that well, the preclear doesn't "have missed withholds which is why the session failed." He's entirely under the control of the case supervisor and the auditor. And if he didn't make it, it is the fault of the case supervisor and the fault of the auditor. Nobody else! There is no escape, safety valve. If he went out and got drunk and fell on his head between sessions, why the hell didn't you audit him fast enough so he didn't have a chance? It's time we took responsibility for the guy in the chair, because properly case supervised you get one zero zero per centum. One hundred cases out of one hundred cases. If you don't get it you're flubbing.

The old timer, he got pretty good. Dianetic auditing and so forth, they got about 50%. They got about a 50% improvement. As technology advanced, and as it was expertly applied, the percentage advanced. 22½% of all cases will get well if you pat them on the head, if you show them a green door, if you put an ice cream cone in their hand, if you give them sugar pills, if you simply give them advice, 22½% of all the people that come in the line-up will get well.

So the zero percentage is 22½. You gonna get 22½ anyhow. Right, wrong, upside down or backwards, you're gonna get 22½. So, you get one of these 22½, you run a squirrel process and he says he got well so you think that squirrel process must have been ... Bah, Nonsense.

Now. You can push this up the line. And you want to know where the psychiatrist is, and so forth, he doesn't even get one percent. He's doing 22½ percent damage. That's how you measure it. An auditor's a very bad auditor if you get less than 22½ percent. He expects that in any event.

Now. The skill and the excellence of the technology, and excellence of its application, the standardness of it will push the percentage up. And through the years it went to higher percentages, and higher percentages, and higher percentages. And you, as a Class VIII,

are looking at the per centium of one zero zero per centium. Any thing that falls below 100 percent is because somebody goofed, boy. The case supervisor or the auditor. Somebody goofed.

Now it may take you two or three sessions. It may take you a repair before you can execute the final action. You may have been fed a bum datum by the auditor and then, as case supervisor, called for a wrong action. And then you'll find this out fast enough because the guy didn't come out of it, so then you've got to go back and find out what it is. You send the preclear to the examiner, you get him run on a seven button assessment, the seven different types of things. You can get him run on a general assessment form, a Green Form, an L4A, various things for various purposes. You find out, you put it to rights, and then you get your 100. It isn't 100 percent, one session. But if you go for two or three goofed-up sessions followed by four or five repairs, which are goofed-up repairs of goofed-up sessions, and then you repair the repair of the repair, and so forth, you're not going to get your 100 percent.

But out of the cases which pass beneath your nose you had better, you had better, better, better, get one zero zero. Because the technology is there with which to achieve it. And if you don't know it's there, we'll put you in an academy someplace to learn some of your basics.

Because the road is a very simple road. And the most difficulty you are having, right at this moment, is asking these marvelously complicated questions of yourselves. You see a table sitting in the middle of the room. I am telling you it is a table, it is sitting in the middle of the room. And you say, "Let's see. Should it go to the antique shop? How far is it? How long has it been sitting there? What are the ramifications and complications in the material of the table? Is the table really substantial? If an elephant sat down on the table, would it stand up?" *[laughter]* I'm just trying to tell you, for god sakes, there's a table sitting in the middle of the room. There is a table sitting in the middle of the room. And that is the total is-ness of it.

I tell you that you do the Ruds to F/N. Therefore, you start in with an ARC break, you got a present time problem, you check for missed withhold, and so somewhere along there she's gonna F/N. If you know anything about your TRs at all you really can't miss. So it F/Ns. Your rudiments are now done, so the pc is set up to be audited. Now you audit what the main body of the session was supposed to be, which is some major action. You complete the major action to F/N, and maybe one, two, three major actions. You complete them all. And you end off the session on an F/N. And if your TRs are very good he'll come back into the next session still with an F/N. If you cannot get an F/N on your rudiments you, of course, do a GF, a Green Form, and you get an F/N on that. And that is setting the case up.

And looking at your folders you've been trying to get case gains out of Green Forms. Well sure, somebody feels better on a Green Form. You're trying to get case gains. Trying to solve cases. What the hell are you trying to solve cases for? They're no problem. They're a problem to a case, they're not a problem to an auditor. You do the usual and the case solves itself. It's too easy. It is too simple. And your complex figure-figure-figure-figure-figure, oh my god, figure-figure-figure-figure-figure is just all over your god damned plate. And you're sitting there saying, "I wonder what the pc's thinking next, and so forth, and waff-waff-waff and doo doo doo thhthhhthh." Relax.

You start in with, "Oh I wonder what's this? Look at this! Christ! Look what's happened! Oh my god! *[laughter]* I'd better do something about this." You've got a C/S right in front of

you, perhaps. Your C/S. And it says *pa-pow, pa-pow, pa-pow-pow-pow-pow-pow*. You do it. And if your C/S knows his business, or if you're the C/S, you already knew the TA was at six and a half. And you simply took it down, that's all. Now what ... why would the TA be at six and a half? You go back to the folder, you'll find out fast enough. The guy went through five blow downs on listing one of the VA [5A] processes. And the auditor gave him the last blowing down item. Power's supposed to be listed to the first blow down. If you list it to more than one blow down you're gonna be in trouble there. And the pc after the session might feel great for an hour, he might feel great for two hours. But sometime between then and the next two or three days he is going to feel like hell. You violate the rules of Standard Tech and the pc feels like hell. You follow the rules of Standard Tech and the pc feels good. And that's all there is to it.

Some day, if you get through this course alive, someday, you will look back on your beginning think as completely ridiculous. You will be sitting there, knocking cases off left and right, *pongety, pongety, pongety, pongety, bong, bang*. Hundred percent, hundred percent, *plongety-bing, plongety-bing, plongety-bing*. "God damn that auditor. He slipped in that session ... I'll write your C/S, repair this *wong, wong, bong bong*." And there she goes. Hundred percent, hundred percent. *Pocketa, pocketa, pocketa*. And you look back at your earlier auditing career ... I draw a curtain over your thoughts. *[laughter]*

But, did you ever see somebody walk on a stage and play a piano? Some fellow walks on a stage and he plays the piano. Mario Fenninger, he walks in, shoots his cuffs, sits down, *bow-wow!* You know that piano really goes, boy, that piano really goes. Now you can say it looks very simple to Mario Fenninger. That's right. He knows he's supposed to strike certain keys and he gets certain results. There isn't any other airy-fairy think about it. Only he knows where the keys are better'n anybody else. And that's a Class VIII auditor. Same piano.

And you see some academy auditor. He comes in and, "Wonder where C is?", and "Where, where, where's the lid to this thing?" You know, lid. Well, I got the lid open. Now let's see. "What are these black and white things? I'll look it up in the instruction book over here. Black and white things ... keys. Those are keys. Very good." Now you expect him to play Moonlight Sonata, huh?

It's a piano. But it isn't anywhere near as difficult as a piano to learn how to play. The biggest hump is learning that it's a very simple action. It's not a careless action. It's terribly simple. You go out and you see an expert marksman. And he throws the rifle up to his shoulder, booms. Bull's eye. *Psst*. Bull's eye. You say, "Gee, that's easy." And you go out and you look for where the trigger is, and you look where the bolt is, where the magazine is, and you look down there to see if it's loaded, and you take it up and this damn strap's getting in your road somehow or another. My god, you're so damned introverted looking at the weapon you never get a chance to look at the target. And the reason most auditors never see what's going on in the pc is the auditor doesn't really even know how to handle an E-meter.

He sits down. "I wonder if I've got the sensitivity right. I've got to ... I've got to write this down." Never mastered the art of handling the tone arm of the meter with his thumb while he's writing down the auditor's report. "And, let's see, what do I say next?" Same thing. He just doesn't know his tools well enough.

You take somebody walks in with a camera. Got a camera? He's a ruddy amateur. If he's a ruddy amateur, if he looks at this camera, and he takes a good look at it, and he says, "Where's the lens? Where do I put the film in? What is this? What's this glass in

front? Oh, that's the lens, yes." And, "I wonder what all these rings are? Well, I'll look it up in the instruction book here. Oh, that is the lens. Now let's see, how do I get this camera open to get some film in it?", and so on. Finally opens it up, finally gets some film in it, loaded some how or another. Then he's going around, "Where's the trigger, where's the trigger, let's see, where's the trigger? Now I'm going to take a picture." And god damn, he's so involved in trying to handle this piece of stuff that he is completely unfamiliar with, that, honest to Pete, the pictures he takes are a complete, stinking disgrace. He thinks he's doing good to be able to point it horizontal.

Now we take some guy, he's got a piece of camera, he's familiar with cameras. He can take this thing and he flips the back of it open, he throws the film in while talking to you about something or other. Sets it up and so forth. Now he looks around, and there's the picture. He hasn't got any attention on that camera, boy. There's the picture. So ... , so here, *powie*. He can see over there, because his attention isn't introverted here.

Standard tech then requires that one know his tools, know the laws of the game, know the correct action so instinctively and so instantaneously that he never has to think a thing to do it. His attention's on the pc. Pc gives indicator sixteen, the auditor does what he's supposed to do. Just think. Well, what do you know?

Pc's talking about an ARC break, but it isn't reading. Now, he knows his technology sufficiently well and he knows the pc talking about an ARC break that isn't reading, it's a missed withhold. ARC breaks that don't read are missed withholds. Standard datum. You don't say, "I think, you know, actually Ron said something about ... when the thing didn't read." Nuts! See? It's bonkers. What, what's all this think and cross think, and wonder and so forth? If you hold up your hand and turn your hand over palm up, and then turn your hand over palm down, do you know what you'd had to do as a thetan? If you could think of the number of channels and muscles and nerve centers and things, and this, and so on which it took to turn your hand right side up and upside down, you would go practically bonkers. And I assure you, you wouldn't be able to do it.

You ask somebody who is a ballerina. You can actually throw off a ballerina who is not quite on the ball, not quite. She puts a good show on, and so on, but she's not quite there. If you say, "How do you balance on your toe?" How do you balance on your toe? Now if she's on the ball she'd look at you and say, "Why, you balance on your toe of course, you idiot."

The great dancer is totally simple. You ask some artist, "How should you paint this picture? What should you do?" Well if he's sort of only painting reactively and he doesn't know his business he's knocked into a cocked hat instantly. He's knocked right off of it. But if he really knows his business he just says, "Ho hum," and goes on with his work. "Why, why do you put green like that? Why do you put a stripe of green like that?", and so forth. And he'd look at you and say, "What? Looks better."

Now you ask some floaky mug, maybe an art teacher some place. And you say, "Now why do you put green across the picture?" "Well, this gives the collateral effect to extensive distance, and balances the color combination, because in actual fact the color wheel, if you see it over here, has complementary color. You see it's green. And if you don't put green there then you'll get concavity of the lumbosis." [*laughter*]

The maddest thing I ever saw in my life. I gave a lecture to a short story class one time. Been giving a lot of lectures to writer's classes and things like this in universities and places. And, I walked up on the rostrum, and there were all the assembled students, and lying on the rostrum was one of my current magazine stories, lying open to my story,

which was the lead story of the magazine. And the instructor had taken every single one of the sentences of the opening of the story and deep into the body of the story, and had marked each one of them foreshadowing, suspense element, you know? And all according to a technology which I knew, but I hadn't thought of for years. And I was fascinated. I looked at this, and just for a moment wondered how it would be to be all thumbs, so you'd have to, while you were writing a story say, "We had better foreshadow some action." [laughter]

Now, if Scientology's definition is the road to truth, then what are the progressive grade processes? They are those barriers, in that order, which keep a person from going forward to an ultimate truth. So if you looked at a normal pc you might see something on the order of where he is parked in *diddy-wa-diddy*. You ever hear of *diddy-wa-diddy*? That's actually ten miles on the other side of hell. [laughter] And that's where the people in hell go on their night out. [laughter] But anyway, he's over here in *diddy-wa-diddy*. Now he's going to walk all the way, the whole route. See? Now these grades are the gates across the road.

One: nobody knew the road. They didn't know he was down there. They didn't know any of the gates across the road. And Standard Tech simply takes this fellow, and it walks him right straight up the lines through these exact gates. And if you walk him through any other gates you're just detouring. There aren't any other barriers on the track. These are the shut gates on his road up the line. And they are the grade pro-ces-ses, and it isn't just an illusion. It is the fact. And because it is a fact, if you know your job expertly, you simply go along and open these gates for him, shove him through, go to the next gate, open it and shove him through, and open the next gate and shove him through.

Now there's eight thousand, seven hundred and fifty billion other things you could do with the case, none of which would put him any further along the road he's supposed to travel. But boy, would they be interesting. And any time else in man's history all they've done is they did find out there might be somebody in *diddy-wa-diddy*, and they just sent him a little closer to hell. They didn't even have the dream that there might be a road out. So how far up the line do you have to come to grasp this thing called Standard Tech? There is a guy, there's a dream of a road out. There is a road, there's a complete ocean of wrongnesses, but what has been isolated are the exact barriers to the exact road that takes him out. And he goes right up the line. *Brrrrrrmm!*

Now along with that is the communication of the technology and the training technology of the person to teach him to do that. These are fantastic wins. They are so airy-fairy and so starry-eyed, and so far beyond anything man ever envisioned. There all by itself it's a little bit hard to grasp. But you just accept it. It's a road out. There's a dream to get out, there's a road out, there're just exactly so many gates across the road, Standard Tech, one right after the other opens the gate, and Standard Tech, when the guy has gone over in the left field, right field, off the road, into the telegraph pole, something like that, also gives you the technology of taking him out and putting him back on the road. And there aren't eight ways to do it. And it doesn't require any opinions.

Let's say we've got a concrete path that goes from A to B. And we start walking down this concrete path. And all of a sudden somebody rushes up and says, "Actually you're supposed to walk over there in the gravel along the side of the edge of the mole,[†] you know, and you swim for a little bit, and that's really how you get up to B." What kind of a jackass is it that would walk over to the mole and jump in? Well he'd have to be somebody

[†] 1) a barrier built of stone to break the force of the waves and sometimes serving as a pier; a breakwater

2) the harbour formed by it.

< Latin *moles*, a mass, dam.

who didn't have any idea there was any, any concrete walk there. Well the first thing you learn about Standard Tech is, one, there is a walk there.

Now one of the ways you learn this is subjectively. Now I don't want to invalidate anybody's case. I don't want to invalidate anybody's reviews. But this pile of crap I've got sitting here is how not to do it. Now also, there's an infinity of ways not to do it. You can always have an infinity of wrongnesses around one rightness. And the rightnesses are very few. So if you learn the rightnesses well then the wrongnesses, to hell with it. Do you follow? You can get an infinity of ways to do something wrong. Well work it out for yourself. Start counting up the number of ways to sink a rowboat. Those are all wrongnesses. Now the ways to row a rowboat, if it is a rowboat, not a sculling boat, you can stand up and row it, you can sit down and row it. You can row it with two men, you can row it with one man. But the right way to row a rowboat is to put the oars into the water and apply some energy to the handles, *[laughter]* pick the oars out of the water and replace them into the position where they can be reinserted into the water to apply some energy.

Now somebody comes along and he says to you, "Yes, well how do you row a rowboat?" "Well, there's several ways you can row a rowboat, that's for sure. You can stand up and face the bow, you can sit down and face the stern, you can stand up and face the bow ... face the stern, you can put a man on the right oar and a man on the left oar, you can have two sets of oars." Sounds like a lot of variables. But let me point out that the oars on the right side and the oars on the left side of the boat are doing exactly the same thing, no matter what arrangement is made. If you've got a trireme, a bireme, it doesn't matter. If you've got a life boat, if you've got a little fishing dory, you're doing the same thing in each particular case.

Now if you lose sight of the fact that the oar is supposed to go into the water, and push the water back, if you lose sight of that, you may have a great deal of theory, and a great many questions, but the boat won't go anywhere. *[laughter]*

That's normally what happens to science. Somebody finds out about rowing a boat. And then for years and years and years guys add to it, and eventually the rowing of the boat no longer functions. And the boats don't row any more, and they have to invent an entirely new technology of getting through water.

You think I'm kidding. The movies, the movies show us in biremes, old men-o-war with double oar banks of Greek times, shows us, shows us all of these oars going, while somebody is going *bong, bong* on drums, or something at the back of the boat, in order to keep all the oars in turn. If you take a life boat out and every rower on the starboard side fails to exactly follow the motions of the aftermost starboard rower, who's called the stroke oar, and if the port aftermost rower, who is the port stroke, does not follow exactly the motions of the other stroke, the boat looks like a centipede with busted legs. Man has actually pretty well forgotten how to row boats. Mass rowing of boats. Big boats. Because they let the coxswain count. And you hear all your demonstrations when your coxswain counts the stroke. The coxswain can't count the stroke. Strokes are counted by the stroke oar. There wouldn't be any reason to hammer a drum because nobody's following a drum, they're following a stroke oar. So why, why would anybody pound the drum just for one oarsman? You could sit down along side of this oarsman and say, "Ok. Stroke. Stroke." There's no reason to waste your lungs. As a matter of fact the entire rowing of the boat is going to be completely ruined. It looks like some wildly galloping centipede going along.

Now I know very well that they did it properly in Greek and Roman times, because they speak of the white wings out of the galleys. The white wings of the galleys. Now you'd immediately, in a sail period and so on, you'd think they meant, think they meant canvas, or sails, or something. They didn't. They meant those double banks of oars. Because it looks just like, it just looks like a big bird flying at you. The oars are flapping, see, on both sides. You see them go up and down. Looks like a flying bird that is sitting down in the water. They never rowed that evenly by calling a stroke or with drums.

And the other day I was looking through a book as to how you rowed a life boat. And it said the coxswain called the stroke. He doesn't. If he does, nobody can row the boat. So look, if this fundamental piece of technology can be wrecked by the simple action of making the wrong person count cadence, or rhythm, do you see that a workable piece of technology is very easily unsettled and upset?

So the thing that keeps Standard Tech standard is following Standard Tech, not anybody else's advice. So somebody comes along and he says, "We got a brand new process which is *riddle-diddle-de-poggle-dings*, and so on, and we've got this brand new meter which we attach to the toes of the pc and it makes him wiggle his ears." Well, I'll probably still be around. You'd better send it to me for a check up to make sure this case ... I'll tell you something absolutely ghastly. In eighteen solid years of research I kept the door wide open to any research suggestion of any kind whatsoever. And from the moment I wrote the last sentence of *Dianetics the Modern Science Of Mental Health*, right on up the line I would have been only too glad to have accepted a workable action. But every time I did it got us in trouble. It might have stayed with it a short period of time, it might have appeared workable a short period of time. But in the final analysis it got us in trouble.

I know how little things can change. And what you haven't watched is that Scientology and Dianetics were developed grade by grade. 1950, running of engrams. Running of engrams. Fascinating. Just before the running of engrams there was Straightwire. Then engram running developed heavily. Secondaries, secondaries were developed in their proper position and place.

The whole subject evolved along this particular line. And do you know why, and what was the clue? And why these became the grades? And why these are run in that sequence? It's because they're the collection of those things which, if violated, prevent any advance of the case. If one of those things are out, then the case never goes OT. Simple. And it's in that sequence. And the width of the road is about one one-thousandth of one micrometer. The variability is zero. The wins are one zero zero. There's a brand new approach. You're looking at a new world.

Now, somewhere up the line you get to start auditing this. And when you start auditing this you're gonna get so damned dizzy and power-happy somebody'll probably have to shoot you down with a shot gun, because a guy just goes completely wild. Normally speaking he goes wild on this. He, he does exactly right, he does exactly what he's supposed to do, the pc all of a sudden goes *zzzooooooooommm*, just like he's supposed to do, and he all of a sudden realizes he can do it. And you can't speak to him for days. And then the mistake he makes is he now thinks he can case supervise also. This is another field. It's based on the same principles, but you have to know. If you have to know it well to audit it, you have to know it ten times as well to case supervise it.

Now, I, I know, I caught that, that there'd been one or two people in this class who were case supervisors at Saint Hill, and so forth, and you can put it down to my charity that you haven't been ground up for hamburger. Because what I see here, wow. I taught you better

than this. There was a thing called Standard Tech. There has been a thing called Standard Tech since 1966, but nobody's caught the brass ring. So I'm putting that brass ring firmly in your paw. I'm not trying to make you guilty, I'm merely trying to give you one hundred percent wins. One hundred percent. If you get less than a hundred percent, you goofed! If you get less than one hundred percent as a case supervisor, you goofed! Less than a hundred percent as an auditor, you goofed. Some of the goofs are beyond your control. And sometimes you hit a real goof that you can't do anything about at all. And those are the goofs which you shouldn't goof on.

You told the auditor to do so and so and so and so, and the auditor did something else! He just got a letter from *yongo-bongo*, and *yongo-bongo*, he said, "When I was studying yogi, I found out that if the preclear sat in an ibis position ... " Well he decided he'd try that, see, and he didn't follow your C/S exactly, and you've got a loused-up case. And then, because it's going to be a day or two between sessions, he goes and walks under a street car. And that cuts your percentage, doesn't it.

Cases that are well audited don't go to ethics. Cases that are badly audited wind up in ethics. All too often. Now, when you're dealing a purity, when you're dealing with a purity of technology, the weapon in your hands has such velocity, that it isn't the airy-fairy days where you couldn't cut below the reality of the pc and louse him up. There were years past where the technology as it went along did not plow under and overthrow the reality level of the pc. Well you're not dealing with it now. You're dealing with the pure dynamite.

Now an explosives expert has often been known to carry nitro glycerin in a flask in his hip pocket. All he had to do was back up suddenly into something and he would have fragmented all over the landscape. I've seen dynamite men sit on boxes of fuses, smoking. And yet here's this guy who is the nitro glycerin soup expert, the soup expert, and somebody else even looks like he's going to touch a bottle of soup and he practically throttles him. You walk in toward the dynamite powder house with a cigarette in your hands, and the guy who is smoking his pipe on the box gets up and kicks you the hell out of the yard. In other words, he knows enough about it, so he can ride it close to the edge. And he's also smart enough to know you'd better not let anybody else. Do you see? You're dealing, actually, with terrifically powerful technology. Used right, it just shoots a guy to the moon. Goofed up, *pooey*. And goofed up cases are too many.

Now it takes a supervisor who knows his business. You can run engrams on somebody, you can do this with somebody, you can do that with somebody, you can run various processes, you can run ... If you can get an idea of a, of a highway running through the middle of a lot of blackness and a lot of little pathways, and all that sort of thing, you can run any of those little pathways. You can run any of those open fields. You can do anything out there that you want to. You can goof around, and *flubble-dubble*, and *bobble-fobble*, and, and so forth. Pc isn't getting anyplace, you can't do him any damage to amount to anything. But you get on the main highway. It is such a straight highway. The actions in opening the gates are so positive, that when you goof that up the pc will goof up. Do you follow?

Now if there's a big question in your mind as to whether or not Scientology works you shouldn't be studying Class VIII. Because, one is expected to be a sufficiently expert auditor to produce some result, such as a touch assist. He should be able to do that, and achieve some result. But if one has got big questions about this and that, please recognize them for what they are. They're just confusion blowing off. There is just about as much question in running a rehab, or the mechanisms of rehab, there isn't any questions concerning it. There are no questions with regard to listing. There aren't any. You list. And

you list it as long as it contains an item on it, and two on the list you extend the list and give the pc the item, and what the hell.

I mean, this is something like saying a box of matches on the table is either full of matches or it's not full of matches. If it is not full of matches and the matches are dumped along side of it, and if the object is to restore it, you pick up the matches, put them in the box, and put the box together again. And you have a box of matches. I mean, it's open and shut data like that, I mean it isn't any *wibble-wobble-wooble*, it, it's just truth. See? So you start watching for these simplicities. But what does it take to be totally simple? It takes a total knowledge of the lot.

At such familiarity, at such familiarity that you never even have to think to do it. Now how often would you have to field strip a rifle so that you could pick it up, put the cartridge into it and fire it, without even thinking? Well, there's a rifle ... *Clank, boom. Poom!* How often would you have had to have field stripped that rifle? Probably dozens of times.

Back in the days when medicine was medicine, and not Parke & Davis and other drug companies pushing their stock up, a medical doctor used to have to identify all of the bones of the human skeleton, blindfolded, by touch alone. Interesting exercise. Well what would be the point of such an exercise? Well, it's kind of pointless, you very seldom operate in the dark. But it sure as the devil gives you familiarity. You know what bone is where when you've done something like that.

Now, there're various actions and exercises which you can do, and you can action them and exercise them. But if you have any comm lag, if there is any comm lag between your think and the datum you're trying to get, you don't know Standard Tech well enough to do it. If there's any comm lag in you instantly thinking of the Law of Listing that you need to apply at that instant, if you had to think of it as a Law of Listing, as something that came off of a bulletin, you haven't got it yet. You understand? You have to ... It's a total. It's a total. You own it, you do it, and so forth. You look at the list, and it isn't, "I wonder where all of it... ?" You look at this list, you say, "That list isn't correct." You just look at it, as I would with any of these, oh, I could do this at random. [*sound of leafing through folders*] List, yes, incorrect. Yes. Good. Yes. Yes. Didn't find any correct lists.

Well anyhow. Imagine a case supervisor now who would have to have his whole bulletin file along side of him to have reference to go over and find any of the errors which had been made in the session, in order to order them corrected, in case ...

The trouble I have in case supervision is trying to read the auditor's writing. It's that degree of simplicity. I know my data. But you say, "Well of course you know the data. You wrote the data. Naturally you know the data. You developed the data." Well listen, god damn it, I've developed more data than you ever heard of. You know? I've just developed data by the wow! The total notes of Dianetics and Scientology, the total tapes of Dianetics and Scientology, are an ocean of data. Tremendous, fantastic scope.

How is it that I know these central data so well? When I started doing CCHs, when I started doing model session, I set myself up just like you. And I drilled it 'till I knew it cold. I could write down the Laws of Listing again after a lapse of several years, even though the bulletin that recorded them originally had been removed from the lines, and I wrote them from memory, and I think it took me something on the order of about fifteen, twenty minutes. The slowdown was Alex Sibersky's ability to keep up with my writing.

Now I know more phenomena than you can count, which are contrary to those Laws of Listing, which seem to be this, which *off woff*. Phenomena that, that ... or is it the other way? And so forth. How is it that I would know those Laws of Listing? Well, I had to keep

check on things that didn't have variables. I eventually isolated those things and they're the things with no variables. So I had to write all those things down. I had to know those. I had to read them back. I had to remember these things. I had to know 'em. You think you're studying this subject, why hell. I've studied ninety five times the subject you ever studied. Alright, then how is it that out of this whole body of stuff I can pick so neatly this and that, and so as to do a case supervision about as fast as I can read it? It is knowing my data. Knowing which datum is the datum which applies at this particular point, and what datum has been violated and otherwise.

And you've got the same data I've got in your study packs. Simple as that. I don't do these folders from crystal balls, boy. I do these just, these folders against the most concise series of data you ever heard of. *Brrrrrp-boom!* We cracked a case today down the middle. Down the middle, cross-wise and diagonally. It was just about, he'd given us a bad time. We keep cracking 'em. Knowing the data. Knowing the exact, basic rules and laws.

Now there's something funny about all this. I know a lot of other subjects in which such data occurs. I can give you the datum of Freudian analysis. I'm a very good swami. I can read minds so as to tear your skull off. Good at it. Don't ever do these things. Still know the data in connection with it.

Why, then, out of this tremendous body of information are we stressing just these data? I've got us the widest possible selection. It's the evaluation of importance, knowing which point is valuable and what is trash. It is knowing where the main line lies and where it doesn't. I wouldn't give you spit for any datum in Freudian analysis. I wouldn't give you dog spit for it. In fact Freud & Breuer probably should have been stood up against the nearest brick wall and shot unpleasantly, with dull bullets. *[laughter]*

You've always heard me be polite on that subject. I'm taking down my hair. I'm talking to a Class VIII student. What a lot of crap! You know who they really were? They were some guys who had found out how you could take the work of Charcot & Mesmer and persuade people to do things against their will under pain-drug hypnotism. And there isn't an analyst on the planet who ever does anything else in the final run. It's a method of shaking people down and bending their will. Breuer & Freud, in 1891, were agents of Kaiser Wilhelm Hohenzollern. And they were dedicated to making politically-minded changes for him. A bunch of crap. A complete swindle. Just a hypnotist. So he invents the *libido-dibido* theory, and he goes *poogly-poods* and ids, and Greek mythology, and *bah!* There're certain principles involved in any savage and primitive think that you can use. Certain principles involved. There's certain magical principles.

There's opening up somebody's memory, making him, forcing him or persuading him to remember something painful, and so forth. These are known to every medicine man, every swami there is. How is it they knew it and never used it, huh?

Right now, right now the beautiful technology, *heh*, of these characters is turned against Scientology, because the politicians you hear crying out against them have wives who have been violated by psychoanalysis. They are under the influence. There are thousands of zones where data could lie. There're billions of zones where, that you could consider truth. There's a whole universe out here full of crap and buck. And I show you one little, narrow line that goes straight through it, like a shot, and a few gates, which if you open them exactly correctly, somebody goes out like he is on a rocket ride. So if you ever mention to me again a question about something over in left field I'll have you spanked. This is the lousiest thing - what the hell is anybody doing wandering around over here in

left field? Here's the main road. Let's get on it, let's find out what the principles on it are. I didn't mean to curse you, that mildly. *[laughter]* Here's the main highway. Now knock off the mucking about and get on it. There aren't any questions about it, it just is. And it's a certain series of actions that you do.

And they wind up at the other end in a total result. So do it. *Boom!* That's all there is to it, and as far as case supervision, your main trouble will be trying to convince the auditors auditing for you that they'd better damn well do what you say on a case supervision folder, and not some other crappy thing. And then you will have to convince them because of your ferocity on this whole subject, you will have to convince them that they'd better damn well speak the truth, by making a false report far worse than just a goof.

These problems are ahead of you. The first thing you must learn is that there is a road. You can learn it subjectively easy enough, or I could turn loose division five on you, left, right and center. Clean up all the flubs and blubs and so forth, and send you flying with the greatest of ease. If anything is wrong with your case or bogged down, you'd wonder where the hell you; what, what you ever thought was gain before this? Well I'm not going to do that. I'm going to let you get that win on each other in the org student course. We could make, make your cases *zongobingo* so fast it'd make your head swim. But then, we've got all the wins we want. You can have a few. And you can also be the effect end of the goofs. *[laughter]*

So anyway, that is everything I have to say to you this evening. And I hope something I have said will assist you on your road to truth. Thank you. *[Applause]*
