CERTAINTY OF STANDARD TECH

Class VIII #08 - 6810C01: Transcript of Taped Lecture by L. Ron Hubbard.

[*applause*]

And what number lecture is this? (*Seven. Eight*) Now we know somebody missed one. Eighth lecture, one October 1968, AD18.

The substance of these lectures should not, of course, be delivered with total ferocity, because up the line someplace the Saint Hill course will teach its teachings, and academies will teach theirs, and somebody will pay attention to the information which is contained on that. And someday in the future the Class VIII course will contain auditors who can audit. And that would be very nice.

I now find out that most of the data concerning Listing is actually still extant on the Saint Hill tapes. This was a great mystery. It's merely that people hadn't studied them. Now, in view of the fact that clay table demonstration has gone out very thoroughly over the past year or two, we can expect, well people did a demonstration. A corny demonstration I heard about today. The little blob's the auditor, and a little blob was the pc, and the ARC break was a busted line between the auditor and the pc. My contempt.

You're dealing with a bank, and the bank is in the pc. What is the mechanism? What is the mechanism in that bank that occurs? The most deadly sins of auditing are, of course, auditing without any comprehension of the Laws of Listing. These are, that is a deadly sin. It can wrap a pc around a telegraph pole. And I mean those Laws of Listing which were put out in a bulletin in 1968. And any one of those, not followed, can wrap a pc around a telegraph pole. It is very serious.

It is sufficiently serious that five pcs audited in a row on an auditor who did not know the Laws of Listing, and so on, and who didn't know these facts, had trouble, each one of them, with ethics. Almost immediately, within some forty eight hours. And it goes something like this: Out-tech results in out-ethics, then out-ethics has to be put in heavily in order to hold the line to get tech back in. If tech were perfect ethics would be unnecessary.

So you see that an auditor who doesn't know his business opens the door to ethics. And the degree that tech has gone out is a direct measure of the amount of ethics which has to be put in. Direct. This has been the subject of actual test.

Now it may not occur to somebody that I am telling you facts. I am not telling you my ideas. Because I say it is true is no reason it's true. Because I'm telling you what it is, is because it is true. And anybody who has an opinion that differs with Ron's, anybody in the world can have an opinion that differs with mine. But you see, I'm not telling you opinions.

Now when I give you the data of Scientology and the unraveling of the problems of the mind, I am not giving you *my opinions*. I am giving you **facts**! And they don't compare with your opinions. Your opinions haven't got anything to do with it, and my opinions don't have anything to do with it. You understand me?

Out-tech normally stems from some kook who gets an opinion. And he thinks "freedom of think" has something to do with truth. He can think all he pleases, he can have all the

opinions in the world, but when he goes into an org and indulges in one of these God damned opinions that throws tech out, shooting is too good for him.

An opinion of this character, "Well, if you get a floating needle on engrams then you can never run any more engrams." That opinion was brought once into Saint Hill. Big discussions on the subject. Would you please tell me how you could ever run III if it was true?

So all you have to do is think it through. Know your business and think it through. And you will be able to differentiate the opinion from the fact. Now if clay table demonstration can go out in the year 1968, it can go out in the year 1975. Other things can go out. But it is not possible to predict what will go out. Because there can be an infinity of wrongnesses around any rightness. There is actually no predicting under the sun, moon or stars what any academy or Saint Hill student will suddenly assume. Because aberration is a bunch of stuck lies. So some teaching comes through, the truth comes through, it misses this guy to the degree that it restimulates some fixed idea.

Now I'll tell you how fixed an idea can go bad. Somebody has been taught for two or three thousand years that man is basically evil. You tell him man is basically good. He considers that a belief, or a religious teaching and *wa ha he seze* ... your idea. To put it lightly, because he's crazy. Now you can prove that man is basically good for this reason: overts read as overts. Not because he's been taught that it was bad to do it. He doesn't get well unless he gets his overts off. When we process a person he becomes better, more ethical. His ability rises. Now look, if he was basically evil he would get worse, more stupid. Do you follow? So all you have to do is think the think through. On the face of it, it proves itself. There would be no reason under the God's green earth to process him at all if he were evil. Because all you would do would be to run out all the things that taught him to be good. And you would wind up with somebody who was stupid, vicious, couldn't do anything, did nothing but loaf. Yes, but processing demonstrates the complete reverse.

Somebody's around feeling tired, feeling tired. And he can't work and all that. Well that can't be a native state, because when you process it he gets ambitious and works. But you haven't educated him, or taught him to get ambitious at work, you simply ran out his blunted purposes, his betrayed intentions. He had some good intention, he was trying to do something and he got kicked in the teeth too often. And then he gets tired. So that auditing, is in actual fact, a subtractive process. And the final product of auditing demonstrates that man's basically good.

Now in Christian countries men are taught that man is basically evil. So, you say this to this character you're trying to teach. "Man is basically good, auditing is a subtractive process and takes away the evil deeds and out of valences and into evil valences." And so forth. "And the fellow gets better and he gets more moral, and he gets more perceptive, and he gets more able, and he has more energy, and so forth." He knows you're ... it's impossible if it's a subtractive process.

Now let's watch this guy in an auditing session. He punishes the pc. He knows the only way you could make anybody better is to punish them. And his pc becomes worse, more tired, less able, the IQ goes down. Now this is a direct example of a fixed idea getting in the road of truth and auditing. So that's why I say an auditor has no case. A student has no case. We are now above the level. We can talk about, "It isn't true if it isn't true for you" to an academy student, because that's true. That's the closest touch he's got to this reality. But I'm not teaching an academy student right now. And you have no business receiving it at that level. These are the facts. This is the hot dope. They're not based on

my opinions. I might have entirely different opinions, and often have had, but I have enough self discipline not to pass them on to you.

There's a lot of things I could believe in. Lots. For instance there are things that I would like to be doing that are, oh my God. When I look at some of these politicos ... The worst valences I've ever been in contact with rise to the fore. [*laughter*] But I don't allow that to color the job. I have a job to do. You have a job to do.

I'm going to let you in on something. I didn't even get R6'ed. I'm not from this planet. Now. If I can take it on that it'd be a very good thing to clean up this planet, you who were here can damn well share the responsibility and not say it's all up to Ron. That's an interesting thought, isn't it?

Right away somebody comes along and tries to hang me as responsible for all the aberrations of the human race because I'm trying to do something for it. Well you can expect such a thing to be passed on to you. But you find out in the long run, if you do your job, do it cleanly, stick to the truth, stick to facts, do those things which exactly work and go on forward, you come out right in the end. It's the only way you ever come out right.

When you compromise with your own reality, when you deny your own basic goodness, when you indulge in your own stuck ideas, you don't come out right. So somewhere up the track somebody listening to this tape, he was trained by a cracker jack academy supervisor, his Saint Hill course was right on the groove, they didn't flub clay table. They did a great job of it all the way across the lines. This guy really knows his business. He knows his business backwards and forwards. He's moved through VII, he really knows how to do Power, and he comes to VIII. And he hears this tape. Well the only thing I wish to advise him, that if he doesn't keep doing his job and keep the data straight, it can get as bad as it has gotten.

You see, the road out is the only road there is. The road in and down is a total stop and stays stuck forever. It isn't a road, it's a hole. Therefore, I enjoin upon you the job of listening to the straight data, teaching the straight data, using the straight data, and keeping the road out open.

And when these wild opinions come in sideways, to knock them out and kick them aside, with the contempt they deserve. Holding the line, holding the road open, is not an easy job. Every suppressive that comes along the line has to invalidate it. He has to discredit it. He goes into a dramatization of discrediting, because he himself is terrified. What if some other being got stronger? It's all he can think of.

What if some other being got stronger? He in his egocentric nonsense thinks that the other being would become more evil, and therefore destroy him with more enthusiasm. But why does he think that? 'Cause he knows damn well he deserves it. And once more on this subject, how does he know so well he deserves it?

So, when I give you this data, I am not giving you a very broad area of opinion. I'm giving you exactly what works, I am giving it to you exactly as it works. And these are the data which you have to know how to do. It's the data which are stressed on the Class VIII course. You will not find any data outside that perimeter. Not even worth paying any attention to.

Now somewhere up the line, probably somebody will invent something else besides LSD that is now exported with such enthusiasm by psychiatrists, to make them drum up business. More than one way to drum up business. The psychiatrist you know, is just a dramatizing mad man. By definition. There are psychiatrists in R6, and certain people go

into valences and become this thing and do it. And they attain their public presence by the fact that people know the symbol in R6 and so accept them without too much objection. They're out of valence in R6.

Now when you get pushed sideways, this and that, it's because you think some new data has come out. Now I tell you exactly how, exactly how a case becomes unsolvable, and exactly why an auditor squirrels. And I've told you something about this before, but this is exactly why and how. Standard Tech is missed by about four or five miles. Missed. And then because the case has been missed, the auditor sits there looking, or the case supervisor sits there looking for an unusual solution, because the case now seems unusual.

All unusual cases are cases that have been mishandled under the heading of Standard Tech. They have already been mishandled by departure from Standard Tech, and then appear to be unsolvable, and then appear to need some new solution. And the auditor, or the case supervisor, seeing this odd phenomenon sitting there of apparently an unresolving case, then dream up something new, or think they have to go into some other area, and practice yogi exercises or drill holes in his head, or something of this sort. Do you see how that happens? But I assure you of this, and this is the stable data, this datum right here. Standard Tech has already been missed! There's a miss in Standard Tech. All unusual cases come about through a miss in Standard Tech. The resolution of all such cases is to find out where Standard Tech became unstandard. Do you see?

So here's this case, he's a wide-open invitation to the auditor and the case supervisor to squirrel, because he appears to be so unstandard. "*Bu-yu-yu-yu-*, he's not solving. We did everything we're supposed to do and nothing happened. So we have to do something else. Now let's dream up some new ... " Now the danger of this is these new ideas usually come from stuck and fixed ideas. And they don't apply to the case, they only apply to the guy who thought them up. So much so that the late Volney Matheson developed a drill. And he found out the cases that were being audited unsuccessfully, way back when, when he was fooling around with this, with meters and so on, he found out what had been audited on the preclear, and then put the auditor on the cans and found out that was what was wrong with the auditor. You see, these failed cases, the auditor was trying to audit his case out of the pc. Hell, that's the introduction of fixed ideas.

You go back over a case like this. A standard flub. And honest to Pete it is sitting there, so big and so wide, that you wonder how in the name of God anybody could miss it. They could just about as well miss a ten thousand watt search light in the middle of a dark night. It is right there!

I'll give you an example. Give you an example. Unsolvable case came up. Absolutely unsolvable. My God, you couldn't do anything with this case. Well the reason you couldn't do anything with him, he had been two days overrun on ARC Straightwire past an F/N. And then this couldn't be rehabbed because he was in the middle of a secondary. But every effort to rehab the ARC Straightwire F/N collided with the secondary which he had already skidded in to, because it's the next, next step up. And the pc, through overrun and so forth, he just slid into the next step up. And all the time the auditor was trying to rehab the ARC Straightwire the guy was trying to run the secondary. Which made an interesting looking session. Auditor trying to do one thing, the pc doing something else, you know?

Well you would have said, "By golly, that's enough, that's enough, enough certainly, to have thrown any case out the window right there." Yeah, yeah, yeah. The case became unsolvable. But going back through earlier Green Forms on the case an R/S was found on

missed withholds, an R/S was found on connected to a suppressive group. And neither one had been handled or touched by the auditor. Now how the hell could an auditor go right past the Green Form, see a great, big R/S turn on, on a missed withhold, and never inquire what it was? Not only that, but another auditor had come along later doing a Green Form, and had gotten a blow down on missed withholds, and had gotten a blow down on connected to a suppressive group. And had never inquired what they were. In addition to that, in the sec check the guy had walked into the organization so damn high on LSD that his eyeballs were Archimedes' spirals going 'round and 'round. [*laughter*] And that was in the sec check.

So what happened? He sat the case down, pulled the missed withhold. It was an over your dead body sort of a, of an action. Got what suppressive group it was. The fellow knew. And then rehabbed a fantastic amount of overrun and weird release on drugs. I don't know the length of the session, I think the total session maybe took forty five minutes.

So here, where Standard Tech had already been passed by, we had an unsolvable case that was just sitting there. Anybody who really didn't know his business would have immediately accepted this invitation to do something wild, weird and wonderful. Here was this fellow with his tone arm stuck way up in the roof, unresolvable, couldn't be audited, nattering, wouldn't go near Qual, hardly could be forced into an auditing chair, reporting to the MO, spent thirty six hours or so in a hospital where the doctors could find nothing wrong with him. These are all unusual solutions. His unusual solution to his case was to stay away from Qual. Qual's unusual solution was to send him to the hospital. People were asking for some brand new technique to come up and hit it. And what was it? It was a case overrun on drugs, with a missed withhold, and connected to a suppressive group. Also, which didn't have to be resolved to solve the case, he was also wanted by his draft board. And was running out on it as a known present time problem, which didn't come up in auditing.

So you see Standard Tech only had to be about three quarters in to resolve the case. Case resolved beautifully. Now when I see a folder which is about a foot thick with mis-Listed Lists, I know there is enough there to wrap it around a telegraph pole. When I see a tremendous number of sessions which didn't F/N, and when I also haven't got the case folder for the entirety of the auditing, and the case has been overrun on a lot of early processes, I could feel very, very sad about the whole thing. Because it's almost an Herculean job to untangle it. The goofs have added on top of goofs have added on top of goofs.

Now you're going to see this in case supervision. In Class VIII you not only have to be a whiz bang auditor, you also have to be a case supervisor. And there are two distinct skills: To audit, you only know how to audit, but to case supervise, you have to know exactly what is wrong with the case in order to order what auditor. Another trick. Entirely separate tricks. And if you think you have to know it to audit, brother, what you have to know to case supervise. You have to know your data. You have to know Standard Tech data main line. Because in one of these things you hand it over to only a slightly experienced auditor who starts goofing it.

Instead of repairing the List, he's never heard of the Laws of Listing. He attests that he has, he can parrot something, but he doesn't know why you do a List, and he doesn't know this, and he doesn't know that. And you ask him to repair a List. Oh my God. Aaah! He doesn't know enough about Listing himself to repair a mis-Listed List. So you get back a case folder where the case is more messed up. You said the right thing. You said

"Straighten out this List." And you gave it back, you gave it to this auditor, and this auditor, he never heard of Listing. You thought he did, but he somehow or another managed to sleep through it all. And you get the folder back worse off. He, he didn't even repair the existing List, he added a nine page List to an already complete List. And the case is worse off than before.

So, you say, "Well we will be hopeful about this", and we direct what it is, and we get the guy grooved in on exactly what he's supposed to do. And we give it back to him, or to another auditor, and when we get the folder back he's decided that it was really not Lists that was worrying this fellow, but the fact that the man hates auditors. So he has run, "From where could you hate an auditor?" Do you see? And the case is now worse off, and you as case supervisor get the thing back. You will actually have to decide now, that you are in a fire fight of some kind or another, and it's over auditor's dead body. And so you have to have a method of cutting their throats. Well the proper order is, "Do an L1 with the prefix 'on Lists'. And just clean up each read as it goes through." In other words, you're not going to let anybody look at a List again. You're going to pick up the ARC breaks which are in restimulation on the subject of Lists and let it go at that, because that's all you can do.

So your case supervision is limited by the skill of the auditor who's doing the auditing for you. You sometimes have to pull your shots. You know, for instance, that this case needs to be, to get the full IV rundown, or something like that, there's something out with the full rundown, and you've got an auditor there that you know damn well he can't do it. Well, so therefore you have to figure out something he can do that will still straighten out the case. And that's the only variability you get in case supervision. Your case supervisor orders may be beyond the ability of the auditor to execute.

That is usually demonstrated, you never really pull your shots on case supervision. You say exactly what he's supposed to be doing, exactly. It's when you get into these wild fire fights, of correcting a correction. So you give case supervision and then they goof it. So you have to now correct the correction. Well, you can only do that a couple of times without all of a sudden having such a glorious mess on your hands that you had better take some more direct route. Obviously beyond the skill of the auditor to do, even though it's a very standard action.

You say the case, because he feels very sad, is in an ARC break of long duration. That's a standard statement. Sad case, ARC break long duration. (snap) *Boom, boom*. Little data add up at once. And you give it back to the auditor. And the auditor gets in some kind of a fire fight with the pc. See? And he puts in an R-factor. Well I had a folder today. The auditor managed to get into a fire fight with the pc over an R-factor. God, I don't know how he did that. That must have been a masterpiece. How could you get into a fire fight? The auditor must have said something very weird. Instead of saying, "We're going to do an assessment on the case", this isn't what it was, but instead of saying, "I'm going to assess a list on your case," and so forth, "We're going to find out what type of resistive case you are." [*laughter*] Must have, because he had protest on resistive case. So he must have mentioned it. 'Course he was a good auditor, he wouldn't evaluate! No.

Now, some auditor you give an, you give a case supervision, you say, "This girl is leading a highly illegal sort of a second dynamic existence. So therefore we're going to pull missed withholds." You have gotten it on your intelligence lines that this is the case with this case, don't you see? Or you've gotten it from something or other, or the case natters in session. All these various indicators. Or the case is just chewing up more husbands than she can get married to, it's a sort of assembly line, you know? So you

figure there must be some kind of an irregularity on the second dynamic, so obviously because the case is mad at men, or something like this ... You've got indicators, indicators, indicators, see? And you say, "Case is living a rather irregular second dynamic existence. Pull the missed withholds."

Then this auditor, he shows the case the ... We don't have any, we don't have any control over this, you see, as the case supervisor, but we sure can find out what happened, 'cause the case … the session won't come off unless it's totally false reported. And the session … the pc, when they go to the examiner, isn't going to do anything, if the session didn't come off, why it's going to show up on the examiner line. And if it doesn't show up on the examiner line I guarantee it'll show up on the ethics line later. You got two spots of control here. Shows up at the examiners or it shows up at the ethics. It'll also show in no further sign ups. See? So these spots, if you were really doing a case supervisor job, your admin would be to find out who is in ethics. Who's in ethics trouble? What pcs have just gone through here that ethics orders have been issued on? And another one would be, from the registrar, of who hasn't signed up for the next grade. So you'd want a leaving interview.

Now I can tell you the tech is out if over fifty percent of the pcs going through an HGC do not show up for a leaving interview. Now you can jump on routing, and you can jump on this and you can say, "How the hell did that get out?" The truth of the matter is, pcs must be avoiding it. So tech must be out.

Now it would be very interesting then, to take such people that didn't show up at the registrar's office when they left the organization, and to check them back against your folders. And then you will find out that Aloysius Q. Zilch, HGC auditor, lies, lies, lies. If the TA is at seven, he writes two, F/N. The lies are never slight. And so you hang him and get on about your business.

A case supervisor's neck is always out. The false auditing reports. So therefore there are various checkpoints by which the false report shows up. But the basis of this is, and must be, that the case supervisor has a certainty on Standard Tech. See, he must know that Standard Tech, applied standardly, works. If he's wondering, "Does this work", or "Something that doesn't work", or "Should I go back to yogi? I used to have such fun sitting in an ibis position." He can't police it down like that.

Now we had one today, case supervision. I gave a little list to be audited. A little list. One, two, three, four items. And this was what, by understanding, with the pc having trouble with any one of these items, or with any one of these items charged. And one of them blew down and F/Ned. It was just the list. Blew down and F/Ned. Well I could tell this because the folder was, I don't know, eight or nine feet thick. That's an exaggeration. It was only about six inches thick. [*laughter*] But, wow!

Now we say, "Well golly, if the guy, if the guy blew down and F/Ned, he's got something wild. Absolutely wild! What terrible auditing he had all the way along the line. Well it's obviously what was wrong with the case, well it's passed an F/N and there isn't any thing you can do about it." Oh yeah? Oh no, as case supervisor that told me that the person had withholds from that item, so in the next session we're going to pull the missed withholds. Because it was a list of people who were trying to help him. So I set up a list of people who were trying to help this person, and one of them blew down, and he said, "Oh they were absolutely terrible," so I know then, at once, that's a critical opinion. So we pull the missed withhold.

Elementary. It's not even very clever. It's very standard. I want to find out where, where is this character sitting? This guy been audited over PTPs, missed withholds, ARC breaks, what? See? Well by ordering a prepcheck on a certain number of items after assessment, I could tell from the answers where he's been sitting. I was denied the information because on one of the items he blew down. And went F/N. And that was the end of that, of course. You didn't prepcheck beyond that. There's still missed withholds sitting there. So now we're going to get in suppress on missed withholds, and pull the missed withholds, and the case'll sail. Missed withholds don't read in a session. But they must be there. They must be there 'cause the folder's too thick. See what I mean? Case has critical opinions, folder too thick, blows down on people trying to help him. Must have missed withhold. Person isn't sad, so it isn't an ARC break. His case rolly-coasters, so it isn't a PTP. Change, oh there's change there. The only one's left is missed withholds. Now that would be combined with overts, so when it comes back and "No the person doesn't have any missed withholds", that's great. I'm going to have overts. And we will get around to this, sooner or later. And the case will no longer go to review.

The case supervisor is in the business of ending off review cycles. He is never in the business of starting them. A case supervisor who has too many people going to review, after he has had them supervised in the HGC, must be working with the damnedest crew of bums as auditors anybody ever heard of, or himself must be driven up the wall by inventiveness. Something must be very out. But what you keep your paws on is Standard Tech. Don't let that slip, see? That's the thing which mustn't slip. Pcs slip, auditors slip, reporting of cases slips, see? Various things slip, but not Standard Tech. That doesn't slip.

Now unless you know that well subjectively, and so on, it will slip. Because you just have it on my say so. So therefore the progress is, that the auditor should be able to get horrendous wins with Standard Tech. And boy, when he's really got it in the groove. Sits down across from that ole' pc, and he says, "*Rattata-tat*", and the meter says *rattly-bang*, F/N. *Ratta-ta-tat*, boom! He just sits there.

An auditor who can audit this by the way gets so cocky and insufferable he can't be lived with. [*laughter*] He does. And that is a frailty, because when you get hotter than a pistol as an auditor, you then automatically assume you can case supervise. And that's another skill. That's really calling your shots. And when case supervision, you're saying the number three ball in the right corner pocket. And the auditor, he doesn't even pick up a cue. He thinks it's hit with a base ball bat. So you've entered this piece of randomity on your auditing lines, and it tends to sort of begin to shake you a little bit. But if you know what can be done, then you know what he ought to be doing. And I assure you that Standard Tech, correctly applied, applied standardly, gets one zero, zero per centum.

Variations, goof balled, mucked up application, and so forth, are all that reduce it. So it's your business to get it applied. Your foe is the introduction of somebody who *knows best*. The bird is sitting there auditing the pc, and the pc comes up with a wide-open invitation to squirrel. And the auditor, the knuckle head, departs from the C/S and squirrels. Now you've got a patch-up of the session. (*Sighs*) Because if this auditor squirreled once, he's liable to squirrel twice. So you have to start nailing it in with ethics presence. And then, the next thing you know, you get the session folder back and he's not squirrel this time, boy he's blown his cool from here to the North pole. Gone. Jeepers. Well.

If you were to research into this you would find out that inadvertently you've put him to auditing his ex-girlfriend. Or that she looks just like his mother. Something is goofed up here of some kind or another. Something has entered into it which has no business in the line of any kind whatsoever.

When you get into one of these fire fights whereby you're trying to get a case supervisor instructions actually done, and the auditor is doing other things. But every now and then you get an auditor who will be obliging and write down that he did what he didn't do. And he's the only guy who can hang you. You can't straighten that out. As a case supervisor you've got to go in through the lines, you've got to go in to ordered re-training, you've got to go into all kinds of side lines that you really have no business in. Case supervisor's neck is out a mile on a false auditing report. So therefore he must be absolutely merciless when he receives one. It's the only thing that can wreck him. If he can get the facts, and if he can read the auditing report ...

That's another thing. It's an actual fact, if I'm auditing for blood, as Qual here can tell you. When I can't read the auditing report it goes back with some asperity and velocity. I won't have anything to do ... By the way this is a very good rule. Don't have anything to do with an auditing report you can't read. Don't have anything to do with it. If you get into it, you will be over mastered, sometimes by your curiosity to know what happened to Zilch. Sort of like *One Man's Family*[†] continued story, you know? You want to know what happens to Zilch. So you try to make out this. And he had a new auditor today, and this auditor writes a script which is just a continuous series of ee's. [*laughter*] And you can't read it.

And the second you discover that to be the fact you take, if you are really on the groove, and you're really clever, you really know your business, you turn it around, without trying to make it out, and send it back for printing in a different colored pen over every indecipherable word.

Make him re-write the whole thing. And then, you assign him projects in penmanship until he can write so that he can be read. You never go it by halves, because I'll tell you why. You're gonna eventually start winding up with headaches as a case supervisor. You got misunderstoods all over the place. You're trying to find out what the hell did the pc say, what, what is that? Looks like ee's. [*laughter*] Is it leave, have, *boo boo, catterwump*? And you sometimes read these out as they would actually look. And you get "*butter wump mum hip*". And you keep doing this, you're gonna wind up with an antipathy toward an auditing report. An auditor, actually part of his training, should be to write rapidly, legibly. Anybody can learn how to do it. Doesn't even take much practice.

Few days ago I ordered an auditor to learn how to write. And I'll be a son of a gun. Session came up, next session that person did a few days later, came up, the auditor was writing. I'm sure the session wasn't slowed up. Only took him a few days to learn how to write.

But a case supervisor should never accept an indecipherable folder, because he starts laying mysteries into his line. He'll start making mistakes. And this is, what's more I tell you. He doesn't do his job fast. See? He does his job right now, and so forth. But that is to say he doesn't do his job on the basis that the pc has got to be audited 'cause he's leaving for Spokane. Just out of pure cussedness don't do the folder.

"*What about that pc that's got to leave for Spokane? He's got to catch a four o'clock plane. We've got to give him a session. He's got his reservations, and so forth.*" As case supervisor you should say, "Bugger off, bud. Let him catch the plane next Saturday. Because I want him to go back to Spokane right, not rushed."

[†] An American radio show which lasted from 1932 to 1959 and consisted of daily 15 minute broadcasts.

What frame of mind must this guy be in during the auditing session? Sitting on the edge of the chair, watching his clock, "Let's see. It's a review. *Awawaww*." [*laughter*] In the first place, standard sessions are very rapid. And very, very, very rapid. And there's no percentage in pointing the guy wrong, as I've told you before. No percentage in it whatsoever. Just make sure you're pointing it right. Don't think twice about, you look at this and you wonder, "What the hell? What, what's this? What's this? I don't know. This case isn't acting right." And send it back to the auditor to get an assessment done. Send it back to the examiner to get the case looked at.

Folder looks a little bit funny to you. Looks a little bit weird. Something a little bit weird about it. Send it back to the examiner for another examination. Don't take chances with it, because that's not where you save your time. Time is saved in the case supervision being correct. And in the auditing being expert. Do you see? And you'll learn eventually, so that your lines smooth out, you do them very rapidly. But when in doubt, the only time you miss, is when you get in a rush. Or you talk, you get in such a rush you send for the auditor. Cut your throat, boy. Want a sales talk? He thinks he's standing there looking a Condition of Doubt in the teeth, maybe. He'll tell you anything. It's a fact. And then, of course you're just seeing the pc from his viewpoint. And he, perhaps is offended. He has tried to help the pc, and the pc wasn't helped in some fashion or another. So he's offended. So he blames you. The fact that he forgot to start the session and plug in his meter, he ignores.

So in the final analysis your grip on Standard Tech must be so standard that you expect standard results and settle for nothing less. And you solve the problems that you run into in auditing on that basis.

Now you could get into some situation where a guy is in an upper OT ... This would be the toughest situation I would know of. The guy is in an upper OT section classification as you walk on the scene as case supervisor. And his TA is at 5, and he has apparently had all known remedies. He's been run on "What has been overrun?" He has been rehabbed on anything and everything you could think of. And he, his TA is up there. And that, something like that will be your first invitation to squirrel. Because, here's, here's the facts. Somewhere in that line of "all this has been done" is a false report. It hasn't ...

I found one the other day. Case was way high, "What has been overrun?" has been run on the case. *Ba-ba-ba, ba-ba*. I went back. I found the session of "What has been overrun?" Do you know what the auditor did? The auditor listed a list of what has been overrun, indicated no reading items on it, although many of them read, and then didn't rehab any of the things that were overrun. The right way to do this list, is, it's, it is not a list. It is simply an auditing question for which you are writing down the answers in order to do something with them. So he'd write down the first thing and it had a fall. Alright. Now at that moment you take that item, which he has just put down, and you run it back to the time it was released, and before it was overrun. And you may not get an F/N on that one. You now give the next item. The pc gives you the next item, and there's no read on that, so you neglect it. The pc gives you the next item, you get a long fall. Good. You take that subject, you run it back, you rehab it. Good.

Now, you got the next subject. He's talking about all kinds of things, you know? Bookkeeping's been overrun. Well you run it back to when it was released. You'll get some charge off of each one of these things as you try to rehab it. And you get him down the line here, another item, another item, six, eight items later that have read, each one of them rehabbed to a time when they went release. The tone arm has gradually come down, and in most of cases where this is happening and there isn't also something else

wildly wrong, it then F/Ns. And the tone arm has been cured. Don't be surprised if it tends to go up, because probably a lot of his Grades are overrun, because they sat on runs, or, a lot of his Grades never went release, because he was so overrun when he got into Scientology, and so forth, that auditors just sort of despaired of actually getting an F/N, and they'd give him F/Ns at 3.9, or something. [*laughter*]

And the truth of the matter is, the guy's Grades are out and they never did go release. But you've cured the earlier overruns. You can bring him up to a point now where you can do something about it. Now you'd have to decide whether or not it was audited over out Ruds or if it was because of basic track overrun, that he never went release on his Grades. Which, which was the reason? Which was the reason?

Well, funny phenomena will occur. You can put in the Ruds. An upper OT guy or something like this, you can put in the Ruds before the point. Put in the Ruds before auditing. Put in his ARC breaks, PTPs, on the whole track, and get him up to a point. Now check, again, the release points. They don't occur. Good. He's not flat on ARC Straightwire, engrams, secondaries, the lot. All the way up the line he isn't flat on a single, God damn thing. Every one of them has to be run. You say, "Magnificent. How the hell did he get this far?" Well, I don't know. How far could a bunch of auditors that didn't know what they were doing push a guy? How many false attests can you get? An infinity, of course.

But you'll see this case, and they will say, "Everything has been done." Particularly if you're new on post. Somebody wants to shake you down, put you in place, see? "Well, here's this case, here's this case. Zilch. Ha-hoo! Everything's been done! Ha ha! Everything's been done. The lot. The whole, yeah everything. What has been overrun, valence shifters, confront, we've rehabbed all Grades, rehabbed drugs, rehabbed *ha ha ha ha ha*, education. He's had forty five remedy Bs, [*laughter*] one hundred and seventy two S & Ds, we've done everything we can do. He's, we've rehabbed all the F/Ns that ever occurred on Green Forms and sec checks. We've done all of this, and there he is! *Ha ha*!" And you say, "Oh my god!" You start looking through the auditing reports on the case which you have to study very carefully. Case supervisor always does. He looks through these things, and he looks through these things, and they all seem to be ok. It all seems to be done alright. Wow. There's your whole tool bag. Been emptied out on the ground. Every one of them's been used. Good. Hm! I would do something like this. "On resistive cases, has anything been suppressed?" Prepcheck the following ... You don't care. You can always prepcheck things. Prepcheck assessment lists. Prepcheck S & Ds. You don't care what you're gonna suppress. You know, prepcheck some things. You can't even assess this list anymore. There's eighteen assessments of resistive cases in it, see?

And all of a sudden something blows down. Now you can follow what blew down back as the false report chain. Got it? You can take and prepcheck everything on the resistive cases list, including resistive cases lists. Something is gonna BD. Something's suppressed. There's something still out. Handle it.

Now, something else comes into view, and you find out that you've been handed a bundle of lies. Everything hasn't been done. I'd just compare it. The same thing. The guy, the unresolvable case, the completely and utterly unresolvable case, who yet R/Sed and then blew down on missed withholds, and connected to suppressive groups. I mean, what more do you want? I mean, how the hell, you say, can an auditor sit there, and actually look at a meter do this? And notice it, because he wrote it in his auditing report, and never asked the guy a single question, What was the missed withhold?"

Well, it compares to a Power which I inspected in one of your folders. Oh my God. *Aaah*. VA [5A]. And it says, almost direct quote, "Places. *No place*. Pc says *no place* is not the answer. Pc sitting quietly thinking. Blow down. F/N." And then he took him to 1D. (Drums fingers on table) Blew down on what? The pc was Listing without talking! In other words, the auditing was so God damn bad, that the pc has ceased to talk to the auditor. He was Listing to himself! Well, that's because the item just above it hadn't been given to the pc. They were just Listed to F/N. *Dadadadamm*. You get it? Never found the item, never gave it to the pc. Or it's a wrong item. The List needs to be checked. But there's evidence, the pc Listing to himself. He wasn't giving any items, but he had a blow down. And smiled quietly. I don't think he smiled quietly. I think he smiled God damned sarcastically. [*laughter*]

What was the item the pc thought of that caused the blow down? Obviously the auditor should give it to him. Left the pc with a withhold of one item. Not only did he not give the pc his items on this, but he left the pc with a withhold of one of the items, which is on 1C. This is clown stuff. But you look back over a lineup like this, you can find errors. Unfortunately, this person's already been through the CC, so that is not a corrective list. Power's not corrective.

You can get into trouble, because you, you ... You can correct it if the person never went Clear, but you can get into trouble. How do you get into trouble? Well, when you try to straighten it out you inadvertently start running it. You find out the List, the Power List or commands or something weren't complete, and you find that as the wrongness. Now you're gonna have to run Power. And you run Power after Clear, you wrap the pc around a telegraph pole.

One auditor in one thousand pcs would be able to do it and get away with it, and thinking he'd gotten away with something he'd find out the pc never went Clear in the first place. But then your side data comes in. "Oh well, I, I ran a pc on Power one time after he was Clear, and nothing happened. I don't see why there's any proviso on that." We're only dealing with **all** data, see? Of course you could probably rehabilitate, rehab Power on this pc or that pc, maybe even, when they were Clear without any great consequence, or even with a bit of a win, see? But it's not one of these data you could do it with every pc, so every time you did it you'd take one hell of a chance.

And then the pc that it couldn't be done on, boy! Now you gonna untangle that, see? Because you can only untangle it by rehabbing it, which ... And Power is an area where you can get into a fire fight on your correction on a person after he's been Cleared, because you of course are never dealing with his Power. You'll find some body thetan on whom of course you could run Power. So you're busy involved in running body thetan Power, Power on a body thetan, and then the individual himself of course mis-owns this and thinks Power isn't flat. It gets into a mess with great rapidity.

So we're talking in Standard Tech on the data you can do on every pc every time. But again, it follows the Laws of processes. On case supervision there are only so many things that you can do. But you can only do them once. Now when they've all been done, you have to ask the question of "Were they done?" So this gets to be very fascinating, because of course they haven't all been done.

Now you're, only thing you have to solve is which one is a false resort. Not to overweigh the, or overrun the, the object of the lesson. But this is what it takes.

Now you're probably struggling along with an infinity of data. And you think that there is an infinity of data. And it'd only be an infinity of data if you had an infinity of fixed ideas.

The data are very few, the overall technical data are probably under, I don't know what they are, just at a guess two, three, four, five hundred. At the absolute outside, I'm talking about data, in the body of data. There's things like the axioms, and things like this, you include these things in. As far as processes are concerned, why there probably aren't fifty. And in the numbers of ways to do them there's only one. So what are you talking about, infinity of data? See? There's no infinity of data. There's an infinity of goofiness in life. That can go to infinity with the greatest of ease.

So whenever you see, whenever you see somebody squirreling you know he's already goofed. And that is the law concerning it. A squirrel has already goofed. Now he can't goof so seriously that he can't ungoof his goof. That's not possible. Unless he takes a brick and hits the pc over the head, and exteriorizes him forcibly, and buries the body someplace and then can't find the pc. But if you can't get, your goof would mostly consist of being unable to get the pc to come back into session. Sometimes he has to be sort of dragged back. But a goof always precedes the squirreling. And that goes clear back to 1950.

If somebody in 1950 had taken Book One, and they'd run engrams the way Book One said, just that, and they'd done that, why they would have found a high percentage of resolution of cases. Just like that. And they got a high percentage of resolution of cases. But engram running started to go out sideways, and it went out sideways over a great many years, until a short time ago it was reported that engram auditing by chains was very old hat and even looked on like squirreling. Brother, I sure don't know how you'd ever resolve a hung up III if you couldn't run engrams by chains. Couldn't. It's the only road left open. See what I mean?

Somebody can come along and take one of the basic central data, they can take a basic central datum, and he can say, "*Ha ha ho*, it's gone now. I well … you mean we don't do that anymore. I just came from the Flag Ship, and so forth, and they, they don't do that anymore." Move it off the line. Now Standard Tech doesn't work anymore. And that is normally what happens. They either take a datum or a body of data off the line by invalidation, or they put some new data on the line by evaluation. And, that way, the subject goes crooked. And it's no longer a straight subject so it doesn't work, so people have to invent all kinds of damn things to make it work. So you see then why I work hard to hold the line. It's very easily made unworkable. All you have to do is throw away the text book.

Now there are certain beliefs that certain subjects of one kind or another have certain degrees of workability. That's perfectly true. Naturopathy, chiropractic, to name a few antique things, phrenology, where they told fortunes by the bumps on the skull, which I think is, they changed its name after a while to psychology. [*laughter*]

They tell fortunes by the bumps on the brain. There isn't actually any difference in these data. Even psychology pre-empted the word of soul, study of. That's what the word means. When they start teaching psychology, they started teaching it by saying they didn't know what it meant. That's a great place to start a student, isn't it? "Psychology. Well we do not know what the word means, because a psyche means soul and we don't have anything to do with a soul." You think I'm kidding. But that is how the last psychology text book read that came off the press just ahead of volume one, 1950. I was down at the American Book Company and I saw these blue covered books were coming off the endless belt of the binder.

And they were coming off, pocketa, pocketa. And we were waiting because there was a big ceremony involved in it, for *Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health* to come up

the first copy through the binder. And it was following this blue book. So I turned around to a, to the head of American Book, and I said, "What book is that?" And he picked up a copy of it out of the bin. It was the University of Illinois, I think it was, psychology text book. It was their basic college textbook. And I said, "I must have this one." And took it off the lines right ahead of *Dianetics the Modern Science of Mental Health*. And I said, "We will preserve this one in concrete so that the psychologist cannot in the future lie about how much he knew about Dianetics."

And that is the way the book starts. We don't know what psychology means. It says, along about line four or five or ten or something, somewhere in the volume, "Intelligence cannot change. It is that way when the person is born. It is the same when he dies." You look at this damn thing, you never saw such a parade of lies in your life. So I said, "We'll keep this one." I've still got it in my library. It shows the state of the mind just before AD 1 … 0. State of the mind. What did they know about it? *Pffft*!

"Now the great discoveries that are made in universities! Professor *Humphgaw*! The great professor *Humphgaw* has just understood that life has something to do with affinity. Give a Nobel Prize." The lion, see? See? They read our textbook you see, and they ... Sometimes you can get a textbook on philosophy or religion, or something, in the library. And you can look through it page after page, and you'll find somebody has marked lines. And they have looked through this book only to find things which agreed with their own fixed ideas. And this book, you go through a lot of library shelves on these subjects, and you'll for sure find one. And it's marked, you know, some obvious thing, you know? "Men are males", you know? And you'll see over here in the margin, "So true." [*Laughter*]

So you could expect for a number of years yet to come, I suppose, the great discoveries are brought about through, somebody reads *Handbook for Preclears* or something of this sort, and he reads some line in there. All of a sudden he realizes that that is the subject for a complete research foundation, and goes ahead and investigates us. It's pretty weird.

But, they'd be much better off if they found out the line following it, too. That also was important. So that you actually can get subtractions from a subject. You can get little isolated bits brought out of the subject. You can take bits out of context. And then build these things up, so that somebody's rather pauperized understanding can reach into some situation and get "Men are males," and then build the whole thing up around "Men are males," and there's a whole bunch of technology like this. But it doesn't work. There's no workability. Because a very few people have that fixed idea. Most people know it already.

So the whole … the whole subject is any subject which you're trying to hold the lines of, is then wide open to variation if the person, one, doesn't have a variability, a factor being entered in by some stable, fixed idea that somebody has. And the net result of it is workability. Now people who have had the subject work well on their cases, and they've seen *pocketa ding thud* crash, and it worked just like that. They don't have any question about this as the right way to do it, because it has worked. But then people who have been audited without those data, and without those Laws or rules being applied, Lists over-Listed, under-Listed, items not given to 'em, Power run upside down, forgot to run Grades 2 and Grades 3 before they ran Grade 4, this sort of thing, they get into a feeling of wobble, wobble. They haven't experienced Standard Tech, so they consider that it is non-standard. And it's always more difficult to teach somebody who has been subjected to non-standard tech than somebody who has received good, straight forward Standard Tech up the lines.

But if you really want to teach somebody the subject, and make him a missionary on the whole idea, is after he has been mucked up from A to Izzard, put him back together again with Standard Tech. Zoom, thud. He's been worrying about his case for the last three years. You put him back together again with just straight Standard Tech. And you put him back together again so fast he hardly knew what happened. It went, *pffft, pffft, pffft*! Never knew. Wow! He isn't necessarily overwhelmed. But he now has the idea that it can be done wrong too. And I think in any group taking a Class VIII course there will be a certain number who have some idea and subjective reality that it can be done wrong, there will also be some, some small number of characters who have done it wrong and have received it wrong, and don't quite know what they're studying. And so don't quite know what to hold on to, because it, haven't seen the workability, subjectively, objectively. See? They've gotten into some back eddy of squirrel-ishness on the thing somehow or another, and just left their case parked in right field and their understanding parked some place back of home base, and they're not quite sure what they're looking at. And they get confused.

Now in this state, groping for some orientation, groping for something, why they'll hold onto some data like fury, which may be a very minor datum. You know, like ARC contains R. They really know it contains R. They got a subjective reality on that. You have to spread them out from that. They're fixed on that, because a lot of confusion is oriented by that. And when you say there's more to it, there's also A, and there's also C, why you're spreading 'em out to a point where the confusion starts to hit them a little bit. And so they go back to the thing, "Well I really am certain that R is R." You see how it happens?

So anyway, holding the line, holding the line. Trying to get it to go straight down, right down the groove, and so on, is subjectable to many cross currents, so that the subject, with certain things subtracted from it ceases to work on certain people, who then start looking for some other way to do it, who then come in with some God damn fool opinion, who didn't know in the first place, and blow. And the whole subject goes up in smoke. Deteriorates. Which is unfortunate. Men who know the Laws of Listing don't follow them. Then they get some loses on cases. Now the cases they've audited don't think, they think the Laws of Listing have been applied, so they think the Laws of Listing are wrong. So they invent some new idea of Listing, which is that all over-Listed Lists must be over-Listed. And that is what an auditor is up against.

Now the auditor himself is subjected to a certain amount of invalidation, because he does what he thinks is necessary, and what he is sure is the right thing to do. And he finds out it doesn't straighten out the pc. This particular instant didn't straighten out the pc. So, this makes him feel like he's had a little bit of a lose. He sees the examiner reports. The guy left the session apparently ok, appeared at the examiner and there was something out. Well how did that happen? So he feels a bit invalidated. He feels he should do something else beyond the C/S.

Beyond the case supervision he should do something else. So, the case supervisor sees this, and then he is subjected to a certain amount of invalidation from the auditor. The auditor, you know, didn't do so well that time. When he appeared at the examiner he wasn't alright. Something's wrong. Well, the one thing you can find to agree on in all this, and this is the stable datum, the one thing you can find to agree on all this, is that something is a departure from Standard Tech. That gives you an orientation zone from which to orient your disagreements. The auditor probably busy blaming the case supervisor, the case supervisor busy blaming the auditor, and the pc sitting back there with a completely suppressed read on PTP. It's completely suppressed because a present

time problem doesn't … doesn't communicate to him. Every time you ask for a present time problem, why he knows what problems are. They're solution to things. And he hasn't got any solutions. All he's got is worry. The communication to the pc is out. And it hasn't emerged. Or he's got an ARC break of long duration. He's there not on his own determinism, forced to be there. And he suffers through it all. The idea of ARC break is completely foreign to him, because the word doesn't communicate. Or, because he's been asked for ARC breaks and then had them invalidated.

You can get an infinity of wrongnesses that happened with the guy, but the resolution of the case will be ARC breaks are out, PTP is out, or, missed withholds are out, or he's committing continuous present time overts, some Grade is out that was supposed to have been run but wasn't, the List that was supposed to have been done was to wrong item, it's falsely Listed, or the general approach on TRs completely out of the case supervisor's sight, and completely out of the auditor's sight. Early on, why it was just constant invalidation. The auditing sessions. He had several auditing sessions in which each one of them was just a constant invalidation. "Well, that's not right, actually what you mean is so and so." See? Something weird has gone on.

Nevertheless you can untangle it all. It's where you've had departures from these exact actions. And some of those departures are important and some of them are unimportant. Now I'll give you an example of what is unimportant. I see in case summaries, which auditors do, they're prone to list the administrative errors of the auditor. They go through the folder and they list the administrative errors. They raise hell. The auditor didn't totally date the session, he didn't give the year, he just gave the month and day, and he writes the TA down in the wrong column, and you can't tell the difference in that, and he doesn't give all of what the pc said, and he gave no reason why he ended off the session, or something. These are administrative, administrative, administrative. And an auditor doing case summary, a case, a summary, a case supervisor's error summary of course is a thing. It is going through every session you can get your hands on and finding every auditing blunder in that session, and making a list of these. Well, making this list, well, you'll find out an auditor who's green at this, or a case supervisor who's very green at this, he will go into this on the basis of the administrative flubs. Do you see? You know, he didn't date it, and he just *wawow* … and he didn't write down ... There is no summary report. Absolutely reprehensible. There is no summary report for this session, and so forth. And he just goes on and on and on, page after page after page. It's the wildest listing of errors you ever saw, **because not one of them would affect a pc at all**. The viewpoint from which case error summary lists are done is the viewpoint of what has an auditor done that would have messed up a pc.

Now, it could also be done from, what would mess up a case supervisor. [*laughter*] So you're interested basically in what would have messed up the pc, secondarily in what would mess up the case supervisor in trying to case supervise it. That's why admin is tough and straight. Just so the people can tell what's happening. That is basically what you want out of an error summary report. What you want is what has been done that would have affected the pc adversely? What departures from Standard Tech do you find? We find PTP has always been handled by "Invent another problem". *Aaaahhh*. Therefore we know there's going to be charge on the subject of PTPs. So we're going to have to get PTP corrected. We can prepcheck it. You always got prepchecks, they're, you can prepcheck anything. Overrun. Check for overrun on PTP.

Check for this, check for that. See? Overrun, prepcheck, do something about it. But you've got it there. Look at this, God damn it. For one and one half years this case, they

attempted to solve this case in a review, somewhere, and they consistently ran "Invent another problem, invent another problem, invent another problem", and the case has just been getting worse and worse, but really hasn't changed in his main basic characteristics. See, you've got your error summary. That would have affected the case. That was important.

And the session which goes *wiggle biggle zibble wiggle zig zig woah hub back yak yak voom*. You can't understand it, so the case supervisor's been done in. So you say, "Out admin, shoot the auditor." That's what your folder error summary should consist of. What affects the case? And what would affect it's case supervision? That's all that's important. There isn't anything else that's important. So it says "PTP, F/N". Doesn't say the pc said anything, it just blew this and that. It happened two years ago - The auditor's already been hanged. It isn't gonna affect the case one way or the other, see, so why remark it? Say the hell with it. That way you get the important things, the very, very important things. Mis-Listed List. Lists. Fifty S & Ds done in the same week. See? That's the stuff. That's the stuff. Now you know, you know what to order. "Too many S & Ds. Fly the needle on S & Ds, overrun of. Find you can't do that, do an L-1." That'll be your case supervision. "On S & Ds do an L-1. Fly the needle on S & D rehab. If this is impossible, L-1, with the opening line is, 'On S & Ds... ' " Do something in this character, which is very standard, standard list, you do it to this subject. But on folder summary, in looking back over it, you'll find these damned S & Ds. S & Ds, S & Ds, S & Ds. Christ, how many suppressives are there on the planet? See? They're over-Listed, under-Listed, wrongly executed, you know? Wow, that must be an awful zone.

Now, but if we find out we can't do anything about it we better stop restimulating it. And you get the other part of the coin. You couldn't get anything done about it, so don't do anything about it. Don't get into one of these perpetuals, gonna take a year and a half to rehab this case. See? Because the case is gonna get worse and worse and worse and worse and worse. Over repair.

Do you have a better grip on this ? (*Yes*) If you think there's an infinity of data then you must have confronted an infinity of wrongnesses. And having confronted it, let it blow. And hold on to the main line. Thank you very much.

****