OUT-TECH
A lecture given on 21 September 1965

Hubbard. (1965, 21 September). **Out-Tech**. *Saint Hill Special Briefing Course,* (SHSBC-430). Lecture conducted from East Grinstead, Sussex.
_____

Thank you.

Well, you probably won't applaud so loud when you hear the kind of a lecture I'm about to give you. You know—mean.

This is what date?

Audience: September 21st, AD 15.

Twenty-first of September. Isn't that awfully significant in some way? What happened on the 21st of September? Fall or something? All right. I gave a lecture on it. I guess that's what's significant.

Well, you see, I have reformed. I have reformed, and I've decided to lecture to you once in a while. But, truth of the matter is, there are so many lectures on tapes, you see, it's rather like gilding it all and putting an unnecessary coat of paint on it and that sort of thing, you see?

But the truth of the matter is, what's happening at this particular moment is we're in the eagle's-eye-view position. Do you see? An eagle's-eye view. That is, we're way up at the top of the Gradation Chart looking back down the lines. Now, that's a very optimum position to be in, because you can see at once what's necessary and what's unnecessary. You can take a look at this and you can say, "Well, that stuff over there, that just went into a slight diversion, don't you see? And this material over here—well, that was not too important. That datum right there, though, boy, that's right straight through. That's important." Do you see? So that when you're taking an eagle's-eye view of the situation, you can select importances of data.

Now, the one thing that the poor bloke down at the bottom of the line, about—along about HAS— he's got an entirely different attitude. He's got an entirely different attitude. He's in a sea of data, and this sea of data is overwhelmingly and overpoweringly general. Every drop of water in the ocean has the same importance of every drop of water in the ocean. He's unable to differentiate between one drop and another. He's in this sad state, then, of drowning. Now, he isn't drowning— actually, he doesn't start his drowning in Scientology. He starts his drowning in life, and that is much more general than Scientology at its early stages. Scientology at least tells you "Scientology is important." But life is liable to tell you "life is unimportant" and "life is important" almost in the same breath.

In other words, did you ever hear anybody say, "Well, life is unimportant?" Hm? "It doesn't matter," and so forth. And then they say, "Well, life is very important and earnest," you know, next breath. And then they say, "You should revere your parents. The trouble with you is—what's wrong with you is you've revered your parents." See? "Now, the trouble with you is, Mr. Jones, is sex. Here—haven't had enough." And when you get all through, you feel pretty groggy.

You start going through school, for instance (when you pick up a body, you get into kindergarten, and so forth): Every teacher tells you that every datum in every part of a subject is very important. And not only that, but each teacher tells you that only *that* subject is important really. And when you get all through, you've been told so much is important that you generally just go on a retreat from the whole thing.

And the hardest thing that a thetan has to do, and the most significant thing he can re-cover across the boards is his ability to evaluate importances—what's important and what isn't.

Now, processing, the basic scheme of processing—what is it? The duplicative question. The examination of the mind for the apparent answer to the question. The knocking out, then, of this, that and the other thing until the individual can take a look at it and see before him some data that is important. Do you understand?

Now, you mustn't underestimate the value of the administration of processing as an entirely separate thing than what is processed. In Scientology we have developed the repetitive process which permits the individual to examine his mind and environment, and out of it select the unimportances and importances. Now, yes, additionally he knocks out of restimulation, he does a little erasure, he gets things out of his road, he clarifies his view, he can see better—oh yes, all of those things too. But remember that all he's basically doing is taking a look at the situation and finding out what is important and what isn't important, but to do that he has to find out what is and what isn't. That is even more fundamental.

So in all of the processing as you come up the line, you are following, in actual fact, a duplicative system of questioning, which is in itself, new, strange, and totally unique to Scientology, which makes the other things work. Other things work because of this. Do you see?

So it comes back, in its original stages, to the auditor. Now, yes, an individual can listen to a few tapes, and he can read a few bulletins and read a few books. Yes, he'll get a great clarification of various things, because all the time what's happening is is I'm presenting him with certain vistas of existence and conditions of existence, and he's examining them, and he's taking them in or knocking them out and handling it and reorienting himself, don't you see? Now, as he does this, he however is straightening up his own mind. And his real gain, when the chips are all the way down, largely depends upon the auditor. And the auditor is very, very important.

Now, the individual who is drowning in a sea of life receives a repetitive question from an auditor, and his statements on it are—the pc's statements on it are handled and as-ised, and those statements are then acknowledged by the auditor, making a full cycle of the situation—only then can get up to a point of where he himself might, all by himself, confront his own mind.

He's got his own mind and life so mixed up that man has completely forgotten what a mind was all about and, in a large numb—the majority of cases, isn't even aware of the fact he has a mind. He thinks the mind is himself. He's made the same mistake that the religionist makes. And the religionist has a ball; he talks about, "You must save your soul." How you are going to save your soul, I'm not sure, see, because your soul happens to be you. But it would be too self-centered and egotistical for you to go out on an all-out crush of saving you, wouldn't it?

So we have to divide this out so that it is "save your soul." And where is your soul? "Well, my soul is over there," some theetie-weetie will tell you. "Yes, *I* am over there. Oh, I know I'm exteriorized now. I am over there by the radiator."

Now, how can an individual be over there by the radiator? Well, he can't be over there by the radiator, because if he were exteriorized he'd be "Oh, I'm over here by the radiator." Do you see that?

So what is all this now? It means that the importance—the big important gain… These all look important to you as you go up the line. They all look important to you. But the big ones—the big ones, actually, are not at the top; the big ones are getting started. And you get some of the most startling gains from some fellow who walks in off the street, and he starts to orient himself just by

the fact that Scientology exists, that there is a body of knowledge that leads somewhere, that there is a road out. He starts orienting himself; he gets tremendous gain.

Now, under expert handling by an auditor using a duplicative question, he is able to look at life and his own mind and himself and his circumstances and so forth, and he's able to come up with additional gains. And we've got tremendous numbers of things that can happen to this individual on improvement, because it's a long ladder; it isn't a short ladder. Of course, we live in a society which rather demands of the individual that he takes a twenty-two-gauge needle and receives it in the gluteus maximus with just one shot, and at that moment goes, "Whee, I'm Clear!" You see? Society has originated, "All you've got to do is eat one bowl of Wheaties and you are Superman." Well, I'm afraid you have to work for it.

It isn't that Scientology is slow; it's that man has gone so far down. To dig him out at all is pretty heroic! And the first step in making him come up the line is, of course, making him aware of the fact that such a thing as Scientology exists. This alone will give him a start. But he actually makes his real first gains on becoming aware that there is a road out. Because he's sure there is none; he's heard that before. He's been told that all he had to do was eat a bowl of Wheaties and he was Superman, you see? And he ate bowls and bowls of Wheaties and he's *still* not Superman.

So what's the—what's the dependency here? A basic dependency is upon your Course Supervisor—the person who is teaching Scientology. That's a basic dependency. There's a slightly prior dependency. That's the fellow who disseminates Scientology. He's doing some-thing for the society all like that—just like that. Even though you get somebody up into arguing of "is it or is it not," he's better off than not being aware of it at all.

So you get the disseminator of Scientology, you get the teacher of Scientology—as in an introductory lecture, as in early classes, that sort of thing—these people are performing a tremendously important function. And it's a function that you, knowing the gains that can be achieved from auditing itself, are prone to overlook. If you present this acceptably and if you teach it so that it reaches in its early stages, you will find the people right in front of your face are experiencing remarkable recoveries up along the road.

These things you don't ordinarily see, because they're not on an E-Meter, they're not being categorized as an individual. But I'll give you an example: I took a rather raw crew of students one time and I did nothing but lecture to them—nothing but lecture to them at all—and got some of the best graph changes I have ever seen in an ACC. I didn't—they didn't receive any auditing for six weeks at all—no auditing at all. They just had lectures.

Now, some individual hears about Scientology, and having heard about it—that there is a road out—hope resurges. He thinks, "Well, maybe I'm not totally licked." Well, that is something like finding a straw in the middle of a vast ocean of nowhere. Something exists.

Now, the suppressive counters this, of course, by saying it doesn't exist, and it isn't, and it isn't any good, and it isn't that. Because all the suppressive is saying, "Boy, the last thing in the world I want to have happen to you is that you get any better. Because if you got any better, you would then get stronger. And I'm having a hard enough time murdering you now".

So therefore—therefore, the person who begins with the dissemination of it—he reaches people; he's giving them the straw in the very tumultuous ocean, something to grip on to. Then the fellow who tells them about it, who teaches them—why, he gets another upward movement. And then it comes into the hands of the auditor.

Now, in the auditor it's in very sure hands, because there's ways to audit and ways not to audit, and there's ways to do a good job on a pc and ways not to. And the big upsurging gains that the

individual makes that can be marked on a chart, and so forth, are of course found in auditing sessions. But remember that if the disseminator and the teacher did not do their job first, that person never gets into the chair of the auditor. So the biggest mistake you can make is not to disseminate Scientology and to teach it in an unacceptable fashion. Those are big steps that can be very badly muffed.

Now, when you reach into a society at large and try to get some common denominators that you can get people to agree with and walk on forward with and so forth, you're talking to very confused and very distracted people, so that you actually could have many approaches and probably many answers as to how to do it. One of the soundest of those answers is speak to them about communication and teach them simply, one, that Scientology does exist, that he has got some friends somewhere in the world, that there is somebody interested in what happens to him. This is all part of the message that Scientology exists.

And then your next line that you throw to him, and so on, is that there is some value in being able to communicate. You teach him the datum, really, that if he could communicate to his environment better, he could handle it better. Now, that's dicey, because some fellows know that if you communicate you will be punished. Do you understand? So you're selling across that line that he's afraid to communicate and you tell him, "Well, it's all right," and he eventually does get the idea that if he could just communicate a bit better, he could handle his life better.

Now, of course, that's—that is one of these horribly obvious truisms that you as a—as an auditor are so familiar with that you forget that this is a new, strange and startling datum to the man in the street: That if an alarm clock is rolling off the table, if you stopped the alarm clock from rolling off the table, it would be better than letting it drop on the floor. And there-fore, when you reach over and stop the alarm clock from falling off the table, you are then handling your environment. But if you don't know enough to reach over and stop the alarm clock from falling off the table, you are not handling your environment. You get the idea?

Well, he agrees with this. "Of course," he says, "Well, that's silly!" And you say, "Well now, if you talk to your wife about the situation, it probably would straighten up better." Now, that's getting adventurous. And he looks that over. So you fix it up on the basis that he might... You say, "Well now, he might be—she might be rather upset at first, but it'd come out better in the long run." And nervously he tries to communicate to somebody and he has some wins, and he has some loses, and gradually it moves into his perimeter that there is some truth in this: that if you communicate in your environment, you can handle it better, and if you don't communicate at all, you don't handle it at all, and you just get worse.

Now, when the auditor moves in on it, and this fellow has never been able to pass a driving test in his life, and the auditor says, "Touch that car," and "Withdraw from that car," and so on, and he puts him through a familiarization of just a Touch Assist on a car, the fellow goes out and passes his driving test. Now, that's very convincing. That's very convincing. He finds out all kinds of wild things happen with a—such a basic and fundamental thing as a Touch Assist. He's now being brought up right, he can now see the gains and so forth.

So that your first wins on dissemination and teaching Scientology do not naturally have to follow a perfect line. They—it can be a pretty wobbly line and you can still get them along it.

But when it comes to that auditing line, that, if it is wobbly, will sink him. In other words, our first touchy operation that we've really got to know our business on is auditing. And that doesn't matter whether you're auditing a little child or you're auditing a dog or you're auditing somebody on very upstage processes. It doesn't matter; that auditing has got to be good. It's got to contain its auditing cycle. It's got to be addressed to the general condition of the person whom you're auditing. The

4

questions have to be understood and acceptable to the person you are auditing. These conditions have got to be straight and you've got to be able to do a good job.

So that, although it's very important to move the person in toward auditing, remember that when you have moved him in toward auditing, then we are now in a position where tech-nology is technology with an exclamation point. Up to that time it's debatable. It's debatable what is the best way to disseminate Scientology, because you're disseminating into such a con-fusion: Life as it exists. It's also debatable what's the best thing to lecture to people about Scientology. See, that's also debatable. Now, it's a little less debatable, but it's still debatable, and we can have lots of opinions on this. Do you see?

The only common denominator we have—well, we tell them about communication, and that sort of thing; people seem, in general, to be happy with this. But that's still subject to a number of questions. See? And we can debate on this and find out this system is better, that system is better, what you tell students when they first come into Scientology should be, and then we can have opinions on it, and we've had personal experiences. You get the idea.

But when we move it into tech we are no longer in a debatable sphere. That is such a *highly* sophisticated, *highly* developed technology, that it works only if it is right along the line—one, two, three, four. Do you see that? So we move out of the debatability of life into the precision of auditing. And auditing is very precise.

Now, when we say technology is out—although we might also include that we have Instructors who refuse to let students study bulletins or something like this—technology would be out, you see, if the Instructor was never in the classroom, and wouldn't give the students any bulletins and refused to teach them anything; we would say that it was out. But *anybody* would see that it was out. Do you understand? Anybody could see that fellow wasn't teaching Scientology and so forth. That—well, that's easy to see!

Ah, but auditing—the ability to observe auditing and tell whether or not it is good or bad—is *far, far* more precise. That is much harder to do. We can observe whether the teaching is right or wrong; that's easy. But to observe whether the auditing is right or wrong, that's much harder to do. In the first place, the auditor can make little, tiny mistakes—little microscopic mistakes—that sufficiently upset the preclear that the preclear then acts up and the casual observer would then say, "That is simply a difficult preclear." Do you follow? Where as a matter of fact the auditor goofed somewhere. You have to be a *very, very good* auditor to be able to perceive good and bad auditing.

Now, in the earlier days, particularly the newer students on course would be observed to miss, on TV demonstrations, the most horrible auditing goofs you ever heard of. You would ask them for an analysis of the session they have just seen. And the new student, being relatively unfamiliar with the subject of auditing, he wouldn't be able to find any. And quite uniformly he would say the best session there was the one that had the most goofs in it.

Here, I'll give you an example: He sees the auditor sitting there, and the pc is a little bit critical, and the auditor, with soothing syrup, sort of butters the pc down and the pc subsides, you see? And they say, "Wasn't that a wonderful job of auditing," and they're absolutely *amazed* when the Supervisor would say, "Well, that guy has flunked. Get him back to unit so—and—so and get him trained." And the new student says, "Get him back to unit so—but the guy—absolute genius! Look at the fellow, he just said, 'Now, now, that's all right,' or 'We'll take that up later'". You get the idea of this? They weren't educated enough in it to see whether it was goofed.

Now, frankly, almost any auditing is better than no auditing. So, therefore, what you're bargaining for is only about 60 or 70 percent of the gains of auditing. You'd get 30 or 40 per-cent of the gains of auditing, you see, if it was all goofed up. Just by duplicative question and somebody being

interested in the fellow, you're going to get some gain, see? But how about getting *real* gains out of this?

Well, when we say "out-tech,"—which is what this lecture concerns—when we say "out-tech," we don't mean, in actual fact, that some auditor isn't sitting there interestedly auditing the pc. We really don't mean that. It's not as corny as what's out-supervision, see, or out-instruction. We mean that they're just not getting that 60 percent of the gains. See, they're settling for 20, 30, 40 percent of the gain and letting it go at that. We mean tech is out because they are not getting out of auditing what they should be getting out of auditing, on a 100 per-cent basis. Do you follow?

This, in other words, is "the niceties of the thing are not with it." So that we can have an HGC which is auditing with *mad* enthusiasm. Pcs are coming in and they're being audited and they're being set a goal and all this. And this is all going on and we say, "Goodness, isn't that a busy HGC and the auditors are seldom late for auditing sessions and that sort of thing. And whenever pcs blow they get them right back to Ethics. Really snap and pop, see?" And we say, "Tech is out."

Somebody will say, "But, that's impossible!" Oh, no, that's not impossible at all. They're just only getting 20 or 30 percent of what they ought to be getting. Why? It is simply and entirely and completely a matter of: The fine points of auditing are missing and what really goes wrong with cases is not understood. They're sitting there giving the auditing command, yes, but making lots of goofs with it, yes!

Now, what does it take to make a good auditor? Now, a fellow who is a good auditor is so far above "somebody who can audit" that it would take an expert, in actual fact, to differentiate the difference. In other words, you'd have to be an awfully good auditor to watch the difference and watch what he is doing. You'd also have to be something of a Case Supervisor. You'd have to know these various phenomena. So a good auditor is what it takes to get good results.

What's a good auditor? Well, let's take up here the first part of this—the GAEs. Now you've heard of this GAE a long time and this has not, really, to any great degree been published. It's not really been published the way it could have been published. These are the five GAEs and there are only really five GAEs—really only five.

Can't handle and read the E-Meter. Gross auditing error—GAE. Auditor is sitting there. He's got a meter in front of him. He's got a pc connected to the meter. He's getting blowdowns. He's getting this and that, and he sees falls—falls occur, but he doesn't see these falls. Do you understand? He's getting tone arm action, but he never adjusts the tone arm so as to be able to record or note the action. You got the idea? Or when he brings his tone arm back to set, and so forth, he overcompensates so the pc is getting 435 divisions of TA for two-and-a-half hours. In other words, he just goofed up on this subject about the E-Meter. That needle moves, he doesn't see it; that tone arm moves, he doesn't see it. The needle doesn't move at all and he sees it move. This type of error—big errors. Now, it'd take a fellow who could run an E-Meter in order to detect whether or not somebody was running an E-Meter. Right?

Oh, a man can look *terribly* competent! You know? I see a lot of these medical instruments, and I see these fellows around in white coats and lead aprons and—although why they use a lead apron, I wouldn't know—but they—here are these fellows and they're all duded up, and they're reading meters and dials and turning them on and off. Honest, some of their machines cover the wall. And when they're all finished reading that and looking so scientific, and so forth, they don't know anything about the person whatsoever. And an E-Meter could have found it out a long time earlier without any white coats and without a whole wall.

It doesn't, then, matter the pose with which you handle an E-Meter or the *attitude* with which you handle the E-Meter. The E-Meter just is—reads; do you see, it read? You see? It doesn't read; do

6

you see that it doesn't read? I mean, it's elementary. When you adjust the tone arm, well, have you adjusted it or have you overadjusted it or not adjusted it, you know? That's it.

Now, let me assure you, every time you see an auditing session break down, one of these GAEs is going to be out. One of them is going to be out, man. And don't go looking for whether or not he was worried about his girl-friend while he was giving the session as the rea-son for giving a lousy session. It's never that. It's always a *gross* auditing error. It's always a *big* one.

So out-tech, when it comes down to research on out-tech, if you go around looking for specks of dust on the session, you're going to be wrong. What you want is a boulder. And there are only five boulders and one of these boulders is going to be in that session. I assure you, there's one place where the Case Supervisor very often takes his finger off of his number. He forgets these GAEs and he thinks it's something about the pc, or it's something about the process, or it's something about this and something about that. And if that Case Supervisor went right down to it and looked real hard, he would find in that session one of these GAEs.

Well, we've covered the meter one. Let's get the next one: *Doesn't know and apply technical data*. Now, actually, the original writing of that was: *Couldn't read and apply an HCOB*. That's a gross auditing error. That also comes to the Case Supervisor. The Case Super-visor says, "Give the person an assessment for any present time problem." And this auditor who has this as a gross auditing error (you'll find out it's rather consistent with this person) will simply say to the pc, "You got any problems?" And then write, "Assessment negative." Do you see?

So you gave one instruction and some other action resulted. Well, it's a gross auditing error not to be able to read and apply auditing directions or a bulletin or something. You should be able to read it and apply it. It isn't necessary that you have to *do* that one, but don't do something else and think you've done that one. You see, that's the gross auditing error, really. The ability to read and apply data. That's all. Now, that actually moves into the zone of the next gross auditing error.

And the next gross auditing error is: *Can't get or keep a pc in-session*. Boy, you will just be amazed how often that is the case. The pc is flying all around the place and saying, "Oh well, my—I'm terribly worried. You know, I have an appointment with Bill this afternoon, and I want to make sure that I've gone and—and—."

And the auditor says, "Here's the next auditing question."

"Yeah, well, I hope I make the appointment with Bill all right."

The auditor says, "Well, here's the next question: Do birds rap?"

And the pc says, "Do birds rap? Do birds—I think—yeah well I don't know about that. But I do want to get out there in time to catch Bill when he drives by."

"Well, all right. Now, do birds rap?"

You see, that can be so gross that the auditor doesn't even see that the pc is totally out of session; pc isn't with it.

Well now, getting and keeping a pc in-session is a little body of technology in itself. Part of the communication formula is you've got to get somebody's attention. See? You've got to get somebody's attention before you can tell them something. Well, if the pc's attention is flying all over the MEST universe, how are you going to get his attention long enough to get in an auditing command?

So what you ought to do is try to find his—where his attention is going to. It actually doesn't matter much how you do it. Don't do it on an endless itsa. But where is this guy? What's he thinking about? Well, naturally there's only a few things that he could be thinking about. He could be ARC broken or he could have a present time problem or he's got a withhold or he's got an overt; I'll take those up in a minute. But that's—the auditor who can't get the pc in-session and keep the pc in-session, and so forth, is actually committing a gross auditing error. Because he's sitting there applying a process to a nobody in a nothing. He hasn't got any pc to audit.

Now, the ne plus ultra of this is, of course—is, of course, down in silliness. These are all pretty gross, but this can get that silly that he just didn't tell the pc to come to session, didn't have a pc in session and didn't himself appear.

And you'll be very surprised to find out how often that was the source of no gain for your pc. You'd just be *amazed!* I know you say, "Well, such errors as that can't possibly exist." The devil they can't, man.

We had somebody around here who was just having an *awful* time a few weeks ago, and the HCO Exec Sec and Area Sec and Ethics Officer were about to shoot this person *down in flames* for just raising the devil all over the place. An investigation—I heard about this, and I said, "You wait a minute." See? I know my auditing. I said, "There's something else here. You'd better look at that just a little bit further—little bit further" And they looked, and I'll be a son of a gun, that pc had been ended and wasn't audited for five consecutive days, although a top-priority pc.

Gross auditing error! Didn't audit the pc, much less just didn't get the pc in session. You follow me? So, at the bottom of all this stew and stir was, sure enough, one of these GAEs. Do you understand? Pc wasn't being audited. Of course, the pc was upset. Pc paid for auditing and wasn't *getting* audited. Obvious. Auditor never appeared in session; pc's name never appeared on the assignment board. You got the idea?

So a gross auditing error—don't you go looking for dust motes. Now, *Can't get the pc in-session and keep a pc in-session.* Well, that is very broadly stated and purposely so, because there are innumerable ways to keep a pc out of session, such as locking the door. Other ways is the pc comes right into session, sits right in the chair, is totally in-session, says, "I've got the answer to that. All night long I've had the answer to that next question, and I've got it, and so forth, and I had a terrific cognition on it." And the auditor says, "Well, we'll have to go over the rudiments first." So part of this could be the PC is right there *in*-session, madly, you see, and the auditor carefully picks him up by the scruff of the neck and moves him right out. "We'll have to find out if there's some reason you can't go into session before we audit you."

Now, I'm making jokes here, but honestly, these things occur. And that's a gross auditing error, and that's gross auditing error number three.

All right. Now, gross auditing error number four is: *Can't complete an auditing cycle.* The auditor simply can't complete an auditing cycle. Now, it's quite remarkable that all this obsessive itsa you see will lay right here in this number four. You know, the PC just talked and talked and talked and talked and talked and talked and talked, and you couldn't get a question in sideways. What's wrong with that pc? Well, in life or in auditing sessions he has been pre-maturely acknowledged so often that he feels that he's never been acknowledged. Premature acknowledgment.

Fellow says—maybe to his mother, you know, habitually—"I've got a brilliant idea!" And his mother says, "That's very good!"

Or instead of acknowledging, they argue. "Are you sure you have answered the question I asked you? I asked you, 'Do birds fly?' and you said, 'When they had wings.' Now, are you sure that that is an answer to the question I asked you?" In other words, he stops the roll of the auditing cycle.

Well, believe me, there are literally hundreds of ways you can stop an auditing cycle from completing. One of the ways is not starting one. I've had this happen to me in the early days of auditing. The auditor simply sat there. I'd answered the auditing command, and the auditor simply sat there and said nothing. Literally, factually true—twenty minutes. I don't know to this day whether or not it was the auditor couldn't *think* of the next auditing command? Never started the cycle to finish. You got that? That was all.

Now, there'll be something wrong with that auditing cycle. And that's a gross auditing error to have something goofed up about your auditing cycle. Now, you can get your auditing cycle better and better and better, but there is a point when it is a passable auditing cycle. And that is, you ask the question, the PC answers it and you say, "Cheers," you know? If you can do that, why, from there on it really isn't a gross auditing error, it simply needs refinement and polish.

No, a gross auditing error, when you come down on it as number four gross auditing error (*Can't complete an auditing cycle*), it will be something utterly *mad*, if it's really getting in the road of the session. It will be completely gruesome. The auditor never asks the auditing question, just Qs-and-As with every answer.

The pc says, "Well, I think my mother." You know, answered the auditing question, "Who did you know?" You know?

"I think my mother"

"All right, what about your mother?"

"Oh? Well, she had bunions."

"What about bunions?"

Where's this session going? It's going to go over the hills and get lost completely. Started one auditing cycle, never finished it off, never did anything with it, never repeated it. You got it?

No, if you're ever case supervising and you suddenly detect that your pc—he could only get in one auditing question in a two-and-a-half-hour session. What's this? It must have been that he prematurely acknowledged it, or he must have told the pc not to say it, or the pc is stark staring crazy and has been audited by somebody who only prematurely acknowledged. There's something *very wrong here*. And you got to handle it, man; you got to handle it. Auditing sessions will not progress, because there's a gross auditing error present here of some kind or another. And somebody couldn't complete an auditing cycle, that's for sure, and the auditor for sure isn't handling the fact so that he *can*. Do you understand?

You could go, even on this basis, you find out—you say, "Do fish swim?" And to the—some actual process, you see. And the PC says, "Oh, well. Now, when you bring up something like that, that brings to mind a time when I was taking ichthyology in the University of Glasgow, and so forth. And I had a professor who had bugs in his skull, and we used to have to get flit guns in the middle of class and blow them in his ear".

An auditor who listens to that very long without spotting something is in error and he's unable to finish his auditing cycle, and who doesn't do anything about it, has not even become aware that he

should finish an auditing cycle. Do you see? So it's a gross auditing error in just not knowing he should finish an auditing cycle. Do you follow?

You've seen pcs wander on and on and on. They're the very low-level guys in a stag-gery frame of mind out in life. You get ahold of them and you start asking repetitive questions.

Psychologists are the real howl. The psychologist is certain that an auditing question is disposed of by being answered once, and it's really crazy auditing those boys. They have given you *the* answer. You talk about a fixated subject; every question has one answer. Oh brother! So, of course, they never discovered repetitive auditing. All right, that's number four: *Can't complete an auditing cycle.*

Now, number five is: *Can't complete a repetitive auditing cycle.* And that's a GAE. Now, completely aside from an auditing cycle, how about a repetitive auditing cycle? And you'd be—just be amazed at the trouble we had in early days of getting somebody to at least say, "Do fish swim?" a second time. And by the time they had been duplicative for about three or four consecutive questions, with somebody holding a pistol on them, their head began to burst and they started falling apart at the seams. It was asking too much that they repeat the auditing question.

All sorts of shifts were gone to, and we eventually developed the TRs. And then we also developed Op Pro by Dup—Opening Procedure by Duplication—and that is simply calculated to cure somebody of this weird malady.

But you should *hear* somebody who had just been caught and is just brought in for training when he is first told to do a duplicative auditing command. He's supposed to ask this question over and over and over. Many of them get away with it, but you'll find some bird who knows the proper thing to do is vary it.

"Do fish swim?" "Have you any idea about the swimming characteristics of fish?" See? "Do you mind if we discuss fish?" "Give me a synonym for fish." He thinks he's duplicating the auditing question.

Now, in other words, these are the five GAEs. These are the five GAEs which, if com-mitted, will dish auditing squarely and tremendously, just like that. It'll be finished.

Now, when you're case supervising and you're looking over auditors, this is what you look over when you find that you're consistently having misses. You look over this one. You look over the five GAEs on the auditor. When you're—when you're case supervising, then you tell anybody responsible for training—this is what I'm trying to relay—that they had jolly well better look over the five gross auditing errors on that auditor, because that auditor isn't going along all right. The sessions weren't going along all right, so we suspect at once one of the five GAEs, if not two or three.

We don't inspect the antagonism of this girl for large ruddy-faced men. We don't ex-amine the auditor's case, you see? We don't do this; we don't do that. All we do, and so on is when we say, "John Doakes has been having a very rough time auditing his last two or three pcs. I want you to go over this pc—this auditor and find out what the score is," now, the Training Officer should not then get the auditor audited. Training Officer should *promptly* and *immediately* check this guy out on five GAEs.

Can this guy read an E-Meter? You sometimes find out he's been bluffing for a long time. He's needed glasses for quite a while, but as a Scientologist he doesn't dare wear them. He can't even see the blur of the needle. You find weird things like this if you look for them. If you look for the *gross error*, you're going to handle the situation. But if you just look for little dust specks and dust motes, and so forth, you'll never get to it. And this is the list of the gross errors.

Then you want to know—you give him a little checkout—give him a little checkout. Say, "Well, let's see. Last week you were studying up on assessment, and so forth, and we went into assessment quite a little bit in the training classes. Here's a little examination on assessment." And the fellow can't pass any corner of it. What's the matter with him? Well, he doesn't know and apply his technical data.

So now—now we could maybe go into his case a little bit. We could say, "What would happen to you if you did apply some technical data? Is there anything wrong with applying straight data? Oh, well, there isn't. All right. Well, then, what word have you misunderstood in Scientology?" And that's the secret of it and we're away. So we'd straighten out his vocabulary. All of a sudden he could know and apply technical data. You understand? So we might go into it on a case basis, but only if we reached that point there: *Doesn't know and apply technical data.*

We'd find out if he could get and keep a pc in-session. We'd ask him such an offhand question as, "What's wrong with a pc who's critical of the auditor? Flunk!" The guy'd say, "Flunk? You didn't give me a chance to answer it." "Huh! Gave you a second and a half to answer the question as you ought to know that in a millisecond! You ought to know that *right now!* That pc has got a withhold! And nothing else!" "Oh. Well, I thought there were several other reasons." "*No!* There aren't any other reasons." GAE. Do you see?

Can't get and keep a pc in-session. Well, he doesn't know the various things which take a pc out of session or get a pc in-session. So how the devil could he get a pc in-session or keep him out of session if he didn't know what took pcs out of session or got them back into session? He couldn't do that at all, could he? So it'd be a gross auditing error on his part. He just doesn't know that—that little list of things, because it's not long.

And if he can't complete an auditing cycle, we can tell that fast enough. All we've got to do is set him up with some TRs and inspect how he does his TRs. And you'll find out about—maybe he can do 1, 2 and 3 or 0 all right, but when you get him to 4, every time he hits origin—no matter *how* you run origin, complicatedly or simply or anything of that sort—he will go appetite over tin cup on this whole basis. He can't handle the whole package all together. The pc says something unexpected, he's *thrown.* Now you know what'll happen; this person will Q-and-A with the pc because he gets *thrown* all the time. The pc originates, "Gee, the wall is covered with spiders!" And the auditor says, "That's—I didn't get that far in my drills."

And then we go into the inability to repeat an auditing cycle. Well, one of the ways to do that is just go into any kind of a repetitive line. Does the pc—does this auditor get nervous? Make him say, "Constantinople" fifty times. Does this make him nervous? You'll find it will, if he can't complete an auditing cycle. Oh, boy. He knows what happens if he's in the same place twice: you get shot. Life is dangerous.

So that—that handles—where we consider out-tech—that handles what can be wrong with the auditor, and that's all that can be wrong with an auditor. And if you go and imagine a bunch of other things can be wrong with an auditor, why, that's silly, and so forth. Because even if you get to such extremities as the auditor is unable to talk at all—not having any tongue or something—well, he can't complete an auditing cycle. Do you understand? He can't even start one. So you'd have to teach him how to audit by writing his commands down. Well, he can't write. All right, we'll fix him up; so, you teach him how to write.

There was somebody around the other day we were having to teach the English language so he could run R6. It was very interesting. I think he was unable to run it in his own native language because he'd forgotten it and he didn't know English well enough to run it in R6, and so forth. Well, the answer to that was very elementary: learn English.

So these things are resolvable. But if you don't know that those are the five gross audit-ing errors, then you can't resolve an auditor in his training or activities.

Now, let's go to the other side of this auditing team and let's take up a pc. And although this is much weightier and longer technology and, you know, is very difficult technology, the actual fact is there are only four things, really, that can be wrong with a pc, but we'll expand it to six, just to be happy about the thing. We cover these in the HCOB of 13 September 1965, out of which we're speaking, but I did not put in here the five gross auditing errors, but could well have done so. I gave some other data concerning the analysis of auditors. I give you now very fundamental data on the analysis of an auditor—whether or not he can audit. He'll have one of his five gross auditing errors out.

Now, let's take up pc—which is very, very important—and let's find out what about the pc. Well, there can be two things wrong with a pc that immediately don't really come into the auditing session, but tell whether or not the pc should be audited. There are only two things; these are only two things: The PC is suppressive or the pc is a PTS. Now, in either case you're running into heavy weather.

Now, what is a suppressive? Well, a suppressive, actually, is somebody who doesn't get any case gain. And that in actual fact is taken up under the later one here of the continuing overts. He really doesn't get case gain because of continuing overts. Now, a suppressive is simply defined as—for your information, regardless—this is an auditor's viewpoint, now, not an Ethics Officer's viewpoint—but a suppressive is somebody who doesn't get any case gain.

And you say, "Well, isn't that nice." That lets you out. So you don't have to get a case gain on this fellow, and if you don't get a case gain on this fellow, you just get rid of the whole thing. You don't have to do a better technical job. You just say, "He's a suppressive! Ha-ha! That lets us out."

Well, the truth of the matter is, in my experience, it's very nearly impossible not to get a case gain. Very close to impossible not to get a case gain. You're only talking about 2½ percent of the pcs in actual fact. You'll have trouble with about 20 percent of the pcs because they're SPs or PTSes, but in actual fact only about 2½ percent of the total pcs running along the line... Now, this doesn't include the society as a whole, but it's certainly people who come into Scientology or around Scientology; you're only handling about 2½ percent of them that are suppressive.

Now, it doesn't mean that you didn't get a gain in the session, so therefore the fellow was suppressive. It means this fellow has been audited by this one and that and the other one, and people have really tried, and this person gets no case gain.

Well, it so happens that we're good enough today to be able to say "SP." What makes an SP an SP? From an auditor's standpoint, he is not even *vaguely* really interested in what makes an SP an SP. He's just interested in the fact that you shouldn't ought to audit one and devote and dedicate your life to auditing an SP who isn't going to get any case gain anyhow. What's going to happen to this fellow? Well, I'm afraid he should have thought about that be-fore he started going so bad! So he's still populating the universe when the rest of us aren't.

What's this worry about the SP? Believe me, he never worries about you. Now, what about this boy? Well, actually, it's covered down here under six on the same list, as I've just said: He actually is committing continuing overts. Now, trying to get those continuing overts off and trying to get to the source of those continuing overts and trying to move forward with any kind of case gain on this person at all is *very,* very hard to do, but can be done. And the *only* process that will *really* handle a suppressive—the only series of processes are Power Processes—Second Stage Release. And that will handle one.

Now, occasionally a person can be overaudited so heavily and so far—particularly over-audited, let us say, on R6EW or in some very powerful process, and they've just been audited up the spout— they, thereafter, won't get any case gain. You have to go back and pick them up where they should have been picked up and rehabilitate where they were overrun before they'll get a case gain. And the funny part of it is, is during that period the person's actions will be slightly suppressive. Quite interesting.

Don't confuse, then, somebody who's been overrun and isn't getting any case gain the last few days. What you want is—on a suppressive is—he's never gotten any case gain. It doesn't ever exist. He has never had any case gain. He has never had any TA. You get the idea? That's the category. And you'll find out that about 2½ percent of the people that are around on the streets, and so forth, will come under that category.

And he doesn't get a case gain because he continually commits little tiny overts. He is so engaged in fighting some imaginary battle in the past that he has no time to have any friends in the present. Everyone to him is an enemy and each individual is an "everyone." He is the master of generalities. The world itself around him is A=A=A. He's actually in a pretty mad spin. And in institutions there are only two types of people: suppressives and PTSes. There is *nothing* else in an institution, from top to bottom. Therefore, the poor old ruddy psychiatrist never gets a crack at anything but a suppressive or a PTS.

That is why consistently I have said to you, "Don't fool with the insane." I couldn't give you a pat explanation of *why* you shouldn't fool with the insane, but I told you, you just shouldn't. Well, that is why. The insane are composed—you see, well, there's an insane person; he's always fighting an imaginary enemy. That's one of the biggest definitions of insanity. Or he's retreating madly from an imaginary enemy.

And then in the insane asylum, you will find the PTSes that the SPs have put there. And you do anything for this person—this PTS—and of course, the SP will cave him in again within twenty— four hours of contact. You're going to see this inevitably. You couldn't win if you had to. Here, then, is this whole subject of insanity.

Now, what is a PTS? Number one: the pc—a case does not advance. Only six reasons a case does not advance—number one: the PC is suppressive. All right, we could go into that. We could get the person to Saint Hill, and so forth. But remember, we don't have any padded cells here. We can't accommodate certain types of personnel here. We have no hospital keepers, guards, all that sort of thing. You'd just be surprised how many people are walking around in that society out there who *do* need keepers and guards. It's quite interesting. There are a lot of them.

And because the psychiatrist isn't any better than he is, he really can't spot his really in-sane people. Oh, he spots them when they finally wind up in his lap. His recognition is up to recognizing an insane person when the insane person is dropped in his lap. But going out into the society and trying to analyze who is crazy and who isn't, the psychiatrist, being a PTS, professionally, himself, has not actually done anything more than just give you a big generality: "Everybody is crazy." You find Menninger was saying that: "Well, everybody is crazy, you know." It's quite interesting. "Some people are more crazy than others." He's not right at all. He's not right at all.

Every once in a while a guy gets a sensation like he's going to blow his top or going nuts. That's for sure. But if he recognizes it is a sensation, he isn't crazy, because a crazy person never finds out.

Now, a potential trouble source is simply, for an auditor's—from an auditor's view-point, somebody connected to a suppressive. That's all a potential trouble source is; don't look for any other trimmings. And from an auditor and a Case Supervisor's viewpoint, a PTS (potential trouble source) is always recognized as a "rolly coaster." Now rolly coaster—that unfortunately adds another tough

13

term to Scientology technology and vocabulary. But a rolly coaster is simply just that: A person goes up and he goes down and he goes up and he goes down. And it's just a jolly-o, billy-o, around the corners. "*Whoop up!* Ah, *whee!* I feel fine! Oh, it's terrific—*uah*—oh, I feel awful."

Now, the psychiatrist specialized in a type of thing called "manic-depressive." Maybe you remember the term. That means the guy is *www*—up and the guy is down. Manic, up; depressive, down. The manic-depressive is one of the common and standard symptoms of insanity, but in some types of insanity-"types" of insanity—why, it's manifested mainly as just frozen fish, you know? The guy doesn't go up or down and that's the suppressive. You got it?

Psychiatrist has differentiated, then, between the manic-depressive and the paranoid. The paranoid doesn't change. He's already got his types, see? But this manic-depressive action is simply symptomatic of a person being next to an undetected suppressive. And I don't care whether he's insanely manic-depressive or sanely manic-depressive. He feels good today and bad tomorrow, don't you see? That's a rolly coaster.

Now, we particularly mean a rolly coaster is: he feels good after auditing and then feels bad. He leaves the session; he's terrific. His tone arm is down. Everything is going along fine. He's had some good cognitions. The somatic is gone. He walks out of that session, he comes back to the next session, and he's on the bottom. And you say, "Oh, I've must have done something wrong. Oh, the pc must have self-audited. Oh, figure—figure—figure—figure—figure—figure," and until you really—till you really got your wits wrapped around this important datum, you're going on figuring yourself to death about this. That person is a PTS.

And then the next little bridge you're going to cover is: "Well, he couldn't be a PTS, because he didn't *meet* the suppressive person between sessions. Now, you've interjected that arbitrary, nobody else has. He didn't *have* to. All he had to think was, "What will Jonesy think about this?" Do you follow? Person didn't have to be present. You don't have to locate the physical presence. This suppressive is around in the environment, even though they're ten thousand miles away. Do you see?

A person rolly coastering—there's only one reason a person rolly coasters and that isn't because an auditor forgets to say, "End of session," with the proper happy *lilt* in his voice. That person felt good on Monday and on Tuesday came into session feeling bad.

Now, an auditor can pull a couple of accidental suppressive acts, like refuse to ac-knowledge the PC or ARC break and make the guy feel worse. We're not talking about that sort of thing. We're talking about just pure, outright rolly coaster. And there's only one thing wrong with a rolly coaster and that is he is a potential trouble source, meaning he is connected to a suppressive. I imagine Ethics Officers around the world are learning this and unlearning it and relearning it and all of a sudden will eventually sort it out and say, "By God, that's true," you know? Because every once in a while, they can't find the SP; they can't find the suppressive.

Why do we say "potential trouble source?" Because they *always* commit trouble, and that's the big generality that you can make about a PTS. Sooner or later you're going to have trouble. Any time you got—we got one the other day—I—well, the other day. We've had one hanging around the fringes for about, I don't know, five, six months and he wasn't convinced there was any SP. And no SP had been really located on the case and confirmed, and so forth. And this person was going up to HASI London and getting audited and getting *tremendous* results and going down to the bottom the next week, and so on. And they finally found the suppressive and got the good indicators in and straightened the person out after this long period of time.

Actually, it was just really not really convincingly locating the SP in that person's life. And that's the only thing that masks it, because an SP speaks totally in generalities. An SP speaks, "Everybody

14

thinks you are a heel." Like, "The community believes you are a dog." You see? "Men are *always* like that. *All* men are like that." This is this type of sweeping generality and the guys are not locatable in the environment. They just sort of butter themselves all over the environment. And you try to get a case to go spot a suppressive in its vicinity and, "No, no, no, no, no. I haven't got any. No, there's nobody there." This person has spoken in generalities to such a point that he doesn't exist anymore. He's just a generality himself—he's everybody!

So in Scientology these days, we know this well enough, and somebody who sails in, and so forth, and says, "Well, everybody thinks we advertise too much..." The HCO Sec will inevitably say, "What is everybody's name?" or "Who is everybody?" And the person will think for a moment and think for a moment, "Well, his name is Sweeney." And good indicators will come in.

Now, if you audit this person, you're just setting this person up. And if you audit this person to a tremendously successful gain, you may get him killed. I say that advisedly, you know—just shot down in his tracks.

Let's say you *really* pulled the technology out, and boy, you really did a bang-up job of auditing; man, you *really* cleaned up this case and this case was just *sailing*. (Of course, you couldn't get the case up to Clear, which is where you'd have had to take the case.) And you sent the case home at the end of the intensive, and the person is *really* walking on air. One of two things will happen. This *has* happened: the SP has committed suicide. *Bang!* Just like that. Or the SP just walks out in the kitchen and pours the arsenic into the coffee, because they can't have anybody better. They're having *enough* trouble killing them while they're sick. Do you see that?

You really—you really can walk a PTS right straight into it, man. Maybe it's not that dramatic, but it will be that gruesome. So you really shouldn't audit an SP or a PTS. Actually, here at Saint Hill, we really shouldn't take on SPs. We can do so because we're insouciant. That's a word you can look up afterwards.

But there we are. There's the two things, now. And one of these days you will suddenly come up with a tremendously important datum, exclamation point, that "By God, Ron's right: A person rolly coasters only because he's connected to a suppressive person and you jolly well better not audit them." And most of the trouble we've had has come from PTSes—actually not from SPs, but PTSes.

SPs have incited it all, but the *trouble* has been made by the PTS. Quite fascinating. But see, the trouble is made by the PTS becoming better, and then the SP gets desperate and makes all kinds of trouble. Do you get the idea? So the source of the trouble is our auditing a PTS. We wouldn't get any trouble auditing the SP because he wouldn't go anyplace anyhow. All he'd do is snarl, and so forth, and make an auditor a bit unhappy and miserable, but he won't do anything like when you audit a PTS.

And it's very discouraging to an auditor. This guy was fine on Monday, collapses on Friday. The auditor is absolutely certain he has done something wrong. He hasn't done any-thing wrong except audit a PTS. He audited a potential trouble source and didn't recognize it.

There was another, earlier rolly coaster—and this is one of the things a Case Supervisor on pcs has to be *very* alert to—there was an earlier rolly coaster and they explained it all away. "Oh, it was because he was up too late that night." Yes, I know. The earlier rolly coaster that was last week on Thursday when he was feeling so good and came back to the session on Fri-day and was feeling so bad—they ran that down and that turned out to be "having been up too late Thursday night." They ignore that and there the guy rolly coasters again, and so forth, and people are wondering, "What on Earth is going on here?" Well, they just weren't industrious enough locating the SP of last week, see? What was it? Who is it? Where is it? That's what you want to locate and when you've got that located—you go right on hunting until you *do* locate it, too. Because when you do locate the SP,

15

why, the good indicators will all come in on the pc. But if the pc has accepted the fact that you have located the SP and the good indicators aren't in, you haven't found the SP. That's the little technology back of that that's been quite interesting. If you find the right SP, you'll always get the good indicators in. If you don't find the right suppressive person to which the PTS is connected, you will *not* get the good indicators in. And it's as obvious as all that.

That's another one of these simple—elementary things. When you push down on the accelerator the engine will run faster, and when you take your foot off the accelerator the engine will run slower. You regulate the engine with the accelerator. Somebody goes out and they say, "I'm very sure you regulate the engine with the brake." Well, they gets a little tiny success of regulating it with the brake. They try going sixty miles an hour and putting on the brake while leaving the car in gear and it slows down the engine, so they say, "See?" Burns the en-gine up, but then that doesn't much—burns the brakes up too. Long as they—as long as they don't know this very interesting little datum then they keep coming a cropper.

See, they get in there—somebody operates without a meter, or they can't run a meter, or something like this. And they try to—they found this person rolly coastered, and then they try to get on this person what person it was, and then they can't find one. Or they find one and they say, "Well, it's your Aunt Mamie." And the person says, "Oh, all right, Aunt Mamie. I'll disconnect from her. All right." No, no, no, no. No, that PTS is not PTS because of Aunt Mamie. *Nuh—uh*. Good indicators didn't come in; your meter didn't blow up. Do you follow? It's very positive.

I mean it's one of these things—I'm actually trying to describe to you something. But all the points I'm describing to you in this particular lecture are the types of points you make with searchlights. See? Searchlights in a perfectly black night. I mean, they're of that value and importance. This isn't just a bunch of tiny data that is all buried with the dust motes, you see? These are the basic regulating data, is what I'm talking to you about, all on the basis of getting tech in.

So those are the first two. You could consider them technical, but actually to a large de-gree they are personal. And when we get right down to it, then, there are four—the remainder of the six. There are four things, then, that can be wrong with a case and *that's all*. That—we've finished the whole door, we've got it all built right there at that point, and it opens, and the corridor is long beyond it. That's the lot.

And if you're going around worrying about, "Somebody isn't being audited, because I haven't got the right process, because if I just assess something or other with my left hand in-stead of my right hand… And Krishnamurti said that time was the devourer of all men. Maybe he has an eating fantasy that's mixed up with sex." You're just talking in a bunch of balder-dash, because there aren't very many reasons why cases don't get along well. First is the SP; the second, the guy is a PTS. All right, if you've gotten rid of those two and he's neither of those two, then, one of these remaining *will* be it—not might be it; *will* be it.

And they are: ARC broken—pc is ARC broken. Pc has got a present time problem of long duration; that comes under categories like hidden standards and all that sort of thing. They're just present time problems of long duration. And number five: The pc's got a withhold or a misunderstood word, which is a withhold of understanding; he's withholding himself from it, or reverse. And number six: continuing overts which he then withholds and that makes a suppressive. And there aren't any more things which drive tech out than that, because a Case Supervisor who doesn't look at those things, then can't get any process to work from there on down!

Now, what are the processes? Processes are things that work if these six things aren't there. Got it? So when you say, "Tech is out in a certain area," you are saying they are trying to make processes work while paying no attention to the five gross auditing errors in auditors; and no attention, or minimum attention, to the six things that prevent a case from advancing. You follow that?

So if you ignore these six things and try to go on auditing cases, no process under the sun, moon and stars is going to work. But the funny part of it is, if these six cases are okay, practically any process under the sun, moon and stars will work, which is quite fascinating. The only reason a process doesn't *work* is because it has worked and is now being madly *overrun*. You got it?

Processes don't work beyond the point when they're finished. You can't lift any more concrete off the sidewalk than there is concrete in the sidewalk, and you try to lift more and people are going to get upset.

Now therefore, if anything goes wrong with technology from the Case Supervisor's viewpoint, on behalf of the auditor, it is covered in these five gross auditing errors. Those satisfied, if a case does not advance and so forth, then the case isn't advancing because of these six things: Pc is suppressive; Pc is PTS; pc is ARC broken; pc has a present time problem of long duration; pc has a withhold or a misunderstood word; and continuing overts are hidden from view.

Now honest, that's all. I'm talking now about an eagle's-eye view of the track and the mind and human beings. And when you look back over it all on the *vast* oceans of data that we could be covering here, and so forth, you find out that if tech is out, then it's just covered in that list. Either one or more of the five gross auditing errors are present, or one of these six things is wrong with the pc. *That's all!* There isn't whether he paid his dues to the "I Will Arise" Burial Society. It isn't because he hasn't paid for his E-Meter.

So that's the total lump sum of important barriers that stop progress in auditing. And believe me, I have been at this now for about, actually, eighteen years, and I can tell you there are no data that lie outside these data. There are no other data. And I tell you that forcefully, just mainly because I don't want you to go on stumbling around thinking that you're going to find one, because you're cleaning a clean; you're looking for something else that isn't there.

Now, therefore, analysis of out-tech would bring about getting tech in. Well, how would you get tech in? Well, you'd get tech in by fixing it up so these five gross auditing errors weren't being made, and so these six things, when—one of these six things, when wrong with a case, would be promptly detected and handled. And tech would then be in; tech would be in well. And you'd go on and audit standard processes and all goes along like a well—oiled dream. There's nothing worrisome or upsetting. You have minimum upsets along the line then. When all of a sudden something shows up over the horizon... Some auditor is on his second pc and hasn't made very fast gains on the first pc, and he didn't make very—he isn't making it very good. And he all of a sudden is having a big problem and suddenly comes up and wants to suddenly run "Give me that hand" in the middle of a Power Process. No, don't for God's sakes Q-and-A with that at all! Don't Q-and-A with that at all! Just go back to stable data, because you're going to be led *all over the pasture!* One of these five things is wrong with the auditor or one of these six things is wrong with the pc.

I don't care *what* the auditor said. If it's some departure from what you know to be standard, or it's a suggestion that is over the hills and far away that doesn't have very much to do with the price of fish, or they're demanding that we change processes and run six of them in one session, or there's something peculiar has suddenly been presented to view; we don't both-er to find out what's been presented to view. We just abandon all of that body of data, and we look for one of the five gross auditing errors in the auditor and one of the six things that can be wrong with a pc. And we just get those things looked for, right now!

All of a sudden, we find out all this time this auditor thought that one process was another process, and it was—in actual fact had never run the first process they were supposed to run on the pc, but had run an entirely different process. You would get absolutely fascinated.

The GAE, here, is indicated by the fact that the auditor also can't do a checkout on cur-rent or modern processes—second of the GAEs is wrong. So you go and look at what they—you know, compare these things. Have they done that on this case too? Ah, well, yeah, yeah. They were supposed to run Process 1, 2, 3 and 4. They didn't; they ran Process 9, 12 and 2. And then ran them with the wrong wording. Do you see?

And as far as the pc is concerned, why isn't this pc making advances? Aw, there's no reason to stand around and try to blow your brains out and worry and lie awake all night saying, "Let's see, could there be some confusion with the collusion?" There's no sense in lying around and lying awake on the thing. *Relax!* You got a pc you're worried about, roll up your sleeves and say, "This pc has got one of six things wrong at this minute. One of these six things is wrong."

Now, the funny, funny, funny part of it is, you say, "Oh well, yes, you can overrun processes. That could also be wrong with the pc." No, that's one hell of a problem to the pc, and it either will wind up as a problem or an ARC break.

I set up this exact run to be run a little while ago by the Qual Sec on a test case—not a test case particularly—a case we wanted to handle. (And I already knew this bird.) But I set it up, and sure enough he got case overrun showing up as a *little tiny tick* which, when he developed it, developed into a blowdown. The process had been overrun and had previously not been detected. A case state had been attained which had never been acknowledged. It showed up on a problem. So there isn't even overrun.

Ah, you're worried about what's wrong with this case? Well, just have a good night's sleep and in the next session you just hammer at it. Has this—just ask yourself (look over this case's folders and so forth), "Has this case ever got a case gain? Has this case ever rolly coastered? Is this person ARC broken? Does this person have a chronic present time problem?" Which would include hidden standards and overrun processes and unacknowledged this and that. "Is this person running along here with a withhold or something misunderstood that they're not telling us is misunderstood and pretending they understand? Is something wrong here in the withhold department? Or is this person every time they leave the auditing session casually go out and phone the FDA to give them some more data on us? *Which is it?"*

Well now, if GAE number one, *Can't handle and read a meter…* If an auditor can handle and read an auditing meter, I assure you, you can assess those things, and you're going to find the right one every time. There isn't anything else that can be wrong with a case. And then if you handled the five things that can be wrong with an auditor and if you handle the six things that can be wrong with a pc, then you won't ever have to worry about tech being out, because it will be in. And when it starts out it will go *straight back in again.*

But you talk about the sea of data—tremendous, tremendous sea of data where we could have *anything* important *anywhere*—I pity you, drowning amongst the data of life. "Is it really my father that drove me mad or was it my Uncle Jim? Or on the other hand, was it the teacher in the seventh grade? Somebody drove me mad. I wonder who it was?"

And you're absolutely certain that if you just solve that point and find out who it was that drove you mad, then you will be totally sane forevermore. Well, in the first place, you couldn't be totally mad if you were trying to find out what drove you totally mad, because the definition of a madman is, he's the last one to know. He thinks he's totally right.

And you think, "If I just dig up that data, that's what Clear means. All I have to do is dig up that one datum and I'll be there," and eventually get run on a process and you find out it wasn't *any* of those people; it wasn't any of those people. Actually, you did have a playmate who was rather mean to you

and suppressive, and you locate him, and you'll feel fine, and you're shut of that problem, and you have made an advance. But you have made an advance of one little chip in a vast ocean.

And when you look at *all* of the multitudinous data of your own past, all the confusing data of your own present and add to that a sea of data that you're given in Scientology, you say, "How can I possibly ever pilot my way through all this? Look at all these bulletins. Look at all these tapes. And all these things seem to be so important, and everything seems to be so important, and nothing, and that, and so forth. And all I'm doing is sitting here trying to find out who was mean to me when I was five."

Well, just remember the saving grace is, one, that people are making it routinely; and as you get on up the line, the selection of importances becomes more and more an ability that is easily practiced. In other words, you could be more and more capable of selecting importances; given sixteen data you can select the one that is important out of the sixteen. And then you find out that you're really getting somewhere.

And when I tell you, looking over all the auditing of the past, that there's just those five things that can be wrong with an auditor, and it's just those six things that can be wrong with a pc; all you've got to find out is how to apply and remedy those five, and how you've got to apply and straighten out those six. Do you understand?

And frankly, there isn't an interminable body of data behind them. There are only a *few* data behind each one of those. And when we get down to it, that is what keeps the cases roll-ing; that's what makes them come on up the line in auditing. You generally look on it and say, "It's processes that do." Oh yes, that's perfectly true. But if the case is going, why, the process will work. But if the case isn't going and the process isn't working, why, then it isn't the process that isn't working, you understand? It's one of these five things. One of the five is wrong with you or one of the six is wrong with the pc. You have to decide which it is and put it right, and all of a sudden it'll all run like a bomb.

That should give you a terrific orientation. Furthermore, it should give anybody who is in charge of any activity or getting anything done, a terrifically keen insight into the situation, because the whole environment is trying to feed him different data than these. And these are the data, and the only data he can afford to look at. And when he pays attention to those, all works! When he ceases to pay attention to those, the whole world becomes a complete sea of confusion again.

All right. Well, I hope that'll help you out. I hope that it narrows the field down. I wanted to talk to you today just to give you a fast reorientation on the subject of what you're looking at. Yes, processes are important. Yes, all the things you're studying are important. Yes, you have definitely got to know how to run a process and what are the manifestations and phenomena of the process. But when it comes right down to it, it isn't because you're running a process badly, in actual fact, that you're not getting case gains on the pc, it's because either you are practicing one of the five gross auditing errors undetectedly or the pc you're auditing falls into one of the six which I have listed. It isn't that you're doing the process badly. So if you think that just by constant shift of process and constant changing everything around and constantly trying to invent Scientology all over again in the middle of a session you're suddenly going to get a gain on a pc who isn't gaining, you're going to have a lose every time.

What it takes is standard processing with all five gross auditing errors remedied in the auditor and none of those six things present in the pc. And if you've got that all straight, then it really doesn't matter, you'll get gains even if you run "Do birds fly?" Do you follow?

And you'll find out, if you pay attention to this and learn how to handle these as a set of tools, that auditing—application of—becomes very, very simple indeed. And when you're very quick off the

mark with these six things—particularly the last four are the ones that you really work on—and if you're very quick off the mark with those, and you can spot them, and you can handle them, and you can get rid of ARC breaks, PTPs and withholds, misunderstoods, overts (you know, that little category of things; you can handle those *brrrtt!* why, there isn't a pc in the world ever gets away with a thing as far as you're concerned. You've got it all taped, all nailed. Sessions just go *bzzoom!* onward and upward, because you're not auditing a pc who is having a bad time, you're auditing a pc who is doing all right.

And I invite you to partake deeply of this wisdom, because you will be very, very much happier as an auditor thereby, and a Case Supervisor, too.

Thank you very much.